

# ENEMY IMAGES

## A Resource Manual on Reducing Enmity

By

*Psychologists for Social Responsibility*

208 I Street, NE - Washington DC 20002

We don't see things as they are;  
We see things as we are.

Anais Nin

An exaggerated, literally diabolical image of another country—a country that is actually composed of human beings not so very different from the citizens of one's own country—is in my judgment the very taproot of war in the present-day world.

*Ralph K. White, Ph.D.*  
*Author of **Fearful Warriors***

We are members of a human race that possesses the knowledge required to feed itself and to provide education and a life of relative health, comfort, and cooperation for all in the context of a globally peaceful and ecologically sustainable planet. Yet, we are still polarized and compartmentalized, torn by racial, ethnic, and class hostilities, religious and sectarian antagonism, and competing special-interest groups and ideologies and steeped in politics as usual, lacking the collective will to extricate ourselves from this quagmire.

*Elena Mustakova-Possardt, Ed.D.*  
*Author of **Critical Consciousness: Study of Morality in Global Historical Context***

The challenge to those of us who set a very high priority on moving towards peace is to induce more of our colleagues and our fellow citizens to agree with us—and to bring our skills and resources to bear on government without the support of a national consensus.

*M. Brewster Smith, Ph.D.*  
*Kurt Lewin Memorial Address, 1986*

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface

Acknowledgements

Introduction

***Section I:*** Globalization and Enmity: Toward a Culture of Peace  
Transcending Beliefs in the Intrinsic Nature of War  
The United Nations Culture of Peace Initiative  
Enemy Images and Nonviolence  
The Nature of Template Enemy Images: The Mask of Enmity  
Enemy Images and Identity Formation

***Section II:*** Effects of Enemy Images: Theory and Examples  
1. Cognitive Biases: Selective Perception and Memory, Cognitive Dissonance,  
and Causal Attribution  
    Ingroup Aggrandizement via Enemy Imaging  
2. Acting on Images: Self-Fulfilling Prophecy & the Cyclical Effects  
of Mirror Imaging  
3. Solutions: Dismantling the Mask of Enmity

***Section III:*** Enemy Images in Fiction

***Section IV:*** Rethinking Enmity: An Introduction to the Psychology of Enemy Images  
(A Sample Talk)

***Section V:*** Audience Participation Activities

## Preface

When asked if they considered the government of Russia evil, 75% of the respondents said “no” (Gallup Poll 2003). *Dismantling the Mask of Enmity: A Resource Manual on the Psychology of Enemy Images* was initially released in 1989. It was directed toward relations between the United States and the Soviet Union. Fourteen years later, we can see the transient quality of an exaggerated enemy image: the “evil empire” has been replaced by an “axis of evil”.

The new East/West conflict involves Western cultural, political and military hegemony versus Islamic fundamentalism and terrorism. In the West political measures employed to defend against Cold War threats are like old wine in new bottles. The Patriot Act legislation echoes a McCarthy-like clamping down on threats to national security in the U.S., while orange and red alerts create an atmosphere reminiscent of backyard bomb shelters as well as a justification for military spending.

Like the original, we have aspired to transcend our Western bias and provide a balanced perspective. We expect that the audience for this updated manual will, as was the case with the original, be predominantly from the U.S. and other Western countries.

This second edition of the manual is a combination of old and new material. Certain examples from the Cold War have been left in this updated manual. They can be examined with a dispassion and perspective we don't have with today's “enemies”. On the other hand, current examples provide an opportunity to moderate enmification that is affecting our world today. The similarity between past and current exaggerated enemy images underscores the human tendency to demonize the “other” when one feels threatened.

This manual was first produced during an increasing thaw in U.S./Soviet relations. Our hope is that with increased understanding, we can contribute to a similar outcome with the current East/West conflict.

## **Acknowledgments**

Psychologists for Social Responsibility (PsySR) is a non-profit organization that relies extensively upon the creativity and the dedication of its members for outstanding volunteer efforts. Some of the most important contributors to the original Manual were Mike Wessells, Brett Silverstein, Dorothy Ciarlo, Sandy McPherson and Linden Nelson.

For this revised edition, I am especially indebted to Elena Mustakova-Possardt, Sandra McPherson and Artis Bergman. Along with cogent additions from David Adams, Elena wrote a new first section, updating the manual for the current global context. Artis Bergman, Elena, Rachel Whitworth and Steve Handwerker helped revise the second section. Sandra McPherson and Tara Nicotra helped revise the third section. And Elena assisted in the revision of the fifth section. Along with PsySR interns Tara Nicotra and Artis Bergman, Aaron Wessells worked on this update and he was instrumental in the early stages of this manual revision.

Special goes to Anne Anderson, the National Coordinator of PsySR, who served as organizer, coach, cheerleader, and critic for the original manual as well as this updated version. This project, like so many others, reflects her tireless and thoughtful efforts.

Finally, thanks are due to the many people who have used the original Manual and who, with the help of this updated Enemy Images Manual, will apply their own art and sensitivity to educate effectively, helping us to deal responsibly with images of the enemy in our new East/West polarity, Western cultural, political and military hegemony versus Islamic fundamentalism and terrorism.

Steve Fabick  
Editor

## **Introduction**

Peacemakers often work on reducing weaponry, an essential step toward security. But building a lasting peace requires that we change not only our weapons but also our ways of thinking. Just as we need to dismantle weapons, so too do we need to moderate the enemy images that limit our thinking about security that fuels tension and war. One of the best ways of moderating enemy images is through education that analyzes the psychology of enemy images, that engages us in experiential learning about our own hidden biases and assumptions about our enemies, and that increases our awareness of and resistance to the harmful effects of enemy images.

Psychologists for Social Responsibility designed this Resource Manual for teaching college and high school students and for educating the public about the psychological processes that underlie enemy images and their diverse effects. Presentations on enemy images may have a variety of related goals. The presenter may wish to reduce misconceptions between particular groups predisposed to conflict, to increase critical thinking skills and resistance to propaganda, to increase receptiveness to negotiation and conflict resolution, to build empathy skills, or to teach psychological principles using material to which many students can relate. The particular set of goals underlying a presentation will define the content and the style of the presentation. To this end, we have organized this guide in a flexible manner, providing presenters with descriptions of theory, research, as well as examples from history and the mass media. We also provide suggestions for audience activities that are useful in bringing presentations alive.

The manual begins with a section on the particular challenge to rethink enmity considering current global conditions. It identifies the pervasive paralyzing effect of the belief in war as intrinsic to human nature, and highlights The United Nations Culture of Peace Initiative as an effort to challenge and transcend this belief. It examines the template for the creation of enemy images and contrasts it to principles of nonviolence. The section explores the psychosocial foundation of enemy images in processes of identity formation, setting the stage to examine, in Section II, the cognitive processes involved in such enmification.

Section II focuses on the cognitive effects of enemy images, showing how our conceptions of a group of people as our "enemy" may lead to systematic misperceptions of them. Although this section focuses on published research, each of the processes is illustrated with examples from history and the mass media. This section is divided into three parts, the first of which concerns perceptions. The second part is devoted specifically to actions based upon perceptions of enmity, and the third part addresses solutions to exaggerated enmification.

Section III deals with enemy images in ancient history and fiction, with a particular emphasis on film. While this section does not deal with psychological research, it reflects some of the ways enemy images are spread among the public. This material appeals strongly to high school and college students and is often an effective means of getting them involved in discussions of the more basic processes.

Section IV of the Manual is a general overview of the topic of enemy images. This section is useful on its own as a sample talk or in combination with the other sections in preparing class lectures or a community presentation. If you are not a psychologist, you will find it useful to read this section first.

Because lectures are not always the most appropriate or effective means of promoting learning, the Section V presents a variety of activities for enhancing learning. Each activity is presented along with a set of goals, an explanation of the procedure, suggestions for discussion, and, where appropriate, handouts for the audience. By choosing activities that are appropriate to your audience, your goals, and your own style of presentation, you may create a rich learning experience that enables the participants so move beyond their own hidden assumptions and enemy images.

This Manual will evolve over time, keeping abreast of the rapid changes underway in the international and domestic arena, of changes in the needs and issues of prospective audiences, and of advances in the study and teaching of enemy images. We welcome your feedback and suggestions, which may be sent directly to Psychologists for Social Responsibility: 208 I Street, NE, Washington DC 20002, or visit the website at [www.psysr.org](http://www.psysr.org).

---

## SECTION 1

---

### **Globalization and Enmity: Toward a Culture of Peace**

---

With the end of the Cold War in the 1990s, the peace seemed at long last within reach. With advances in technology and communication, it is more possible for everyone to view the world, with all its myriad diversified peoples, as connected. Is world peace achievable as the next stage in the evolution of this planet?

#### **Transcending Beliefs in the Intrinsic Nature of War**

Whether peace is attained only after unimaginable horrors precipitated by humanity's stubborn clinging to old patterns of behavior, or is to be embraced by an act of collective will, is our choice.

Favorable trends include the creation of the League of Nations, succeeded by the more broadly based United Nations Organization; the achievement of independence by the majority of nations since the Second World War; cooperation among hitherto isolated and antagonistic groups in collaborative undertakings in the scientific, educational, legal, economic and cultural fields; the rise in recent decades of an unprecedented number of international humanitarian organizations; the spread of women's, youth, and peace and justice organizations; and the networking of ordinary people through the internet.

The scientific and technological advances occurring in the twentieth century mark a great opportunity for social evolution as well. They provide the means by which many practical problems of humanity may be solved, including ways to bring us together physically, socially, intellectually and politically. Yet barriers persist. Prejudice, mistrust and narrow self-interest beset peoples in their relations with other groups. Indeed, so much have aggression and conflict come to characterize our social, economic and religious systems, that many have succumbed to the view that it is intrinsic to human nature and therefore ineradicable.

Over the years, studies have shown that more or less half of all young people around the world have come to believe that war and violence are intrinsic to human nature<sup>1</sup>. A study that investigated the question, found that the myth of war being intrinsic to human nature discourages action for peace by young people<sup>2</sup>. Regrettably, the culture of war is still supported by many in government and the mass media, and there is a tendency to support any argument for a so-called genetic basis to war.

---

<sup>1</sup> Attitudes of young people about war and human nature were measured by the following studies: Wahlstrom, R. (1985). On the psychological premises for peace education. 3rd European Conference, International Society for Research on Aggression, Parma, Italy; . Donald Granberg (Granberg, D. 1975. War expectancy: Some further studies, International Journal of Group Tensions, 5: 8-25. Eckhardt, W. Cross cultural theories of war and aggression, International Journal of Group Tensions, 2: 36-51, 1972.

<sup>2</sup> The Myth That War Is Intrinsic to Human Nature Discourages Action for Peace by Young People, David Adams and Sarah Bosch, in *Essays on Violence*, J. Martin Ramirez, Robert A. Hinde and Jo Groebel (eds.), University of Seville. 1987, Pages 123-237 (available online on the Internet at <http://www.culture-of-peace.info/myth/title-page.html>).

To challenge media bias, leading scientists from around the world met in Seville, Spain, in 1986, examined the evidence and issued the *Seville Statement on Violence*. They stated that warfare is not intrinsic to human nature and not based on genetic, brain or "instinctual factors." They concluded, echoing the words of the great anthropologist Margaret Mead that "the same species that invented war is capable of inventing peace."<sup>3</sup>

The Seville Statement on Violence has been formally adopted by the American Anthropological, Sociological and Psychological Associations. It has been published in hundreds of journals and books in scores of languages. One of the most accessible is in the *American Psychologist*, October 1990, 45: 1167.

Dispassionately examined, as in the case of the Seville Statement on Violence, the evidence suggests that enmity, far from expressing people's true nature, represents a distortion of the human spirit. Such a view promotes constructive social action, which encourage cooperation instead of war and conflict.

Hence the need for this revised Resource Manual on Enemy Images. Its focus on reducing enmity requires a close examination, through a mixture of theory and application, of our tendency toward polarization of us and them, and increasingly exaggerated justifications of such polarization. As we begin to understand the psychological processes involved in constructing enemy images, we are able to counteract these processes, without underestimating global tensions and resulting conflicts, while beginning to develop a larger and more inclusive sense of belonging to an interdependent human family.

In 2004, there are 35 low intensity wars, 40 million refugees and displaced persons, and 20% of the world population lives in absolute poverty. Such suffering can be seen as a transitional phase in the development of human civilization toward further unification. Prejudice, war and exploitation have been the expression of less mature stages in our psychological evolution as a species. The human race is experiencing the unavoidable tumult that marks its collective coming of age. To accelerate this process, we encourage the systematic deconstructing of the process of enemy imaging that has sustained division and war in the past.

### **The United Nations Culture of Peace Initiative**

In 1999, the United Nations General Assembly adopted *The Programme of Action on a Culture of Peace* (A/53/243). It identifies as one of its eight programme areas actions to advance understanding, tolerance and solidarity. The Programme of Action serves as the basis for the International Year for the Culture of Peace (2000) and the International

---

<sup>3</sup> The Seville Statement on Violence: A Progress Report, by David Adams, *Journal of Peace Research*, Volume 26, Number 2, 1989, Pages 113-121. (available online on the Internet at <http://www.culture-of-peace.info/ssov/title-page.html>). An newsletter about the Seville Statement on Violence is also available on-line at <http://www.culture-of-peace.info/ssov-intro.html>.



Decade for a Culture of Peace and Non-violence for the Children of the World (2001-2010).<sup>4</sup>

The basis for the programme areas was spelled out in the draft presented to the General Assembly in 1998 (A/53/370), which stated the following: "There has never been a war without an 'enemy', and to abolish war, we must transcend and supersede enemy images with *understanding, tolerance and solidarity* among all peoples and cultures. Only by celebrating the tapestry of our diversity, the common threads of human aspiration and social solidarity that bind us together, and by ensuring justice and security for everyone who makes up the warp and woof of the cloth, can we truly affirm that we are weaving a culture of peace. Therefore, a renewed commitment is needed to the actions proposed by the Declaration of Principles on Tolerance (Paris 1995) and other actions which promote 'intellectual and moral solidarity' which, as declared by the UNESCO Constitution, is the only secure basis for peace."<sup>5</sup>

Enemy images are an essential part of the culture of war that has dominated human societies since the beginning of recorded history. Enemy images are used to justify the violence of war and oppression. They are used to justify the secrecy and hierarchical authority that characterize the culture of war. Not only are enemy images used to justify war against other nations, but they are also used to justify oppression of people within countries.

During the discussion of the draft document by diplomats at the United Nations, the European Union insisted that all reference to the culture of war, including references to enemy images, had to be stricken from it. In the words of the German ambassador, on behalf of the EU, "there is no culture of war and violence in the world." This was in May, 1999, at the same moment as NATO was killing people by high-altitude air missions over Kosovo, dropping, among other things, depleted uranium bombs.<sup>6</sup>

Fortunately, the positive message of the culture of peace survived intact in the final document adopted by the UN General Assembly. Eight programme areas were adopted:

1. Understanding, tolerance and solidarity
2. Culture of peace through education
3. Sustainable economic and social development
4. Respect for all human rights
5. Equality between women and men

---

<sup>4</sup> The full text of the Programme of Action on a Culture of Peace (A/53/243B) is available on the Internet at both the UN and UNESCO sites. If you have problems downloading it from those sites, it is also available at <http://www.cpnna-usa.org/resolutions/resA-53-243B.html>

<sup>5</sup> The full text of the draft Declaration and Programme of Action on a Culture of Peace (A/53/370) is available on line at <http://www.culture-of-peace.info/annexes/resA-53-370/coverpage.html>

<sup>6</sup> For an on-line history of the culture of peace, including the adoption of the Declaration and Programme of Action on a Culture of Peace, see <http://www.culture-of-peace.info/history/introduction.html>, especially page 21.

6. Democratic participation
7. Participatory communication and the free flow of information and knowledge
8. International peace and security (including disarmament)

As pointed out by UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan in his report on the culture of peace in 2000 (A/55/377), "Each of these areas of action have been priorities of the United Nations since its foundation; what is new is their linkage through the culture of peace and non-violence into a single coherent concept. Linkages have often been made (for example, democracy, development and peace; equality between women and men with development and peace, and so forth). This is the first time, however, that the sum of their complementarities and synergies can be developed." The report went on to propose a series of recommendations for educational systems and mass media in order to promote the culture of peace.<sup>7</sup>

The United Nations cannot accomplish by itself the enormous educational and political task of moving from the culture of war to the culture of peace. With this in mind, the Programme of Action that was adopted by the General Assembly called for involvement of the civil society to widen the scope of activities on a culture of peace and to be part of a "global movement for a culture of peace." Emphasis was put on the "sharing of information among actors on their initiatives in this regard" including the civil society, the United Nations and the Member States. It is perhaps the first time that the UN has ever called for a "global movement."

In response to this call, Psychologists for Social Responsibility offers this revised Manual in the conviction that it can be used by psychologists, educators, activists, policy makers and private citizens in their efforts to mobilize U.S. civil society to address the eight areas of the UN Program of Action. While this Manual may be particularly relevant in areas 1, 2, and 7, if creatively used, it can apply to an even broader range of areas of concern.

The Global Movement for a Culture of Peace is still in its infancy. However, every year the UN General Assembly passes a resolution calling for it to be strengthened, and over the years there have been more and more sponsors of the resolutions. Non-governmental organizations such as PsySR are increasingly using the concept of the culture of peace as they strive to find common ground to work for peace and justice.<sup>8</sup>

### **Enemy Images and Nonviolence**

The question of enemy images is central to the philosophy and methodology of nonviolence, which is one of the great social advances of the 20th Century and may prove to be a key to human survival in the 21st Century.

---

<sup>7</sup> Document A/55/377 is available on-line at both the UN and UNESCO sites.

<sup>8</sup> The Culture of Peace News Network is an on-line participatory news service dedicated to the Global Movement. See the US site at <http://cpnn-usa.org>

Nonviolence is central to the movement from the culture of war to the culture of peace. It has become clear to more and more people around the world that war and the politics of violence must be replaced. Nonviolence as a viable alternative to the culture of war was developed by Mahatma Gandhi in the struggle for justice in South Africa and then in the campaign for independence from British colonialism in India. Gandhi based nonviolence on the principle that we must have no enemies, only opponents whom we must try to "wean from error by patience and sympathy." He proved that the refusal to have enemies can be a powerful tactic in struggles for social change.

As Gandhi explained it, we must distinguish between a man and his deed. "Whereas a good deed should call forth approbation and a wicked deed disapprobation, the doer of the deed, whether good or wicked, always deserves respect or pity as the case may be. Hate the sin and not the sinner. ...it is quite proper to resist and attack a system, but to resist and attack its author is tantamount to resisting and attacking oneself. For we are all tarred with the same brush, and are children of one and the same Creator..."<sup>9</sup>

Martin Luther King, Jr. was inspired by Gandhi to employ nonviolence in the American Civil Rights Struggle, and his description of non-violence is perhaps the clearest ever made. He, too, emphasizes that we must have no enemies, but only opponents whom we seek to convert to the truth:

"First, it must be emphasized that nonviolent resistance is not a method for cowards. It does resist. If one uses this method because he is afraid or merely because he lacks the instruments of violence, he is not truly nonviolent. This is why Gandhi often said that if cowardice is the only alternative to violence, it is better to fight. ...while the nonviolent resister is passive in the sense that he is not physically aggressive toward his opponent, his mind and emotions are always active, constantly seeking to persuade his opponent that he is wrong. The method is passive physically, but strongly active spiritually. It is not passive non-resistance to evil, it is active nonviolent resistance to evil.

"A second basic fact that characterizes nonviolence is that it does not seek to defeat or humiliate the opponent, but to win his friendship and understanding. The nonviolent resister must often express his protest through non-cooperation or boycotts, but he realizes that these are not ends themselves; they are merely means to awaken a sense of moral shame in the opponent ... The aftermath of nonviolence is the creation of the beloved community, while the aftermath of violence is tragic bitterness.

"A third characteristic of this method is that the attack is directed against forces of evil rather than against persons who happen to be doing the evil ... We are out to defeat injustice and not white persons who may be unjust.

---

<sup>9</sup> Mahatma Gandhi, *The Story of My Experiments with Truth - An Autobiography*, p. 231 of the on-line version at <http://www.mahatma.org.in/books/showbook.jsp?id=241&link=bg&book=bg0001&lang=en&cat=books>

"A fourth point that characterizes nonviolent resistance is a willingness to accept suffering without retaliation, to accept blows from the opponent without striking back.

"A fifth point concerning nonviolent resistance is that it avoids not only external physical violence but also internal violence of spirit. The nonviolent resister not only refuses to shoot his opponent but he also refuses to hate him. At the center of nonviolence stands the principle of love ...

"A sixth basic fact about nonviolent resistance is that it is based on the conviction that the universe is on the side of justice. Consequently, the believer in nonviolence has deep faith in the future. This faith is another reason why the nonviolent resister can accept suffering without retaliation. For he knows that in his struggle for justice he has cosmic companionship ..."<sup>10</sup>

As we enter the 21st Century, nonviolence has yet to reach its full potential. Both Gandhi and King were assassinated. In India independence was marred by a bloodbath between Hindus and Muslims and the splitting off of Pakistan. The movement begun by King has yet to reach its goals of racial equality in America. Enemy images continue to be used by those seeking dominance in the world today, including the anti-Islamic language of American militarism and the anti-American language of Islamist sects.

We have a long way to go to achieve social justice through nonviolence and to replace enemy images by the tactic of "weaning opponents from error by patience and sympathy."

### **Enemy Images and Identity Formation**

Enemy images have always been rooted in the human need to define a sense of identity with reference to a particular group or tribe. Those that we perceive as different from our tribe, can easily be seen as threatening. Under such circumstances, the natural human need to belong transforms into the phenomenon of tribalism - a reactive hardening of boundaries, which "insulates and defends 'me and mine' against what appears to be an overwhelmingly complex and threatening world" (Daloz et al, 1996). This exclusiveness and hostility of "us" toward "them" encourages people to retreat into fortified enclaves<sup>11</sup>, has led to much suffering in human history.

With the evolving social organization of life on the planet, boundaries of belonging have steadily expanded from family and clan, to tribe and nation. As humans struggle to negotiate the swiftly-shifting boundaries and expanding global commons of life in the

---

<sup>10</sup> Martin Luther King Jr.'s description of nonviolence comes from *Stride Toward Freedom: The Montgomery Story*, Harper and Row: New York, 1958. The above quotations may be found on-line at <http://progress.org/gandhi/gandhi15.htm>

<sup>11</sup> Daloz, L, Keen, C., Keen, J., and Parks, S. (1996). *Common fire: Lives of commitment in a complex world*. Boston: Beacon.

21<sup>st</sup> century, individual identity formation is still construed according to primarily national, ethnic and socio-economic distinctions, which characterized the 20<sup>th</sup> century. These limited identities have produced much strife in the 20<sup>th</sup> century; however, people do not yet have larger frames of reference to assist them with more inclusive identity groupings in our global age.

As Erik Erikson<sup>12</sup> observed almost fifty years ago, individual ego development in the lifespan is shaped by “compelling social prototypes of good and evil”, by “images [which] reflect the elusive nature of historical change”, are shared by people who share “an ethnic area, a historical era, or an economic pursuit”, and “assume decisive concreteness” in the individual’s life (p.17). These images, which Erikson sees as based on the way a particular group organizes geographic and socio-historical experience, and economic goals and means, offer “a limited number of socially meaningful models” for the formation of identity (p.25).

Despite the fact that we are steadily moving toward a global community, there is still a conspicuous absence of new and more meaningful models of identity formation in our global age. Hence, the explosive encounters of cultures and worldviews, and the difficulties with tolerance as a result of the often overwhelming experience of multiplicity and uncontrollable change. The tragedy of September 11 and the subsequent intensified polarization between the ideologies of East and West, as well as the growing chasm that divides the Global North from the Global South, are examples of the difficulty the world is experiencing in transcending fragmented and partial worldviews, and integrating them into a larger collective sense of belonging.

Let us examine for a moment the new East-West conflict around the question of global terrorism. While the West views recent Islamic extremist terrorism as primarily an example of religious fundamentalism, the Arab world claims that this is a struggle against the social/political/economic injustice and oppression by the West and its extreme materialism promoted as the ultimate solution to global problems. Neither side recognizes the partiality of its worldview, in which a particular sector of human society is overdeveloped at the expense of other sectors. (In the West, the economic sector overshadows the socio-political and spiritual orders. In the Arab East, the spiritual sector overshadows both the economic and the socio-political orders.) There is little recognition that the current clash between East and West is primarily the clash of two unsustainable perspectives, challenged to become integrated into a mature whole. Neither viewpoint recognizes both the role of science and the role of religion in the grand historical movement toward material and spiritual emancipation, and social justice for the whole human family.

As Deputy Director-General of the World Health Organization Lambo<sup>13</sup> states,

---

<sup>12</sup> Erikson (1980). *Identity and the life-cycle*.

<sup>13</sup> Lambo, A. (2000). *Constraints on world medical and health progress*. In Lanza (Ed.) One World: The health and survival of the human species in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Santa Fe, NM: Health Press.

“Man, today, is a victim of his own political, cultural, social, economic, ideological, and psychosocial constraints and his extreme prejudice, although he has at the same time become the sole representative of life in that progressive aspect and its sole trustee of any progress in science, the technology of the future. But he must release himself from this bondage” (p.114).

What would such a release from bondage mean? According to Erikson (1980),

*“many of the mechanisms of adjustment which once made for evolutionary adaptation, tribal integration, national and class coherence, are at loose ends with a world of universally expanding identities. Education for an ego identity which receives strength from changing historical conditions demands a conscious acceptance of historical heterogeneity on the part of adults, combined with an enlightened effort to provide human childhood anywhere with a new fund of meaningful continuity”* (p.40).

While most young people negotiating identity today are seeking to overcome the narrow tribal identities that their respective groups offer them, and feel disillusioned with the prejudicial and socially unjust nature of their societies, relatively few have viable models of what it means to embrace a larger humanity, and to identify oneself as a citizen of the world human family. Rutstein<sup>14</sup> suggests that essential to a viable education for the 21<sup>st</sup> century is incorporating the principle of the oneness of humankind across school curricula. Such an approach would help young people during the crisis of adolescence to negotiate their unique individual psycho-social identities in the reassuring context of a larger understanding of being primarily members of the human family, and sharing with others the same basic strivings.

Such an approach, which cultivates an appreciation of unity in diversity, is the prototype of the kind of education Erikson pointed to, which equips ego identity to receive strength from changing historical conditions. In a fast-changing world, limited psycho-social identities become harder to maintain. Hence, to the extent that people understand the reality of the oneness of the human family, beyond all its differences, they can begin to ground their specific identities in this unchanging and fundamentally hopeful reality, and to develop a more dialectical understanding of their own role in this global transformation.

As Rutstein (1999) points out, it is evident for a growing number of people now that humanity is moving, though quite painstakingly and unevenly, toward unification. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, drafted by the United Nations in 1948, inspired people of good will on all continents to develop nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) that would carry out the letter and spirit of the Declaration of Human Rights. In time, many of them – such as Amnesty International, Oxfam, and the Red Cross – became

---

<sup>14</sup> Rutstein, N. (1999). *Coming of age at the millennium: Embracing the oneness of humankind*. Albion, MI: Starr Commonwealth.

affiliated with the UN. There are now more than 1,200 NGOs. While UN agencies and NGOs have made great strides toward eliminating certain diseases, overcoming literacy and poverty, settling long-standing intergovernmental disputes, and improving agricultural output in many developing nations, they have, as of yet, done little to correct humanity's fractured view of itself. The oneness of humankind remains, for most people, a strange concept.

Yet, Guy Murchie, in his book titled *The Seven Mysteries of Life*, explains the reality of the oneness of the human family:

“... no human being (of any race) can be less closely related to any other human than approximately fiftieth cousin, and most of us (no matter what color our neighbors) are a lot closer. Indeed this low magnitude for the lineal compass of mankind is accepted by the leading geneticists I have consulted (from J.B.S. Haldane to Theodosius Dobzhansky to Sir Julian Huxley), and it means simply that the family trees of all of us, of whatsoever origin or trait, must meet and merge into one genetic tree of all humanity by the time they have soared into our ancestries for about fifty generations” (Rutstein, 1999, pp.113-114).

Hence, as Rutstein suggests, “oneness is a principle, a fundamental truth. Unity is a process... The mechanics of unity are inherent in oneness, just as the mechanics of an oak tree are inherent in the acorn” (p.123). Social science is challenged, in this historical time of transition, to assist people in understanding the universal human experience in its **unity in diversity**.

Education, grounded in such a comprehensive scientific understanding, has the power to change the current explosive situation in the world, and to help humanity address pressing issues of justice in a fast shrinking world without violence, with wisdom and through collective consultation.

As Martin & Sugarman (1999) point out in their *Psychology of Human Possibility and Constraint*,

“In the course of our development a good deal of what is sociocultural is incorporated into both our prereflective, intentional actions and the more advanced reflexive consciousness that emerges as development unfolds. In the context of development, the social, cultural forms and practices we have internalized become infused with individual intentional agency, eventually giving way to a truly reflexive consciousness capable of transcending these sociocultural legacies, even while constrained by them” (p. 115).

This manual can be an important tool in assisting people to learn to appreciate more fully their sociocultural legacies and those of others around the planet, without absolutizing them and creating, as a result, masks of enemy images. Embracing diversity into an

integrated view of the human family requires an awakened awareness of the many ways in which enemy images distort our thinking, affect all of our cognitive processes, and hence limit us in achieving our full humanity.



---

## SECTION II

### Effects of Enemy Images: **Theory & Example**

---

The creation of enemy images is a devolutionary dynamic process leading us into conflict on many levels. Enemy images distort our thinking by influencing cognitive processes such as attention, memory, and attribution. The first part of this section examines selective perception and causal attribution as central to the processes of forming enemy images. The second part focuses on applying the understanding of these processes to understanding the ways people act on these images; specifically, the subsection focuses on the self-fulfilling prophecy. The third section examines solutions to breaking the cycle of self-fulfilling prophecies.

#### **I. Cognitive Biases: Selective Perception and Memory, Cognitive Dissonance, and Causal Attribution**

Selective attention and memory leads to individuals seeking out, attending to and remembering primarily information that affirms their previous conclusions (Broadbent, 1958). Such selective attention means greater focusing on and memory of negative aspects of “enemies”. This tendency can be reinforced through intentional misleading by political leaders and the media. For example, results of a survey by The Program on International Policy Attitudes released on July 1, 2003 showed a strong relationship between respondents who believed in a close link between Al-Qaeda and the Iraqi Ba’athist government (52%) and support of the U.S. invasion of Iraq (72%) (Americans on Iraq; 2003). These two statistical figures hint at selective attention to reduce cognitive dissonance (Festinger, L., 1957), i.e. once someone supported the war, he or she attended to information that supported the need to fight in Iraq, such as a close link with Al-Qaeda.

Schooler (1995) conducted a study to examine whether hearing positive information about an enemy nation would change the negative stereotype of that nation. The results showed that when participants accepted information about an enemy nation that was not congruent with their perceived negative stereotype, they did not change their opinion of that nation. The participants were able to maintain the original enemy stereotype by increasing the importance of other elements of the schema that supported their opinion and were in alignment with the enemy image, an example of the role of cognitive dissonance in the maintenance of enemy images.

Levine and Murphy (1943) gave American students five weekly fifteen-minute periods to learn each of two short written selections dealing with the Soviet Union. One of the two selections was favorable to the Soviet system while the other was unfavorable. Half of the subjects were pro-communist while the other half were anti-communist. By the end of a five-week period, the anti-communist subjects remembered significantly more of the anti-Soviet selection and significantly less of the pro-Soviet selection than did the pro-communist subjects.

Flamenbaum and Silverstein (1987) found that compared to American students who read a description of actions supposedly taken by Australia, those who read an identical selection about the Soviet Union were more likely to remember aggressive actions. For example, in this study, after reading the statement “The Soviet Union [Australia], on the other hand, denies the Chinese countercharges concerning the beaming of radio broadcasts into China,” compared to those who read about Australia, the subjects were almost four times as likely to recall the item as saying that the Soviet Union beamed radio broadcasts into China.

Vallone, Ross and Lepper (1985) found that people who favored the Israelis in the Mid-East conflict perceived media coverage of the Beirut massacre as biased against Israel whereas people who favored the Arabs perceived the same coverage as biased against the Arabs.

Enemy images have been found by psychologists to distort the process of attributing the motivations of nations in three ways (PsySR report to the United Nations, June, 1988):

1. When nations assumed to be enemies perform actions that might be considered hostile, people tend to underemphasize or ignore the situational pressures experienced by the “enemy.” As a result, they view the actions as proof that the enemy is hostile or barbaric.

2. When nations assumed to be enemies perform actions that might be considered to be peaceful, people tend to overemphasize the situational processes experienced by the enemy. As a result, they see the actions as forced upon the enemy by circumstances and not as evidence that the enemy truly desires peace. Thus, apparently hostile acts do more to strengthen enemy images than apparently peaceful acts do to dispel them.

3. When enemy images are powerful enough apparently peaceful actions of adversaries may be attributed to hostile motives. Thus, a peace proposal may be viewed as crass propaganda, an attempt to increase tensions among allies, or a trick to allow enemies to maintain or increase military superiority.

Taylor and Jaggi (1974) provided evidence regarding the first two of these processes. They gave short descriptions to Hindu office clerks in southern India of either a Moslem or a Hindu behaving in friendly or unfriendly ways in various situations and asked the subjects to choose the major reason that the person in the description behaved as he or she did. The Hindu subjects in the study ascribed the friendly behaviors of the Hindu characters in the story to their personalities and the unfriendly behaviors to circumstances. For the Moslem characters the results were reversed. Their unfriendly behaviors were ascribed to personality dispositions and their friendly behaviors were ascribed to the situation.

Burn and Oskamp (1989) and Sande, Goethals and Ferrari (1989) demonstrated that all three of these processes affected U.S. interpretations of Soviet actions. Burn and Oskamp provided U.S. college students with a list of Soviet actions including an apparently peaceful action, the 1985 moratorium on nuclear testing, as well as apparently hostile actions, such as the downing of the Korean Airlines Flight 007. They found that when asked to attribute motivations for the actions listed, about 60 percent of the subjects in their study tended to choose the most negative motivations, whether they actions appeared to be peaceful or not.

Sande, Goethals and Ferrari (1989) did a similar study using fictional situations such as the shipment of arms, in one case, and the sending of aid, in another, to an African nation. Although the actions were fictional, the student subjects thought that they had actually occurred. The use of the fictional situations allowed Sande et al. to determine that in attributing motivations for the action, U.S. students chose more negative motives when the actions were supposedly performed by the Soviet Union than when the actions were supposedly performed by the United States or by France.

Koopman, Snyder and Jervis (1989) had a sample of subscribers to the journal *International Security* that included academic experts as well as government advisors respond to scenarios describing hypothetical situations in which the Soviet Union sent military forces into Iran. Varying the circumstances of the scenarios, such as the balance of conventional or nuclear forces, or more relevant to this report, the likelihood that the Soviets were acting in response to a perceived threat, had very little effect on the policy recommendations made by the respondents in the study. That is, the elite respondents surveyed in this study essentially ignored the evidence regarding possible situational pressures leading the Soviet Union to act in an apparently hostile manner. What did predict the recommendations were the initial beliefs held by the respondents regarding the Soviet Union and the U.S. – Soviet relations.

The third process, whereby apparently peaceful acts are attributed to hostile motivations, was evident on April 8, 1985, when Soviet Premier Gorbachev announced a six month unilateral freeze of the deployment of medium-range missiles in Europe, the *Times* reported that the proposal “seemed to officials here designed to cause dissension in NATO and undercut American interests in Europe.” Similarly, the unilateral nuclear test ban announced by the Soviet Union in 1985 was treated by the U.S. leadership and media as simple propaganda.

These psychological effects of enemy images act as barriers to peace in several ways. They all result in even stronger enemy images. In addition, the first process is particularly dangerous during periods of heightened international tension when an incident such as the sinking of a ship or the downing of a plane can rapidly create “war fever.” Finally, the third process is a powerful barrier to peacemaking when one nation that is a party to a conflict makes an offer to dispel tensions that is treated as a threat by another nation. As a

result, communications and attempts at negotiation are blocked and some of the best opportunities for peacemaking are missed.

Psychologists have studied several aspects of the process of attributing motives for the actions of others. One that deserves particular attention in the context of international relations is the role of ignorance. It is difficult for people to take into account the situational pressures experienced by a nation in a particular situation if they are unaware of all the actions of the nation in the situation or of the reasons put forward by the nation for its actions. It is difficult for people to view an apparently hostile action performed by a nation as being motivated by defensive considerations if they are unaware of previous situations that the nation might have been involved in that may influence the responses of that nation. It is difficult for people to overcome their enemy images and be open to peace gestures by a nation if they are unaware of earlier gestures of peace made by the nation or of earlier situations in which the nation worked cooperatively with their own nation.

#### Ingroup Aggrandizement via Enemy Imaging

Exaggerated enemy images allow us to protect our own self-images—and therefore, exaggerated enemy image is in many ways an inverted image of our ideal self or ingroup. This psychological tendency has political repercussions, as governments try to preserve their country's honor, innocence and beneficence. Since actions taken by governments or by the authorities of any group of people often lack moral justification, such as terrorist attacks, torture of prisoners (as seen in Iraq), limitation of civil liberties (United States), or other governmental actions, to preserve an idealized self, the enemy is misperceived, and the untoward aspects of the enemy are exaggerated.

The creation of an idealized self-image is one of the primary products of an exaggerated enemy image. This creation is both psychodynamic and cognitive in nature since it is created by both the movement of negative self-characteristics to the enemy and the social construction of an in-group and out-group itself. Having an enemy has a useful cognitive foil. Described by Middents (1990):

“The threat of enemies justifies actions that might otherwise be unacceptable or illegal. Physical assault and killing becomes justified in war, combat or provocative situations. Enemies serve as a focus for aggression and as a means of diverting attention from complex and pressing internal problems or domestic conflicts. In addition, enemies provide a contrast by which a person or nation can measure their status or inflate their sense of superiority.”

That last element, the contrast, results in what Ralph K. White describes as "idealization of the self." He states in the journal article *American Acts of Force* (1998), "...in the projection mechanism, which is one main source of devil images [exaggerated enemy

images], the original need is to *escape blame*. The formula is, ‘We are not to blame; they are.’” In addition to shifting blame, the characterization of an enemy as dehumanized allows more actions taken against them to be justified. While religious fundamentalists would not be able to kill a devoted member of their own religion, they would be more easily able to kill infidels. Even if their moral self-image is somewhat hazy, anything is better than being the enemy. In Yugoslavia and Nazi Germany, governments committed acts of “ethnic cleansing.” This description elevates the self-image of the governments by suggesting a ritual of care and purification. This image was only possible, however, because the image of the enemies were exaggerated—dehumanized and degraded, to the extent that they could be “cleansed” just like a pile of grime.

This idealized-self is reinforced through collective rationalization by in-group members. There is also a fairly obvious reason for rationalization: a need to think well of one’s own group, at least in comparison with others. Group pride is a gratifying thing, and by various psychological ego-serving devices (rationalization, projection, denial, selective inattention) groups usually succeed in achieving it.

From a psychodynamic perspective, exaggerated enemy images can be viewed as a shadow--a counterpart to an individual that is impenetrably linked to him or her, but which is also the opposite of his or her morals, values, being, etc. Vamik Volkan (1985) suggests that the psychological need for an enemy develops very early in someone’s childhood, as they characterize experiences into distinct “good” and “bad” categories. When the mind is still primitive, one object, such as the self, cannot be both “good” and “bad” at the same time. As the developing mind finds ways around this dichotomous categorization, it finds suitable outlets for externalizing bad aspects of the self-image. He gives the example of a child breaking an object and then explaining to his or her mother that their “doll did it.” Volkan suggests that this process of externalization for self-protection is taking place in the creation of enemy images.

In addition to the creation of an idealized self-image, an exaggerated image of the enemy elevates the in-group by making them seem more realistic--and therefore, "ready to take the facts," "face the music," etc.

An expansion on the image of an idealized-self is the “pro-us” illusion and can be defined as the tendency to perceive others as more friendly to one’s own country—or less hostile—than they actually are. For example, Haslam, Turner, Oakes, and McGarty (1992) conducted an experiment with Australian students that examined whether one’s opinion of a nation’s stereotypical traits could be manipulated by changing social events. They found that opinions of America, when compared to those of Iraq, were significantly more negative at the end of the Persian Gulf War than at the beginning, a finding that would have probably surprised most Americans.

## REFERENCES

Burn, S.M. & Oskamp, S. (1989). In-group biases and the U.S. – Soviet conflict. *Journal of Social Issues*, 45 (2), 73-90.

Festinger, L. (1957). *A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Haslam, S.A., Turner, J.C., Oakes, P.J., McGarty, C. (1992). Context-dependent variation in social stereotyping: I. The effects of intergroup relations as mediated by social change and frame of reference. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 22(1), 3-20.

Koopman, C., Snyder, J. & Jervis, R.I; (1989). American elite views of relationships with the Soviet Union. *Journal of Social Issues*, 45 (2), 119-138.

Middents, G., (1990) Psychological Perspectives on Enemy-Making. *Organization Development Journal*. Summer, 44-48.

Sande, G.N., Goethals, G.R., Ferrari, L. & Worth, L.T. (1989). Value-guided attributions: Maintaining the moral self-image and the diabolical enemy image. *Journal of Social Issues*, 45 (2), 91-118.

Taylor, D.M. & Jaggi, V. (1974). Ethnocentrism and causal attribution in a South Indian context. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 5 (2), 152-171.

Volkan, V. D., (1985) The Need to Have Enemies and Allies (Presidential Address for), *Political Psychology*,6(2).

White, R. K., (1998) American Acts of Force, *Journal of Peace*

White, R.K. (1984). *Fearful Warriors: A Psychological Profile of U.S. – Soviet Relations*. New York: Free Press.

White R.K. (Ed.) (1986). *Psychology and the prevention of Nuclear War*. New York: New York University Press.

## **II. Acting on Images: Self-Fulfilling Prophecy & the Cyclical Effects of Mirror Imaging**

The second stage of the devolutionary dynamic process of enemy imaging is the self-fulfilling prophecy and cycles of violence. Enemy images lead people to predict hostile behavior from enemies and to act in a hostile manner toward enemies based upon this pre-judgment.

Snyder and Swann (1978) set up a competition in which participants could use bursts of uncomfortable noise to punish opponents. Subjects who were told that their opponent was hostile used more loud bursts than other subjects, even before the opponent had an opportunity to demonstrate hostility by using the noise machine.

In 1956, General Curtis Lemay, then the chief of the U.S. Strategic Air Command, was reported in the May 27 *New York Times* as predicting that "... the Russians would have by 1959 twice as many long-range bombers as the United States." In fact, the United States has never fallen behind the Soviet Union in long-range members and has even maintained a lead as large as 5-1 (Kaplan, 1983). It is likely that the U.S. build up of its bomber fleet was based upon the prediction that the Soviet Union would do the same.

Schafer (1997), in studying perceived historical relationship and cultural differences between nations, found that participants who viewed international relationships as hostile, were more likely to develop negative attitudes and advocate conflictual foreign policies with those nations. Cultural differences also increased conflict between enemy nations, but had no effect on relationships between friends.

Duncan (1976) showed white undergraduates videotape depicting either a black or white person ambiguously shoving another person. The shove was labeled as more violent when it had been administered by a black person than when it had been administered by a white person.

### **The Mirror Image of Enmity**

Enemy images are dangerous when they are held by even one party to a conflict. But typically they are held by all parties, and in mirror-image form (Bronfenbrenner, 1961). Mirror imaging can help set in motion a cascade of misperceptions on both sides of a conflict. With each side biased toward perceiving each other's actions in the worst possible light, every statement and action becomes an additional source of hostility, ratcheting tensions up and fueling dangerous arms buildups. Since each side expects the worst from the other, they both take protective steps such as building new arms. But each side perceives these steps by the other as aggressive rather than defensive. By increasing tensions, the buildup of arms may actually help to bring about the crises and armed conflicts that they had been intended to prevent. With mirror-imaging, both adversaries

become the aggressor and the defender, greatly increasing the cyclical nature of the self-fulfilling enemy images.

Oskamp (1964; 1968; Oskamp and Hartry, 1968; see also Mickolus, 1980) has performed several studies that demonstrate mirror imaging affects American evaluations of Soviet actions. He made up a list of actions, belligerent and conciliatory, that had been taken by both the United States and the Soviet Union. The actions were described without reference to specific places, dates or details so that they covered both the countries' actions. He then made two versions of the list. In one he filled in the name of the Soviet Union in the same list of items. For example, one item read "The head of the (U.S. or U.S.S.R.) has publicly denied any intentions to conquer the territories of other nations" while another read "The (U.S. or U.S.S.R.) has established rocket bases close to the borders of (the other nation)". Students were then asked to read one of the lists and indicate how favorably they viewed each of the actions. Students were much less favorable to the actions of the Soviet Union than to the same actions when they were ascribed to the United States.

An historical analogue of this study occurred in 1955, when the Soviets submitted a disarmament proposal to the subcommittee of the United Nations Disarmament commission. The proposal was strikingly similar to one submitted earlier by the British and French. Instead of appreciating that the Soviets were willing to go along with a Western Proposal, James J. Wadsworth, the head of the U.S. delegation (as reported in the *New York Times* on May 21) "... conceded that some parts of the Soviet proposal were reproduced in the identical language previously used by the West, but declared that "sometimes words mean different things" to the Soviet Union and to the Western powers."

Herman (1982) tallied the coverage given by the *New York Times* to dissidents in various nations. Between January, 1975 and July, 1981 Soviet dissidents Alexander Ginzburg, Anatoly Scharansky and Andrei Sakharav were mentioned in the Times 68, 138, and 223 times respectively whereas Archbishop Camara, a church leader from Brazil, Jose Luis Massara, a noted mathematician from Uruguay and Heri Akhmadi, a student leader in Indonesia, all of whom are major dissident figures in nations allied with the United Nations, were mentioned 4, 5, and 0 times respectively. One labor leader, Lech Walesa of Poland, was mentioned 81 times whereas another important leader, Luis Silva of Brazil, was mentioned 3 times.

Both Al-Qaeda and the B'athist administration of Iraq were viewed very negatively by the U.S. public. Therefore a positive relationship was believed to exist between the two groups—an example of balance theory. In contrast to the perceived close relationship, substantial evidence of a connection has never been established. There are just as many reasons for Al-Qaeda and the B'athist administration to conflict as there are for them to partner up. These include Iraq's secular nature, which contrasts Al-Qaeda's religious fervor, and Iraq's Socialism, which Al-Qaeda frowned on as well.



The presence of Israel in the Middle East is perceived as a threat by many neighboring countries because of previous skirmishes, its treatment of the Palestinian people in the occupied territories, and because of differences in group identity. Israel is seen as an outsider, and many of the surrounding countries probably have exaggerated enemy images of it. The Israeli government and its military receive over 15 million dollars a day from the United States. This level of financial support is perceived by our Arab states as U.S. participation in the Middle-East, using Israel as a proxy (Knew; 2003). The veracity of this belief is disputable, but it is important that Americans appreciate the role such support plays in fomenting suspicion and even hatred of the U.S. by many Muslims.

Exaggeration of enemy images can take place through the filtering of the actual images as they reach us. Selective attention is a process in which an individual only absorbs certain images, but this selective attention also operates on the level of suppliers of information as well. In media coverage of the 2003 United States invasion of Iraq “Nearly two thirds of all sources, 64%, were pro-war, while 71% of U.S. guests favored the war. Anti-war voices were 10% of all sources, but just 6% of non-Iraqi sources and 3% of U.S. sources. Thus viewers were more than six times as likely to see a pro-war source as one who was anti-war; with U.S. guests alone, the ratio increases to 25 to 1. Looking at U.S. sources, which made up 76% of total sources, more than two out of three (68%) were either current or former officials. In the category of U.S. officials, military voices overwhelmed civilians by a two-to-one margin, providing 68% of U.S. official sources and nearly half (47%) of all U.S. sources. This predominance reflected the networks focus on information from journalists embedded with troops, or provided at military briefings, and the analysis of such by paid former military officials.” (FAIR; 2003, page 12).

Note that FAIR categorized sources as pro- or anti-war only if they made a political stance themselves or are members of a group with a public statement on the invasion. These statistics suggest that the *sources of enemy images are skewed, leading to exaggeration of the image of the enemy due to ignorance of certain aspects of the world situation*. It is also important to note, that it is not the pro-war nature of the sources that is dangerous, but merely the lack of balance—since exaggeration occurs regardless of the political viewpoint, i.e. on both ends of the political spectrum. (Source: FAIR Study *Amplifying Officials, Squelching Dissent* in EXTRA; May/June 2003:16, (3).

## REFERENCES

- Americans on Iraq: WMD, Links to Al-Qaeda, Reconstruction (July 1st, 2003): A PIPA/Knowledge Networks Poll.
- Bem, D. (1972). Self-perception theory. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, (Vol. 6). New York: Academic Press.
- Bin Laden Tape: Text (2003). Accessible at: <http://news.bbc.co.uk/s/hil/middle-east/27551019.stm> (source of front quote)
- Broadbent, D. (1958). *Perception and Communication*. London: Pergamon Press.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1961). The mirror image in Soviet – American relations: A social psychologist's report. *Journal of Social Issues*, 17, 45-56.
- Duncan, B.L. (1976). Differential social perception and the attribution of intergroup violence: Testing the lower limits of stereotyping of blacks. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 34, 590-598.
- Dutta, S., Kanungo, R.N., & Freiberg V. (1972). Retention of affective material: Effects of intensity of affect on retrieval. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 23, 64-80.
- Flamenbaum, C. & Silverstein, B. (1987). *Exaggerated enemy images and the selective recall of the actions of nations*. Paper presented at the 95<sup>th</sup> annual meeting of the American Public Health Association, Washington, D.C., August.
- Herman, E.S. (1982). *The real terror network*. Boston: South End.
- If Americans Knew (2003). Accessible at:  
<http://www.ifamericansknew.org/stats/usaid.html>.
- Kaplan, F. (1983). *Wizards of Armageddon*. New York: Basic Books.
- Kriesberg, M. (1946). Soviet news in the “New York Times”. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 540-562.
- Levine, J.M. & Murphy, G. (1943). The learning and forgetting of controversial material. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 38, 507-517.
- Oskamp, S. (1965). Attitudes toward U.S. and Russian Actions—A double standard. *Psychological Reports*, 16, 43-46.

- Oskamp, S. (1968). Relationship of self-concept to international attitudes. *Journal of Social Psychology, 76*, 31-36.
- Oskamp, S., & Hartry, A. (1968). A factor analytic study of the double standard in attitudes toward U.S. and Russian actions. *Behavioral Science, 13*, 178-188.
- Schafer, M. (1997). Images and policy preferences. *Political Psychology, 18*(4), 813-829.
- Schooler, T.Y. (1995). An hydraulic model of enemy image maintenance. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences & Engineering, 55*(7-B), 3044.
- Shulman, M. (1980). *The path of U.S.-Soviet relations*. New York: Columbia University School of International Affairs.
- Silverstein, B. & Flamenbaum, C. (1989). Biases in the perception and cognition of the actions of enemies. *Journal of Social Issues, 45* (2), 51-72.
- Snyder, M. & Swann, W.B. (1978). Behavioral confirmation in social interaction: From social perception to social reality. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 14*, 148-162.
- Vallone, R.P., Ross, L. & Lepper, M.R. (1985). The hostile media phenomenon: Biased perception and perceptions of media bias in coverage of the Beirut massacre. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 49*, 577-585.

### III. Solutions: Dismantling the Mask of Enmity

The “pro-us” illusion evidently takes several forms: underestimating the chance that certain potential opponents will become actual opponents and therefore initiating a war in a spirit of overconfidence (Hitler in 1939); underestimating the tenacity and fighting spirit of an actual or expected opponent (Japan in 1941); believing that the people in an opposing country are more acutely discontented and in a more revolutionary mood than they are (the United States and Cuba in 1961, the Bolshevik leaders and the rest of Europe in 1917-20, the West and the USSR for many years thereafter); and believing that that a rebellion in some other country—a rebellion opposed to one’s own interests—is less formidable and has less popular support than it does (the United States in Iraq and in Vietnam; the Soviets in Hungary and Afghanistan).

#### Realistic Empathy

Without empathy, a group’s image of the enemy will not be realistic. According to Ralph White (1998), a lack of realistic empathy results in “underestimating the high-flown ambitions of an aggressor, demonizing the enemy (ignoring their more “human” feelings such as fear), underestimating the likelihood of third parties intervening, and underestimating the fighting spirit of a people who are defending their homeland.” There are many different psychological principles that have been identified as causing the exaggeration of our image of the enemy, from cognitive simplicity (ignorance) to selective attention.

Empathy is potent because it humanizes (reversal of dehumanization), identifies rational reasons for action (reversal of irrational image, i.e. the irrational view of the terrorist as mentally ill), and illuminates the generic nature of the situation that is caused by projection and mirror imaging. After learning to identify the enemy image, the preliminary step a critical observer can take is attempting realistic empathy with the adversary. It is important to note that *realistic empathy does not mean sympathy* but is simply an attempt to “understand what is in the minds of others” (White 1998). To produce this empathy, the various psychological processes that exaggerated the enemy need to be acknowledged in the process—from taking into account the other’s expectable misperceptions to taking into account also one’s own expectable misperceptions. This is hard to do because the processes of cognitive simplicity and selective attention work against it.

This difference can be illustrated in the example of the Persian Gulf War. Saddam Hussein was clearly an enemy, but without any attempt by the United States to understand the situation, he became a dehumanized irrational “demonized enemy.” White identifies four basic goals of Saddam Hussein that guided his actions in the first Persian Gulf War: national security, national power, economic gain, protection of reputation as champion of the Arab World (White, 1991). This attempt at realistic

empathy illuminates the context of an enemy's actions. And while White accurately points out that the goal is not to justify, a realistic understanding of the enemy does dismantle the exaggerated enemy image. In extensive U.S. policy statements prior to the invasion of Iraq in 2003, Saddam's deplorable actions were described in great detail, but the reasons for them rarely explained. If they were explained, they were attributed to personality alone, with descriptions of Saddam Hussein as a "madman," etc. (an example of the under emphasis of situational factors). If the leaders of the United States had a realistic image of Saddam Hussein, he would not have been so closely linked to international terrorism.

The Cuban Missile Crisis is an example of where realistic empathy broke down an exaggerated enemy image, resulting in the successful defusing of a tense international situation. In fact, it was because of realistic empathy that the situation was diffused (White 1998). President Kennedy realized that the Soviet Union was afraid of the U.S. missiles in Turkey and that was why they were installing retaliatory weapons in Cuba. The situation was resolved when Kennedy suggested that the missiles in Turkey be removed along with the missiles in Cuba. The back-channel nature of this agreement allowed for its success. The realistic empathy was kept within the elite, which preserved the duality of the enemy image itself, its reflexive propagation of an idealized self-image, and protection of America's moral goodness.

What may be in the mind of an opponent is essential to consider if we want peace, but does not come naturally when one feels threatened. There are three core assumptions to help adversaries empathize with each other.

1. People want peace.
2. People fear attack.

Arabs may not realize how desperately Israelis fear being overwhelmed by encircling and hostile Arabs who outnumber them 30 to 1. Yet Israelis may have little appreciation of Arab fears of "Zionist expansionism".

3. Enmity toward the "other" is mirrored and reciprocal.

That is to say that antipathy toward an adversary has a parallel experience within the other party. How often do people on either side of the East-West conflict realize, or even try to realize, the ways in which their own behavior has created anger and fear on the other side?

A study conducted by Dumont, Yzerbyt, Wigboldus, and Gordijn (2003), showed that non-Americans who were prompted to identify as ingroup members the American victims of the September 11<sup>th</sup>, 2001 attacks were more likely to report fear-related responses and behavior than when the September 11<sup>th</sup>, 2001 victims were identified as

outgroup members. Empathic behavior can be fostered by viewing the other as a common group member.

Al-Qaeda has done many things to terrorize and enrage the West: destroying the World Trade Center and attacking the Pentagon-- and in so doing killing thousands, bombing of the USS Cole, supporting the Taliban's tyranny in Afghanistan, killings hundreds of Spanish citizens, as well as the dramatic terrorist attacks attributed to Al-Qaeda in the past and if Osama bin Laden and his followers succeed other successful acts of terror in the future. The terror itself, as is its goal, has prompted the need restrictions and massive security expenditures, draining resources from human and more productive sectors of targeted societies. *There is a stark contrast between the righteous self-image of Osama's religious extremists and their actions that induce hardship, pain and death.*

But it is also crucial for citizens and leaders in the U.S. to appreciate the how many in the Arab world have been offended or threatened by our actions, e.g. our unilateral support, both politically and militarily, of Israel; our military presence in Saudi Arabia, considered to be the Holy Lands in Islam; the civilian suffering and casualties caused by the U.S. economic embargo of Iraq; civilian casualties in Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan; our support of India in their Kashmir conflict with Islamic Pakistan; our involvement in southern Sudan, Somalia, and the Philippines, Chechnya, Bosnia, and East Timor. *There is a stark contrast between the righteous self-image of U.S. administration and their actions that induce hardship, pain and death.*

In how many of these cases did we in the United States—whatever it was that we actually did—take fully into account the impact of our actions on our adversaries? How often did we Americans acknowledge that our actions, regardless of their justification or motivation, contribute to the spiraling process violence that leads to war?

## REFERENCES

Hesse, P. (1989). The World is a Dangerous Place: Images of the Enemy on Children's Television: Leaders Guide, Harvard University: Center for Psychological Studies in the Nuclear Age. 5-7.

White, R. K. (1991). Empathizing with Saddam Hussein, *Journal of Political Psychology*, June.

White, R.K. (1998). American Acts of Force, *Journal of Peace Psychology*.4(2).

Yzerbyt, V., Dumont, M., Wigboldus, D., Gordijn, E. (2003). I feel for us: The impact of categorization and identification on emotions and action tendencies. *The British Journal of Social Psychology*, 42, 533-549.

---

## SECTION III

---

### Enemy Images in Art, Fiction and Film

---

The portrayal of peoples and nations considered "enemies" as barbaric, rapacious, untrustworthy and inhumane has a long history. Sometimes these portrayals take the form of non-fiction - textbooks, news articles and broadcasts, documentaries, and the like. But fictionalized portrayals have many advantages. They tend to attract large audiences, to play upon emotions and to allow artistic license, which may be interpreted by those who so desire as freedom from the limitations of evidence or fact. Accusing the enemy of inhumanity is less effective than graphically depicting on the screen or printed page inhumane enemy acts against characters with whom people identify. In the words of a 1918 review of an anti-German World War I film: "Here we have an art of pure emotion which can go beneath thought, beneath belief, beneath ideals, down to the brute fact of emotional psychology and make a man or a woman who has hated war, all war, even this war, feel the surge of group emotion, group loyalty, and group hate" (MacGowan, 1918, p. 344).

The entertainment media used for this fictionalized propaganda have ranged from spy novels to music to brilliant drama. Shakespeare's *The Tragedy of King Richard III*, for example, contains poetic descriptions of Richard's dastardly deeds in his fight to grab and keep the crown of England. The play may be more than a great drama, however. Between 1585 and 1604, Queen Elizabeth I spent 72% of her nation's revenues fighting a war with Spain, making this a very tense time for England. In 1586, a Government Propaganda Department was instituted which used stage plays, among other media, to inculcate the English people with a warlike spirit and a strong loyalty to the reigning Tudors. Many of Shakespeare's historical plays date from this period and he knew that it would serve him well to please the rulers of England. This portrait of Richard III, a member of the House of York that was a rival of the Tudors, was that of an evil demon who schemed, lied, plotted the deaths of his relatives, and ordered the smothering of children (War of the Roses, retrieved 4-24-04). Richard may be not only a work of historical art but a hatchet job that promoted support for a government during wartime.

ancient times provide examples. For centuries, scholars have reviewed and characterized the governments of Sparta and Athens in often idealized and rather inaccurate fashion. What is interesting, however, when one looks at remnants from classical times, is that the devices Even of enemy images, including demonization of "them" and idealization of "us" are found in the history, art, and literature produced in the period (Ferris, 2000). To complicate matters, positive and negative characterizations also reflected the attitudes of the historian who was writing. Thus, Sparta has been both idealized as a society of strength and demonized as a precursor of Nazism. Athens has fared somewhat better in that it has been seen primarily as the heart of democracy but a realistic review of the history of the Greek city states does not necessarily uphold that idealized version

(Pomeroy, Burnstein, Dolan, Tolbert, & Roberts, 1999). In fact, direct comparisons have been drawn between Greece and Nazi Germany as examples of societies where war was the prime force shaping art (Orians, 1999).

Further, Greeks as a group, confronted by an expansive Persia, developed a self presentation of superiority which was reflected in their sculpture and their plays. The enemy was demonized and Greek society allowed no non-Greeks any potential for equal or even respected status. The Romans, on the other hand, were somewhat more likely to see the enemy as potentially having dignity. Their empire building was more inclusive whereas the Greeks strove to exclude (Ferris, 2000).

Enemy images thinking was clearly understood and presented in a variety of ways in plays by Aristophanes and others. One can consider, for example, Aeschylus' *The Persians*, for whom the word "barbarian" was coined – a word that derisively suggested the Persians to have no civilized speech (Ferris, 2000). It should be noted that Persian society was well developed with art and complex social orders.

Similarly, Euripides' *Medea* involved the device of showing an enemy character (Medea) as only good because she betrayed her people and helped Jason get the golden fleece. During the Roman era, an interesting contrast presents in the columns of Trajan (112 AD) and Marcus Aurelius (180 AD). Although not greatly separated in years, by the time of Aurelius, the empire was deteriorating. Trajan's column includes the more benign noble enemy typical of the Romans; the Aurelius monument reflects much more demonization of the adversary (Compton-Engle, 2004).

Following 9/11, Palaima (2000), a specialist in ancient and modern war, explored the parallels that exist between the understandings of the ancient world and its best thinkers and contemporary commentary. Palaima's analysis included the following:

...Egyptian, Byzantine and Roman justification of war through ideology of "enemy provocation" reminds us of Orwell's "two minutes hate."

A very concrete current example presents itself. When a terrorist bombing of the Oklahoma Federal Building occurred, the initial response was to look for Middle Eastern terrorists. As is now well known, that act was perpetrated by purely homegrown operatives but the principle that it is the other who is bad and the countryman who is good was nicely illustrated in that initial set of assumptions. Further, in spite of the identification of the real perpetrators of the Oklahoma disaster, the view of Middle Eastern terrorism did not remit and led to ongoing victimization of persons in this country, including a detention policy which violates cherished freedoms of due process and fairness.

Today demonic images of Arabs are not uncommon in the Western world. Fiction, ranging from political cartoons to suspense novels, often depicts an evil caricature of Arabs. The spate of anti-Arab propaganda since 9/11 is closely linked to the efforts to justify the Bush administration's foreign policy decisions and the anti-terrorism efforts of



like-minded governments. President Bush was quoted telling a group of troops in Ft. Hood Texas, "In America, we say everybody is precious, everybody counts, everybody is equal in the eyes of the Almighty. That's not what the enemy thinks. They don't value innocent life. They're nothing but a bunch of cold blooded killers, and that's the way we're going to treat them" (President rallies troops, January 3, 2003).

Anti-Arab t-shirts, mugs, buttons, baseball caps and other items are easy to find in gas stations, stores, and from street vendors. One political cartoon entitled "What would Mohammed drive?" portrays a man in Muslim attire driving a rental truck with missiles hanging out the back. While many of these images focus on specific figures, such as Saddam Hussein or Osama bin Laden, they leave the impression that such figures are representative of Middle Eastern persons. Comic books and novels often depict evil Arab characters. In one survey, Shaheen (2002) examined the portrayals of Arab characters in 215 American comic books. Of the 218 Arab characters he came across, he classified 149 as "evil," 30 as "good," and 39 as "common people". Shaheen concluded that there were three villainous Arab characters for every one heroic character. In this review, evil Arab characters were broken up into three categories: the repulsive terrorist, the sinister sheik, and the rapacious bandit; over 50 instances of Arab terrorist activities were recorded.

In a book entitled *Dr. Seuss Goes to War*, Minear (1999) detailed the prolific political cartoons of Theodore Geissel and World War II. All of the usual devices done with the inimitable visual whimsy for which Dr. Seuss became famous are in evidence in these cartoons. His production level was extremely high, some 400 cartoons. They represent all of the things that war-driven political propaganda art incorporates. There is a nice illustration of the way in which enemies change only in their identification but not in their images. In a cartoon of July 3, 1942, (p. 94) an angry Hitler riding atop a typical Seuss camel screams at some distant Muslims, "Stop them praying with heads toward Mecca! It's insulting how their other end is pointing toward Berlin!" In this cartoon, the sympathy is clearly with the religious freedom of the Muslims against the intolerance and arbitrariness of Hitler. Intriguingly, Minear also pointed out that the post-World War II story *Horton Hears a Who* was actually a continuation of a racist presentation regarding Japan and a glorification of the U.S. as having done only good things for that (small) country.

One sub-genre of enemy portrayals might be termed "hypothetical attacks and conquests." These devices describe in lurid detail what attacks by the enemy would be like and how horrible daily life would be if the attacks succeeded. The use of a hypothetical frees the writer from any serious duty to fact while allowing the ostensible authority that derives from a factual base to adhere. The hypothetical question is the delight and bane of the courtroom and it is a mechanism par excellence of propaganda.

In one example of this genre, the list of actions that are depicted as following an enemy victory in America include the institution of a religious inquisition, the burning of a

Quaker who refused to recant, the abolition of the use of the English language, the prohibition of trial by jury, the execution of the American head of state, and the massacre of protestors in one American city. What makes this example so interesting is that it was published in the Royal Gazette, March 17, 1779. Written during the American Revolution by a supporter of King George III, it purported to portray what life would be like if the rebel forces under General Washington were victorious. The horrible consequences were to result from the seizure of power after the Revolution by the rebel's ally, France (Davidson, 1973/1779).

After the United States entered World War I against Germany, the Committee on Public Information, created by President Wilson to drum up support for the war distributed three-quarters of a million copies of a pamphlet entitled "Why America Fights Germany" which included the following (Vaughn, 1980):

Now let us picture what a sudden invasion of the United States by these Germans would mean: sudden because their settled way is to attack suddenly. First they would set themselves to capture New York City. While their fleet blockades the harbor and shells the city and the forts from far at sea, their troops land somewhere near and advance toward the city in order to plunder it... They pass through Lakewood, a station on the Central Railroad of New Jersey. They first demand wine for the officers and beer for the men. Angered to find that an American town does not contain large quantities of either, they pillage and burn the post-office, and most of the hotels and stores. One feeble woman tries to conceal twenty dollars, which she had been hoarding in her desk drawer; she is taken out and hanged (to save a cartridge). (p. 88)

Similarly, in 1948, Look Magazine ran a pictorial article entitled "Could the Reds Seize Detroit?" describing how communists might be able to overrun an important American industrial center (Metcalf, 1948). The article accompanied posed photos of evil-looking communists who had murdered a telephone operator and a policeman in cold blood and included such lines as: "Detroit...is the industrial heartland of America. Today, a sickle is being sharpened to plunge into that heart."; "Assume that Russia declared war upon the United States not in the obsolete fashion of serving formal notice, but in a sneak offensive - and all-out initial blow in the best blitzkrieg style"; "The first few minutes would be busy ones for the Communist flying squads. On split-second schedule groups would be liquidating certain civic and political leaders"; "Rabble-rousers using sound trucks would roll into those sections of the city where years of preparation had conditioned the people to Communist leadership. Now, caught in the madness of the moment, emboldened by darkness, intoxicated by an unbridled license to kill, loot and destroy, mobs would swarm the streets" (Metcalf, 1948, p. 21-27).

### **Enemies in Film**

Almost from their birth, motion pictures became an important medium of enemy portrayals. In the words of George Creel, head of the Committee on Public Information during World War I, "I believe in the motion picture just as I believe in the press, and in my work it plays just as powerful a part in the production of an aroused and enlightened war sentiment," (Mock & Larson, 1939, p. 156). One pre-war silent film, *The Battle Cry of Peace* (1915), depicted what would happen if the United States were to be invaded by an enemy army shown wearing German uniforms. The film was based on a book written by Henry Maxim, a major weapons manufacturer, and included among its cast former President William Howard Taft, Secretary of State Lansing, Secretary of War Garrison, and Admiral Dewey. In the film, the U.S. Army is overwhelmed, New Yorkers are forced to evacuate the city and the nation's capital is destroyed (Isenberg, 1981). Similarly, in 1984, the ABC miniseries *Amerika* showed the destruction of the capitol by the Soviets, (Gottlieb, 1986). In real life, of course, the only troops to destroy the American capitol were those of the British in the War of 1812. But not since Thomas Jefferson described Great Britain as "...aiming at the exclusive domination of the seas, lost in corruption, of deep-rooted hatred towards us, hostile to liberty wherever it endeavors to show its head, and the eternal disturber of the peace of the world" (Ford, 1848, p. 519) have the British borne the brunt of serious enemy portrayals in this country. In fact, when a film about the American Revolution which depicted British Redcoats slaughtering women and children was shown during World War I, the producer was convicted of violating the Espionage Act and sent to a federal penitentiary (Isenberg, 1981).

During the First World War, Eric von Stroheim rose to fame playing cruel, mean-looking German officers who pushed around old women and pulled the hair out of children's heads. In a scene from *The Heart of Humanity* (1918), he played a German officer attempting to rape a sweet looking Red Cross nurse who is holding a baby. He yanks the baby away from her, she struggles, he rips and bites the clothing from her body. Meanwhile, German soldiers ignore her cries as they guzzle beer downstairs. The baby starts to cry, disturbing von Stroheim in the middle of his rape, so he rushes over to the window and tosses the baby out.

After World War II, noted American director D.W. Griffith relied on an enemy image in his film *The Birth of a Nation* (1915). The film depicted the post-Civil War period in the American South. In the film, blacks (portrayed by white actors in makeup) are shown walking barefoot and chomping chicken in the state legislature. The most emotional scene occurs when the white Southerners are threatened by blacks intent on rape and murder but are rescued at the last minute by the "heroic" riders of the Ku Klux Klan who gallop into town to music by Wagner.

The United States has not had a monopoly on enemy portrayals on film. Before and during World War II, the Nazis made several films depicting the barbaric behavior of the British (*Ohm Kruger*, 1941), the Russians (*GPU*, 1942) and the Jews (*Jew Suss*

1934), *The Rothschilds*, 1940). In 1938, the famed Soviet director Serge Eisenstein made *Alexander Nevsky*, a film about the 13-century invasion of Russia by Germanic knights. The Germans are shown wearing frightening helmets, stabbing the male inhabitants of one Russian town, trampling the females, and picking up the infants one at a time and throwing them into a burning pit. The film was popular when it first appeared, then banned during the period of the Soviet-German non-aggression pact and widely distributed once again after the Nazis invaded the Soviet Union (Taylor, 1979).

The British not only made several war films but also used enemy portrayals in historical films that show British soldiers heroically fighting against the evil forces of natives of British colonies. In films such as *Gunga Din* (1939), *The Lives of a Bengal Lancer* (1935), and *The Charge of the Light Brigade* (1936), made while the Indians under Gandhi were pressuring the British for their independence, popular actors such as Cary Grant, Douglas Fairbanks, Jr., Tyrone Power, and Errol Flynn played British soldiers who heroically defeat 19<sup>th</sup>-century uprisings in and around India. Although there is little doubt that in the British colonies many more natives than Englishmen were mistreated and killed, in these films the English are always gentlemen and the nationalist forces of the natives are always evil savages. If torture or mutilation is shown in these movies, it is done by the natives to the English (e.g. *Bengal Lancer*, *Gunga Din*). If a massacre is planned or takes place it is a native massacre of British subjects (e.g. *Gunga Din*, *Light Brigade*). But if someone risks his own life to save a comrade or fights against great odds, it is usually one of the handsome, heroic British except in *Gunga Din* where Sam Jaffe, playing the title role, is an Indian water boy in the British army who is treated as a hero for sacrificing his life to help the British defeat his own people. In these films, the battles fought by native populations to free themselves of British domination are turned into treacherous ambushes motivated by greed, savagery, or religious fanaticism and what was at the time the most powerful army in the world is turned into an underdog which triumphs because of the courage of a few heroes (Eisenberg, 1981).

Some American films about Vietnam resembled these British historical films. Although *The Deer Hunter* (1978), for example, does not glorify the American soldiers in the same way that the British films glorify Englishmen, almost every evil act in the film is perpetrated by the Vietnamese. One Vietnamese soldier opens a trap door and throws a grenade, killing women and children. Another Vietnamese soldier attempts to shoot a mother and her children but is killed by one of the heroes of the film. American prisoners of war are held in cages with most of their bodies immersed in water in which rats are swimming. For sport, American POWs are forced to play Russian roulette while the Vietnamese drink, laugh, and bet on the results. *The Green Berets* (1968) shows American soldiers caring for orphans and bravely resisting the atrocities of the Vietnamese guerilla leader, who lives in a mansion, travels in a chauffeur-driven Citroen, and sups on caviar.

Another group of historical films that include enemy portrayals were those made in the United States or Great Britain that focused on the Russian Revolution. These productions tended to be filmed from the point of view of aristocrats who suffer as a result of the revolution. They include *Dr. Zhivago* (1965), story of a doctor who is the orphaned son of a nobleman, and *Knight without Armor* (1937), a story of a countess escaping from the revolutionaries. Also in this category are *Tovarish* (1937), about a prince and princess impoverished by the revolution, and *Nicholas and Alexandra* (1971), about the czar and czarina who were killed by the revolutionaries. The casting adds to the bias, with popular actors such as Omar Sharif, Marlene Dietrich, Charles Boyer, and Claudette Colbert playing the victimized aristocrats, while the revolutionaries are played by unknowns or by character actors, such as Basil Rathbone and Rod Steiger, who are not handsome and charismatic and who, therefore, do not elicit much sympathy or identification from the audience.

Thus, *Knight without Armor* tells the story of a beautiful countess (Marlene Dietrich) escaping from the madness of the Russian Revolution. The revolutionaries in the film are shown throwing bombs, ransacking homes, destroying valuable paintings, getting wildly drunk, sentencing people to death while smiling, taking the clothes from condemned prisoners, and attempting to rape and rob the countess. The only acts of kindness or courage in the film are those performed by people fighting against the revolutionaries, including the Cossacks and noblemen who are fighting to put the Czar back in power as well as a revolutionary commissar who heroically sacrifices his own life in order to allow the countess to escape from his comrades.

Recently, enemy portrayals in American films not infrequently feature Arabs or other Middle Eastern people. Although these images have become increasingly prominent since the ending of the Cold War, their history predates it. In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, stereotyped images of Arabs began to emerge out of Europe. Images portrayed Arabs as desert dwellers and camel riders and as sleazy, suspicious cheaters and liars. In the early 1900's, European filmmakers began to introduce negative image Arab characters in the fledgling new art form of film. Thus, in *The Palace of Arabian Nights* (1905), a greedy Arab ruler has control of submissive women. With the advent of the automobile, filmmakers either depicted people living in deserts and riding camels or as rich businessmen who live in palaces and get around in limousines. These original images "stuck" with the result that Arabs are still being portrayed this way.

Upon completing research on over 900 feature films released between 1896 and 2001 portraying Arab characters, Shaheen (2002) found that the vast majority of them portrayed Arabs as terrorists and bad guys or as oppressed and voiceless women. These films promoted a one-dimensional view of this group of people. Today, there are over 265 million Arabs living in 22 different countries stretching from the Middle East to Northern Africa. They are an extremely diverse group of people with a variety of different traditions and customs.

It is also important to note that the way in which Arabs are not portrayed is equally problematic. For one, they are rarely depicted as heroes. In one study, 287 teachers were asked to identify a heroic Arab character in cartoons, movies, or television. The vast majority of them could not name a single one, but were easily able to identify Arab villains and bad guys (Moyers, 1991). There are also very few films depicting Arabs as friends or as family members partaking in typical everyday activities.

The negative portrayal of Arabs in films includes children's films as well as those geared toward an older audience. These images shape children's understanding of the world around them. The Disney film *Aladdin* (1992), is a prime example of enemy images in children's films. In the opening scene, a disheveled looking Arab sings "I come from a land, from a faraway place where the caravan camels roam, where they cut off your ear if they don't like your face, it's barbaric but hey it's home." There are several scenes in this movie that suggest that Arabs use extremely harsh and cruel punishments for crimes. One scene in particular depicts the princess coming close to having her hand cut off for stealing an apple for a starving child.

More specifically than just 'bad guys,' the portrayal of Arabs as actual terrorists out to get Americans is an increasingly common theme in films. In the 1976 film, *Black Sunday*, a Palestinian female terrorist, aided by a deranged and disaffected US Vietnam vet, attempts to blow up the Miami Super Bowl. Heroics are primarily performed by the brave Israeli commando whose own gratuitous violence, while not allowed to virtuous US types, is nonetheless condoned against the implacable enemy. The *Black Coin* (1936) was the first film of many to portray an Arab airplane hijacker. The first Hollywood feature film to depict Arab terrorists was *Sirocco* (1951).

*Back to the Future* (1985) depicts two Americans trying to defeat "nuclear Arab terrorist bastards," members of a threatening Libyan terrorist group. In *True Lies* (1994), Arab terrorists are stopped by a heroic white male character from setting off an atomic bomb in the Florida Keys. Other films include *American Ninja 4: The Annihilation* (1991), in which a US school teacher, Delta Force commandos, and African villagers defeat a mad Islamic sheikh, his ninja guard, and Arab allies. Another example is *Navy SEALs* (1990) in which Arab terrorists hold an American helicopter crew hostage. In *The Siege* (1998), Arab immigrants and Arab Americans destroy New York City's FBI building killing hundreds of government officials, bomb a theater killing hundreds, and attempt to detonate a bomb in a children's school bus. While listing all the films that portray negative Arab characters would be nearly impossible, these are representative examples.

Terrorism is often associated with Muslim fundamentalists in films. The religion of Islam is often falsely portrayed as a violent, Christian-hating religion. It is also common for films to falsely assume that all Arabs and Arab-Americans share a Muslim faith. Upon being asked why he dislikes Westerners, an Arab character in *Another Dawn* (1937) responds "It's a good Muslim hatred of Christians." Islam and fundamentalism

are portrayed as going hand-in-hand, suggesting that all Muslims are radical fundamentalists associated with violence and terrorism.

Enemy images in films are contributing to widespread racism against Arabs. However, it would be unfair and incorrect to assume that these filmmakers are consciously and purposely encouraging Arab stereotypes through such negative portrayals. Rather, these images are so ingrained in the society that such depictions are commonplace. They are widely accepted and rarely challenged. Unfortunately, filmmakers will continue to produce movies such as these as long as they still sell. This cycle is difficult to end. Movies often include archetypes and stereotypes. People who watch the movies incorporate the images into their schemas. Filmmakers are then further encouraged to produce films with such images because they fit the model of what people want to see and what they understand as reality.

In an interesting comparison, Zogby (1998) discussed a study he did of political cartoons and other pop culture which looked at how Jews were presented in Czarist Russia and pre-Nazi Germany versus how Arabs were presented in the United States in the '70s and '80s. He documented that, "in both content and form, the treatments given to each were identical." The stereotype of a Jew was often a fat banker or merchant and the stereotype of the Arab was the obese sheik. Both groups were given characteristics of being alien and hostile, as taking possessions from the West, and as threats to Western civilization. Both were seen as "the main agents responsible for international terrorism." Zogby then went on to point out that the Holocaust effectively acted to reduce, although not eliminate, the stereotyping of Jews. However, his studies of television, film, and books have shown that during a five-year period, "the only portrayals of Arab or Muslim Americans were either as terrorists or lecherous oil sheiks." In response to his criticisms, network executives pointed out that they had shown negative images of Italians and American Jews as well as negative images of Arabs. Zogby's rebuttal went to the unanimity of presentation which was not reduced by more complex representations of the other ethnic groups.

#### Soviets as the Enemy During the Cold War

For a number of years, coinciding with the Cold War, exaggerated enemy images became the norm for novels and films about the Soviet Union. These images appeared most frequently in spy novels. Along with romances, western adventures, science fiction, and mysteries, spy novels can be found in most American bookstores, dime stores, and airports. Many of the most popular of these spy novels were well written stories that were not simplistically ideological. A large subset of the genre, however, was made up of tales of the Soviet perfidy peopled with power-mad Russian bureaucrats, crazed generals, vicious KGB officers, and murderous spies. These books could be judged by their covers; they often had names like Red Square, Russian Spring or The Kremlin Control, and they almost always displayed a hammer and sickle or a picture of the Kremlin. Many of the authors were little known. In some cases, however, the authors had established

reputations. Gerald Green, author of Karpov's Brain about a sadistic KGB major, also wrote The Last Angry Man and Holocaust. Allen Drury, author of The Roads of Earth about a Soviet plan described in the book as designed to "eliminate the United States, decide the fate of all mankind, and assure for the Soviet Union the final conquest of the world," also wrote Advise and Consent. Some of the authors had made reputations in conservative politics. William F. Buckley, author of the Blackford Oakes novels, was best known as a conservative editor and commentator. Arnaud de Borchgrave, co-author of The Spike, was editor of The Washington Times, the newspaper associated with Reverend Sun Yun Moon and with a number of CIA/KCIA (Korean CIA) operatives linked to that cult. E. Howard Hunt, author of The Kremlin Conspiracy, was involved in the Watergate break-in.

These novels contained many recurrent themes: Soviet citizens or bureaucrats lament that the Soviet economy is failing; the people are unhappy; leaders are protecting their privileged positions; Soviet technology breakthroughs result from purloining Western secrets; blackmail and torture are common. Two books by different authors, for example, described the Soviets or their allies tying a man to a board or stretcher and then slowly feeding him feet first into a burning oven. Two books shared the theme of KGB agents who become ordained as priests as cover for murderous activities. One of these books went as far as to place upon a KGB priest the responsibility for preventing a peaceful settlement of the Catholic-Protestant conflict in Northern Ireland. Characters who begin the novels by distrusting the CIA, the U.S. military, or the use of weapons in space eventually realize the error of their ways. Peace organizations are Soviet dupes to be called upon whenever the Kremlin wants to weaken Western defenses.

Terrorist organizations throughout the world are depicted as working for the Soviets. (Although none of these plot elements were based upon much evidence, this is one of the most obvious examples of the use of "artistic license" as both the FBI and the CIA have concluded that there was no evidence linking the Soviet Union with world terrorism.) Soviet leaders who profess peace were either lying or under constant attack from militaristic generals and KGB officials who want war. The Soviet military was presented as more powerful than that of the United States either because of its superior armaments or due to the weakening of the American might by liberal politicians and naïve peaceniks, an obvious distortion as the subsequent fall of the USSR illustrated. And perhaps most dangerous of all, the Soviets were pictured as usually planning an invasion, sometimes the target was Eastern Europe, sometimes the Persian Gulf, sometimes Western Europe - or a first strike attack against the United States.

In Red Chameleon, published by Bantam after Mikhail Gorbachev became leader of the Soviet Union, Gorbachev (then described as Minister of Agriculture, which he was at one time) takes part in a discussion of a Soviet invasion of Europe. The only doubts he expresses about the plan deal with whether the Soviets can be certain that, "the Americans and NATO will go along with their declared intention not to be the first to use



nuclear weapons." These scenarios are indeed interesting to contemplate in light of the post 9/11 US led invasion of Iraq.

While evil Russians appeared in a number of films (including several of the James Bond series), the enemy image was most evident in four: Rambo (1982) and Rocky IV (1985), both starring Sylvester Stallone, Invasion U.S.A (1952). and Red Dawn (1984). In Rambo, Stallone single-handedly locates and frees several U.S. POWs who are imprisoned by the Vietnamese (who are clearly under the command of Soviet officers). Rocky IV pits Stallone as the champion boxer against a mighty Russian challenger. Invasion U.S.A. stars Chuck Norris (who in Missing in Action (1984) also frees POWs from Vietnamese imprisonment) as the one American who can prevent two agents named Kikko and Mikhail Rostov from using terrorism to push the United States into mass anarchy. Red Dawn, the most similar to Amerika of the four, portrays the effects of a Soviet invasion of the United States on a mid-Western town.

In all of these films, costumes, makeup, lighting, and acting are combined to make the actors portraying the Russians appear savage and fierce. The gigantic steely-jawed Russian boxer in Rocky IV, who is often shown wearing a Soviet military uniform, is so animalistic that he barely speaks throughout the film other than to utter threats in a deep, spooky voice reminiscent of the character "Lurch" on the old television program, The Adams Family. (It can be remembered that inarticulate speech was the meaning of the word "barbarian," given by the ancient Greeks to their enemies, the Persians.)

Just as the powerful British Army was made to appear the underdog in India, so the powerful Americans in these films always start at a disadvantage. Rambo has to fight hundreds of Vietnamese and Soviet troops alone. The Soviet agents in Invasion U.S.A. are able to wreak chaos in the United States, almost bringing the nation to its knees, before Chuck Norris stops them only by using a clever trick. The Soviet sneak attack in Red Dawn overwhelms the small town. The only resistance to the Soviet tanks, bombs, and helicopters is offered by a handful of heroic high school students. Rocky IV is a perfect example of the underdog technique. Although Rocky is the heavyweight champion boxer of the world, his Russian opponent is so strong, so fierce, and so invincible that Rocky's decision to fight him is described by his wife as "suicide."

All of the gratuitous violence is exhibited by the Soviets in these films. The off screen torture of the father of two of the young heroes is implied in Red Dawn by showing him with blood on his face. Onscreen torture using electric shock administered by a Russian is graphically depicted in Rambo. Perhaps even more disturbing is the way in which the Russians in the film are portrayed as enjoying killing and inflicting pain. In Invasion U.S.A. one of the Russian agents murders two American teenagers in cold blood who are necking on a beach while listening to a portable television. Immediately after the murder, he smiles as he watches a talk show on their tv. In Rocky IV, immediately after he pulverizes a Muhammad Ali-like character called "Apollo Creed" (note the hidden and associational reference to Christianity – The Apostles' Creed -- and also a Greek hero

representing Western Civilization) in an exhibition match, the boxer comments, "If he dies, he dies."

Civilians are massacred in *Invasion U.S.A.* and *Red Dawn* and in both films the Russians deliberately gun down young children. *Red Dawn* actually portrays the Soviets as beginning their invasion of the United States by slaughtering most of the students and teachers of a mid-West high school. *Invasion U.S.A.* includes a touching holiday scene in which the evil Mikhail Rostov smiles as he blows up a suburban home just after a little girl places an angel atop her Christmas tree. The rape in *Red Dawn* is not shown on screen but one of the two female leads is almost mute throughout the film after "those sons of bitches tried to have their way with them." It is one thing to portray competition with or even danger from another nation. Only in a full-fledged "enemy portrayal," however, are groups of people shown as being totally evil, enjoying murder for murder's sake, and expending massive resources at great risk to themselves in order to hurt or destroy harmless citizens.

As in *Gunga Din* and *Knight Without Armor*, the only decent action taken by an enemy in *Red Dawn* is one in which he betrays his own side. At the end of the film, a Hispanic (perhaps Nicaraguan) officer, realizes that the Americans, who have killed hundreds of his men, are the real good guys and allows them to escape when he has a chance to stop them. This incident points up the one element of these films that is rare in earlier enemy portrayals: the use of people from Third World nations as pawns of the identified enemy with power. In *Rambo*, it is the Vietnamese; in *Invasion U.S.A.*, many Hispanics and some Asians play the part; in *Red Dawn*, Cubans and Nicaraguans all act as Soviet underlings sent out to do most of the dirty work. Even *Rocky IV* has a Cuban trainer assisting the Russians. Thus, the target populations, Americans, are not up against the Soviets in these films but have to face every Soviet ally. In America, the forces occupying the United States do so in the name of the United Nations, thus presenting the whole world as against the U.S.

#### The Post Cold War Period: Enemy Images Transcended?

Predictably, as the political focus shifts, the devices of enemy images will remain the same but the targets will reflect the contemporary political situation. Thus, after a brief period of relative world peace, perhaps one which could have been called a *pax Americana* since the only super power was the USA, new international polarities and pressures emerged. World terrorism came into focus as the enemy and was promptly identified as primarily Muslim or Arab in nature. 9/11 solidified that focus and effectively removed the sense of invincibility Americans enjoyed for a brief period. Quasi-enemies also began to emerge for a time, notably the French and other Europeans who did not support the decision to unilaterally invade Iraq.

In spite of reasons for pessimism, an increase in knowledge about and appreciation of enemy images devices may serve to decrease their potency. Furthermore, just as the arts have been used or misused to maintain an enemy images atmosphere consistent with

contemporary political concerns, the arts have also been a source of transcendence and education that attempts to moderate the extremes of enemy images thinking.

At the outset, stage theater gained popularity by portraying politically correct moral tales with stock characters. Nonetheless, even in its infancy, theater strove to push the frontiers of social thought. That gadfly function continues to the present. In 2000, Caryl Churchill wrote *Far Away*, a play which begins with a young girl's discovery that some kind of malevolent activity is taking place in the bucolic surroundings of her uncle's farm. Initially, she hears distortions that are to keep her from knowing the nature of what is taking place, but by the end of this surreal drama, nations and animals and things have taken up arms against each other and the enemy cannot be known because friend and foe are constantly changing. The play presents a world governed by fear and deterioration into factionalism that is the ultimate splitting of everything. Churchill is a voice of warning about the end play of an enemy images driven global society.

As all film makers know, music builds suspense, amplifies the viewer's emotional responses underscores the movie's messages. Accordingly, the movie score is another vehicle for conveying enemy images. Thus, Wagner's operas were clearly a programmatic glorification of Aryan/German superiority and justification of the regime's racist policies (Richard Wagner, biographical sketch, retrieved April 23, 2004). However, by the year 2000, it would have seemed unlikely that the arts would reflect rampant anti-Semitism and other hate-based messages. Nonetheless, as detailed by O'Connor (2000), local and national white supremacists and other hate-based groups have developed and supported a music, primarily hard rock, that utilizes many enemy images devices and is aimed at Jews and African Americans with particular viciousness. Samples include "Aryan Rage," in which the words tell whites they are lazy for not being angry and should "get off the fence white man/it's time to kick some ass!/pulverize the niggers/trash the (expletive) fags!/Grab yourself a club and beat down a lousy Jew." A skinhead involved in this genre is quoted as saying, "Music is the best recruitment tool in the world." Titles of other pieces clearly reveal their intent: "Declaration of War," "Hate Train Rolling," "Born to Hate." Some pieces are not hard rock and one can even find cello music in this category!

By contrast, a contemporary composition called *Drala* by Lieberson was first presented in 1983. *Drala* combines two Tibetan words where *dra* means enemy and *la* means above. According to the composer as cited by Laki (1995), it is a, "gentle and invisible state in human beings that transcends aggression." The piece looks at how music can embody the conquering of differences and the ultimate potential for a sense of unity in the tradition of the more esoteric Buddhist writings. The score reflects a diversity of moods ultimately unified through syncopated rhythms and the climatic passage.

The nature of terrorism itself – ephemeral, often state-less, and frequently involving people who feel they or their constituency are under cultural attack – may make simple and enduring stereotyping in film quite difficult. And some contemporary film reflects that ambiguity and complexity. For example, in *The Sum of All Fears* (2000), the hero is

African-American and CIA, the US and Russia are duped into enmity, the terrorist manipulators are identified vaguely with Nazism and fascism, and both Israelis and Arabs are depicted as minor pawns. Similarly, while *The Siege* (1998) includes many stock images of enemies, the good guys, uncharacteristically, are the FBI and a Lebanese naturalized US citizen, while the bad guys include a general in the US Army as well as a Middle East terrorist. And finally, the film depicts the defense of a massive peace march against a government policy of internment of Arab-Americans.

### Final Thoughts

Understanding the mechanisms by which enemy images in fiction are either thinly disguised propaganda, or more often, simple reflection of contemporary cultural archetypes and stereotypes, allows for more discriminating viewing. However, fictional portrayal of enemies can be influential because of their emotional appeal and the consumer's relaxing their usual judgment. Enemy images in fiction are based on the human tendency to externalize that which is bad and internalize that which is good. This splitting of good and bad has long been recognized by psychologists and found even in literature and film that has no propaganda motivation. Enmification in fiction is likely to continue with only the target groups changing.

Countering the impact of that likelihood is the increasing connection between cultures and people. The globalization spearheaded by information sharing, while having some adverse impacts on diversity and cultural integrity, may also lead to a global village in which facile enmification in film and fiction is processed with greater awareness and skepticism.

## REFERENCES

- Compton-Engle, G. (March 22, 2004). Lecture entitled "Imagining the barbarian: Greek and Roman views of the enemy." John Carroll University, University Heights, Ohio.
- Davidson, P. (1973). *Propaganda and the American Revolution 1736-1783*. New York: Norton.
- Ferris, I. M. (2000). *Enemies of Rome: Barbarians through Roman eyes*. Stroud: Sutton Publishing.
- Ford, P. L. (Ed.) (1848). *The writings of Thomas Jefferson IX*, New York: Putnams, 519.
- Gottlieb, J. (June 3, 1986). The politics of Amerika. *Los Angeles Herald Examiner*, B-1.
- Isenberg, M. T. (1981). *War on film*. Rutherford, NJ: Farleigh Dickinson University Press.
- Laki, P. (November 9-11, 1995). Drala. Program notes for the Cleveland Orchestra, 25, 27.
- MacGowan, K. (1918). Hearts of the world. *New Republic*, July 20, 344.
- Metcalf, J. (August 3, 1948). Could the Reds seize Detroit? *Look*, 21-27.
- Minear, R. (1999). *Dr. Seuss goes to war: The World War II editorial cartoons of Theodor Seuss Geisel*. New York: New Press.
- Mock, J. R., & Larson, C. (1939). *Word that won the war*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Moyers, B. (1991). *The Arabs, who they are and who they are not*. Public Affairs Television. VHS tape. New York: Mystic Fare Video
- O'Connor, C. (March 5, 2000). Sounds of hate. *The Plain Dealer*, I-1, I-4, I-5.
- Orians, J. (1999). *Classical art and the cultures of Greece and Rome*. NewHaven: Yale University Press.
- Palaima, T. (December 1, 2000). Wars that shaped the world. *The Times Higher*.
- Pomeroy, S. B., Burnstein, S. M., Donlan, W., & Roberts, J. T. (1999). *Ancient Greece: A political, social, and cultural history*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Richard Wagner, biographical sketch. Retrieved 4/24/04. <http://w3.rz-berlin.mpgde/cmp/wagner.html>.

Shaheen, J. (2002). Reel bad Arabs: How Hollywood vilifies a people. *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, 34(4), 775-777.

Vaughn, S. (1980). *Holding fast the inner lines*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

War of the Roses: Myth, propaganda and history. Retrieved April 24, 2004. <http://stjohnchs.org/english/shakespeare/warroses/wr.htm>

Zogby, J. (1998). The other anti-Semitism. *Sojourners Magazine*, 27(6), 22.

---

## SECTION IV

### RETHINKING ENMITY: AN INTRODUCTION TO THE PSYCHOLOGY OF ENEMY IMAGES (A SAMPLE TALK)

---

#### Preface

Constructing a new, more peaceful world order requires sustaining a vision of international interdependence, collective security, and of the interconnectedness of peace, justice, and environmental issues. Unfortunately, there are significant psychological obstacles to such collaborative thinking about security. Too often, our thinking is marked by simplistic images and ethnocentric stereotypes of other nations.

In the West, images abound of "Muslim extremists" or "suspicious Arabs." Similarly, others harbor images of "greedy capitalists" or "American bullies." Locked in the grip of these stereotypes, images become realities through such psychological mechanisms of self-fulfilling prophecies and the mirror imaging of the enemy. Such mechanisms will be described late in this talk.

A particularly dangerous stereotype is the exaggerated image of the enemy, the representation of another group or individual as implacably evil, aggressive, and untrustworthy. Psychological research over the past three decades has identified the exaggerated image of the enemy as a key source and amplifier of international tensions.

Today, enemy images continue to fuel conflicts and to limit our receptiveness to new ideas. Yet the general public has little awareness of enemy images and their psychological effects. We need public education programs that heighten awareness of enemy images and their effects.

#### Introduction

Enmity is a relatively permanent fixture on the international landscape. For over forty years, East-West enmity dominated U.S. national security policies until the end of the Cold War. In the Mid-East, enmity is a condition of life, triggering sporadic outbursts of war and terrorism. Now such terror has boiled over and has a world-wide scope. In many developing nations, enmity rages between competing internal factions, speckling the globe with civil wars and low-intensity conflicts, as well as periodic genocides.

Conflict and enmity have many sources--political, economic, ideological, religious, and so on. But conflict and enmity also have psychological causes. One of the most significant psychological causes is the exaggerated image of the enemy resulting from

fear of the unknown, and an exaggeration of negative characteristics of the adversary. While there is real conflict and enmity, the mind embellishes reality, creating demon images that go beyond the negative characteristics and conflict that actually exist. The resulting exaggerated enemy images produce a host of ill effects ranging from misperceptions of the adversary to excessive fear and unwarranted aggressive actions seen as self-defense.

Overcoming enemy images is a bit like overcoming a disease. To defeat a disease, we must first understand it and discover how it works, thereby putting ourselves in a position to prevent it. In the same way, moving beyond enemy images requires that we first understand them. In particular, we must ask what are the psychological processes involved in enemy imagery, and how do enemy images influence our thinking and social behavior? To move beyond enemy images, we must also ask how “enmification” (Rieber, 1991) can be resisted.

### Enemy Images and Biased Thinking

The ability to think is one of our species' greatest assets. But this ability carries no guarantees of accuracy, logic, and open-mindedness. Without even knowing it, many people harbor deep prejudices, tune out information that does not fit into their preconceptions, and make unwarranted negative judgments

These biases do not reflect a lack of intelligence; even the most intelligent people can and do engage in misguided thinking. Rather, they reflect the operation of common psychological processes toward self and other that may affect all of us to varying degrees. With regard to enemies, these processes include: stereotyping, dehumanization, selective perception and remembering, and attributional biases.

#### *Dehumanization*

Mentally, one of the first things we do to our enemies is to dehumanize them by overlooking their human qualities and by depicting them as subhuman. During World War II, for example, Americans portrayed the Japanese in editorial cartoons in dehumanized forms such as jungle monkeys and lice, while the Japanese portrayed F.D.R. in such dehumanized forms as a demon who wore a deceitful mask of friendship. Nazis depicted Jews as rats and as vermin. Similarly, today both Arabs and Israelis often denounce each other as terrorists who have little regard for human life. During the Cold War, millions of Americans saw dehumanized images of the Soviets in films such as *Rocky IV* and *Rambo*, which portrayed the Soviets as cold, bloodthirsty, and machine-like. In the 1980s, Iranians often constructed dehumanized images of Americans who were portrayed as Satanic bullies.



Dehumanization is no mere oversimplification--it is part of the psychological engine for war. To see the importance of dehumanization in warfare, think how much easier it is to kill someone while imagining an evil figure rather than a kind son or father. Before we can kill, we must have an enemy and a reason for killing, and the dehumanized enemy image gives us both. Seeing an inhuman figure that threatens to kill us, we suspend our normal compassion and moral inhibitions to killing. Because it is either us or them and they are inhuman, we have a ready justification for killing.

### *Stereotyping*

Dehumanized images are an extreme example of stereotyping, the creation of an oversimplified view of other persons or groups. Stereotypes simplify the world for us which is adaptive in many contexts. Events in the international arena are extremely complex, and they change at a dizzying pace. Faced with this complexity, it is a normal psychological response to simplify the world by using a relatively small number of mental categories. It is relatively difficult to keep in mind all of the subtle differences between subgroups of "them". For example, we can reduce this complexity by thinking in terms of "Terrorists" and "the West". In the 21<sup>st</sup> century, it is a complex task for most ordinary people who know very little about Islam to develop a genuine understanding of it. It is easier to reduce the complexity of Islamic social organization to stereotypes of backwardness and religious fanaticism. But, in the long run, this type of stereotyping does more harm than good because it limits the opportunity for respectful dialogue, and generates global polarization instead of peaceful integration.

Although stereotypes help us to simplify and order the world, they limit our view of the other by ignoring the complexity and the diversity of the other. Stereotypes about Islamic countries prevent us from appreciating the civility, lack of crime and general peacefulness of these societies compared to the crime-torn West. The religious spirit in these societies has yielded not just oppressive laws and practices, but also some positive and commonly upheld values. Stereotypes prevent us from examining dispassionately social organization in both the East and in the West and finding some wise middle ground, building on the strengths of each. Where the world provides a wealth of diversity, a stereotype provides a colorless gray.

In this way, stereotypes invite dichotomous thinking. By labeling all countries as either "democratic" or "non-democratic" we divide the world into "East" and "West". This hopelessly simplistic framework encourages us to overlook similarities between people and between nations where religion and state are separated, and those where religion and state are fused. Similarly in the Mid-East, stereotypes of Arabs and Jews abound, leading people to analyze statements or actions as either pro-Arab or pro-Israeli and cementing the ideas that there are neither similarities and common interests nor other points of views.

### *Selective Perception and Remembering*

We would all like to be relatively objective receivers and judges of information. Few people set out intentionally to be biased. Yet without knowing it, our stereotypes filter what we perceive and remember. In particular, enmification lead us to selectively attend to and remember negative aspects and actions of our adversaries.

One study found that people who favored the Israelis in the Mid-East conflict perceived media coverage of the Beirut massacre as biased against Israel whereas people who favored the Arabs perceived the same coverage as biased against the Arabs.

This tendency is pernicious because it makes enemy images self-confirming and resistant to change. Viewing the world through the lens of enemy images, we selectively pick up and remember the negative information that fits the image, thereby strengthening it. At the same time, we pay little attention to the favorable actions of the enemy, and this makes it difficult for us to see the enemy in a new light.

### *Biased Attributions*

Enemy images also bias our ideas about our adversaries' motives, portraying them in the worst possible light. In a study conducted in southern India, where there has been conflict between Hindus and Moslems, Hindu office clerks read short descriptions of either a Moslem or a Hindu behaving in friendly or unfriendly ways. The clerks then chose the major reason that the person in the description behaved as he or she did. The Hindu clerks ascribed the friendly behaviors of the Hindu story characters to their personalities and the unfriendly behaviors to external circumstances e.g., someone had been rude to the clerk earlier. In contrast, the clerks attributed the negative Moslem behaviors to negative personalities e.g., they were unfriendly persons, and they ascribed friendly Moslem behaviors to external circumstances. Thus they made positive attributions about the Hindus and explained away their negative behaviors, but they made negative attributions about the Moslems, ascribing their negative behaviors to unpleasant, hostile personalities.

When enemy images are very strong, we may attribute hostile motives to peaceful actions. Thus an adversary's peace proposal may appear to be a trick, a propaganda ploy, or a way of increasing tension among allies. In 1985, for example, when Soviet Premier Gorbachev announced a six-month unilateral freeze on the deployment of medium-range missiles in Europe, the *New York Times* reported that the proposal "seemed to officials here designed to cause dissension in NATO and undercut American interests in Europe."

Biased attributions create a double standard for judging behavior. For example, when major networks cover surges of violence in the Middle East, there are very rarely any accounts of the actual living conditions of a whole generation of Palestinians born and raised in refuge camps. All we see are Palestinian youth throwing stones and Israeli troops retaliating. We are not shown the actual living conditions, nor the violations of

dignity on both sides of the divide. The average viewer is conditioned to think of Palestinians youths as aggressive potential terrorists. What they see as resistance, we see as fanatical.

Enemy images do not reside passively in the minds of their holders. Articulated by leaders and propagated by the mass media, they actively shape the behavior of groups and become deeply ingrained in societies. Particularly when held over a long period of time, they fade into the background, acting as hidden assumptions that subtly influence policies and that escape critical scrutiny. An essential first step toward resisting their adverse influence is to ask how and why they affect our social behavior.

### *US and THEM*

As groups form, the members bond with each other, and they distinguish between their group and others, thereby drawing a line between “us” and “them.” Enemy images amplify this process by forging unusually strong bonds within the group. Nothing unites a group more strongly than an enemy. Feeling threatened by a hostile “other”, the group pulls together and develops an esprit de corps so strong that people are willing to die in order to protect their group.

In addition, enemy images skew the process of distinguishing between “us” and “them.” Viewed through the eyes of the enemy image, the “other” appears not only different but foreign, alien, and lacking in human qualities. This is no ordinary “other” but one that is imminently threatening.

This heightened perception of difference between “us” and “them,” coupled with feelings of fear and hostility, leads us to overlook common interests and similarities. There appears to be an unbridgeable chasm between “us” and “them.” Furthermore, this perception thwarts communication and impedes negotiation and other attempts to resolve conflict nonviolently. After all, if we have nothing in common, we have little to talk about, and if the enemy is truly hostile, attempts to communicate and negotiate will only be used to trick us or to weaken our resolve. Thus we forget that the enemy has human qualities and may have as strong an interest in security as we have.

### *Mirror Imaging*

Enemy images are dangerous when they are held by even one party to a conflict. But typically they are held by all parties, and in mirror-image form. During the Cold War, for example, the Soviets harbored the same kinds of dehumanized stereotypes and made the same kinds of biased perceptions and attributions about the U.S. that the U.S. made in regard to the Soviets. The Soviet media often deplored “the U.S. imperialists” for being highly aggressive and interventionist. Similarly, the Soviets described capitalism as morally corrupt, oppressive of minority peoples, and destined to collapse because of the social inequalities it creates. Because both the U.S. and the Soviet Union viewed each

other through the distorting lens of the enemy image, enemy images became woven into the social fabric of U.S. –Soviet relations.

Mirror imaging can help set in motion a cascade of misperceptions on both sides of a conflict. With each side biased toward perceiving each other's actions in the worst possible light, every statement and action becomes an additional source of hostility, ratcheting tensions up. Since each side expects the worst from the other, they both take protective steps such as investing in more arms. But each side perceives these steps by the other as aggressive rather than defensive. By increasing tensions, the buildup of arms may actually help to bring about the crises and armed conflicts that they had been intended to prevent. In this sense, enemy images act as self-fulfilling prophecies.

### The Value of Having Enemies

One of the questions that may have occurred to you is “If enemy images have such negative effects, then why do we form them?” In part, the answer is that enemy images have significant social functions, that is, they have a number of short-term benefits.

One benefit of enemy images is to divert attention from domestic problems. Politicians have long understood that if there are domestic problems such as poverty, homelessness, and internal unrest that threaten the current administration, one way to stay in office is to emphasize threats to one's national security. This tactic not only diverts attention from the domestic problems but also encourages people to rally behind the current leaders for protection. Hitler, for example, rose to power largely by virtue of his ability to convince the Germans of a Jewish conspiracy and to play on the people's sense of mistreatment at the hands of the victors of World War I. As shown by the negative outcome of the Nazi regime, whatever short-term benefits come from cultivating enemy images may be easily outweighed by disastrous long-term consequences.

Enemy images may also stimulate short-term economic gains. One can boost a sagging economy by increasing military spending and production. But to justify this spending, there must be a threat, which of course is exactly what enemy images provide. Caught amid the ambiguous and complex demands of competing constituencies and wanting to provide both jobs and security, politicians may drift into the practice of pointing to the external threat and expounding the need to build weapons to thwart it. In turn, the populace often responds with a mixture of aroused patriotic fervor and gratitude for jobs, which influences their voting behavior. As a result, both the leaders and the people become locked into a social system in which enemy images exert a powerful short term influence on the economic life of the society.

Furthermore, nations may need enemy images to give people a sense of moral order and of legitimacy for acting in the international arena. Believing that “we” are good but that “they” are evil, we develop a clear sense of obligation to contain, thwart, and even overcome the enemy. This gives us a strong justification for building up a powerful

military. It also justifies invasions and other uses of our military might. If we attack another nation or group, it is not because we are aggressive but because we want to protect our citizens or our way of life from the enemy. Locked in the grip of enemy images, people lose their ability to question their nation's military actions, falling prey to simplistic and self-serving justifications of why their nation acted as it did. By providing all of the parties to a conflict with a ready justification for fighting, enemy images pave the way for war.

Although there are discernible pressures for and short term benefits of having enemies, there is no compelling evidence that we have an immutable, deep-seated psychological need for an enemy. By taking appropriate steps, we can resist enemy images and their ill effects.

### **Beyond Enemy Images**

#### Education

Because enemy images thrive where there is ignorance, balanced education about adversaries is a key component in a program to correct enemy images. Yet enemy images resist education, particularly traditional forms of education such as lectures that attempt to transmit information about the adversary. People who have strong enemy images seldom listen to both sides. Instead, they select or reinterpret the presented information in a manner that fits their biases. For example, an ardent peace activist who hears of a military plan for promoting peace may not try to acquire extensive information about the plan, rejecting it out of hand as a misguided idea. Thus enemy images encourage a close-mindedness that blocks effective listening, learning and dialogue.

Helping people to become more aware of their biases can counteracts the effects of propaganda and promote the critical thinking that is necessary for making informed decisions. Educational efforts aimed at fostering a recognition of the interdependence between different peoples is another way to inoculate against the tendency to irrational enmification.

Likewise, incorporating the principle of the oneness of humankind in our school curriculums is a crucial long-term step to moderate the tendency to fear the unknown, to stereotype, to yield to tribalism, and to create enmity. Contemporary education needs to help young people view themselves as part of their own unique community while equally part of the world community. If young people can learn to value and respect the uniqueness of their own tribes of belonging, while understanding the principle of unity in diversity, they will be less prone to allow tribes to develop tribalistic attitudes because they would recognize the unsustainability of such attitudes for all. This recognition is the greatest long-term protection against the perpetuation of enemy images. It would compel people to seek understanding of different perspectives and the meeting ground between different needs and worldviews.

## Empathy

Enemy images lock the adversary behind a mask of enmity and otherness, obscuring human qualities and motives. To dismantle the enemy image, we must penetrate this mask by empathizing with the adversary, that is, by learning to see the world from their perspective. Empathy does not imply sympathy or acceptance of the adversary's actions. In empathizing with the enemy, we do not accept the adversary's values, feelings, and interpretations as our own, nor do we condone the adversary's behavior. Rather, the goals of empathy are to acquire a deeper understanding of the adversary's actual motives and to help us to look beyond our own limited point of view. When we do this, we simultaneously step out of our own perspective and acquire a more nuanced understanding of the adversary. What appear to be hostile actions from our perspective often appear to be defensive actions from the adversary's perspective. And what appear to be propaganda ploys from our perspective may appear to be genuine efforts at peacemaking from the adversary's perspective. In many cases, empathy puts a more human face on the adversary, showing us the human thoughts, fears, and foibles that guide their behavior.

One of the most effective ways of fostering empathy is role-playing, an activity in which audience members think and act as the adversary would. For example, half of a group might be asked to act as Middle Eastern citizens or leaders, while the other half act as American citizens or leaders. By having each group list the main characteristics of the other, processes such as mirror-imaging and attributional biases become apparent, and both groups learn about how they view each other. A variation on this activity is to have both groups comment on events such as the U.S. invasion of Afghanistan or Iraq, thereby identifying the differences in how the two countries interpret those events.

## Personal Connections

Enemy images lock people into a protective shell, encouraging them to avoid direct contact with the other. Making direct, person-to-person connections is a powerful method for overcoming enemy images. For example, problem-solving groups comprised of midlevel leaders from each group have helped to dispel some of the most dehumanizing stereotypes that Israelis and Palestinians had of each other. When Americans and Soviets entered the warmth of each other's homes in unprecedented numbers in the latter part of the 1980s, they often discovered that the "other" had likeable human concerns—humor, skepticism, and love of family—and many of the same desires and concerns they themselves had.

There has been a remarkable transformation of the image of Russian femininity since the end of the Cold War, a matter reflective of societal changes, not inherent qualities of Russian women. This change is most dramatically represented by the plethora of attractive Russians on the Women's tennis circuit. The Russian male image has also undergone a favorable image change in the U.S. as exemplified by American's fondness

for many Russian hockey stars, who are typically seen as not only skilled but exhibiting great sportsmanship.

Contact alone, however is not sufficient to counteract enemy images. In fact, people who have very strong enemy images have such biased perceptions that they selectively use information from visits and personal contacts with the adversary to confirm their preconceptions. Moreover, if tensions are very high, contact between adversaries may spark insults and fights that strengthen hostilities. To break down enemy images, contact should be structured so that groups have the blessing of their communities to meet with each other. It should be contact of sufficient depth and duration for the sides to really get to know those from the other group as real three dimensional people, not stereotypes. It should also be between equals who will respect each other and who will not view the other as inferior. Finally, it should be oriented toward identifying common interests that reduce the sense of insurmountable differences that adversaries often have toward each other.

## Conclusion

Enemy images promote intense rivalry and an attitude of “it’s us or them.” Feeling competitive and threatened, we forget that we may have interests in common with the adversary and that we can work together to achieve those interests. Research has shown repeatedly that getting adversaries to cooperate to achieve shared goals is one of the best ways of reducing enemy images. Through cooperation, adversaries learn that they have common interests, that teamwork is possible, and that the other side is less diabolical than was previously believed. In addition, collaboration brings people together in a positive setting, fostering the formation of the personal bonds which help to overcome enemy images.

Today there are a multitude of transnational problems that invite cooperative efforts—globalization with its economic and social justice conundrums, terrorism, the need to prevent and nuclear proliferation as well as reduce nuclear arsenals, stopping the spread of AIDs, reforesting Europe, cleaning up the environment, exploring space, and many others. Problems of such scope require multinational collaboration and a new awareness of the regressive pull of enemy imaging if we, as a world community, are to meet such challenges.

## FOR ADDITIONAL READING

- Arnett, J.J. (2002). The psychology of globalization. *American Psychologist*, 57, 774-783.
- Daloz, L., Keen, C., Keen, J., and Parks, S. (1996). *Common fire: Lives of commitment in a complex world*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Eidelson, R. J. and Eidelson, J. I. (2003). Dangerous ideas: Five beliefs that propel groups toward conflict. *American Psychologist*, 58, 182-192.
- Fabick, S. (2004). *US & THEM: Moderating Group Conflict*. MI Psychologist for Social Responsibility, Birmingham, MI.
- Keen, S. (1986). *Faces of the Enemy: Reflections o the Hostile Imagination*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Kelman, H.C. (1987). The political psychology of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict: How can we overcome the barriers to a negotiated solution? *Political Psychology*, 8, 347-363.
- Mustakova-Possardt, E. (2003). *Critical consciousness: Study of morality in global historical context*. Westport, CT: Greenwood/Praeger.
- Rieber, R.W. (1991). *The Psychology of War and Peace: The Image of the Enemy*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Silverstein, B. (1989). Enemy images: The psychology of U.S. attitudes and cognitions regarding the Soviet Union. *American Psychologist*, 44, 903-913.
- White, R.K. (1984). *Fearful Warriors: A Psychological Profile of U.S. –Soviet Relations*. New York: Free Press.



---

## SECTION V

### Enemy Images Exercises

---

“When I was facilitating classroom discussions, children were asked what they could do as young people to create peace in New York. A second grade student boldly stated, 'We need to get rid of the people who wear their hair like this...!' (motioning to a turban-like wrap on his head). I asked why he thought that would be the solution. He responded, ' They are bad people. They killed many people.'”

Sensitive to his developmental level and what he might be hearing from adults in his environment, I explained, “People who wear their hair in turbans are not bad. If there was a bank robber and he was wearing sneakers, would that mean that all people who wear sneakers are bad and are bank robbers?” The young student was able to understand my example and understood that we cannot stereotype others and make judgments simply on their appearance.

Marygrace Berberian, Art Therapist, NYU, NY. from Christian Children’s Fund (2002), *A Manual for Caregivers*.

#### Experiential Exercises

We can hope that this second grader went home that night with a more realistic image of the “bad people in society.” We can take from this anecdote the optimistic message that exaggerated enemy images are pervasive, but they are not immutable. The following exercises are ways to bring the theory of enemy images back to the individual in a concrete and personal way.

Audience participation is a vital ingredient for successful learning, particularly for exploring and changing attitudes. While lectures are useful in communicating information and in raising questions, they are not always effective in helping people to identify tendencies to exaggerate images of an enemy. Since lectures can be monotonous, interspersed exercises are needed to provide a change of pace.

Below is a brief description of recommended activities and suggested contexts for using them. In the following pages, the activities are presented along with detailed instructions and any handouts that are needed. Ultimately, these activities will be most successful when they are supplemented by the imagination and sensitivity of the presenter in terms of the “enemy” addressed and the sophistication of the audience.

## Exercises

1. **Who Said It?** This brief quotation from Thomas Jefferson may be used to introduce the concept of enemy images. Using this quotation adds a touch of irony, and helps listeners look beyond recent history and see that even our most revered leaders have cultivated malignant images of the enemy. This use of humor and historical perspective can aid in creating a positive, receptive atmosphere, particularly with skeptical audiences.
2. **Drawing an Enemy.** Asking participants to draw an enemy helps them understand more clearly their own hidden assumptions and feelings about enemies. This activity shows the relevance of the concept of the enemy image on a very personal level. It can be effective in dealing with people who are highly articulate but who tend to shy away from emotional reflection.
3. **Matching Enemy Images and Nations/Sources.** This exercise is for sophisticated adult audiences only given its historical content. Participants are shown images of enemies from popular posters (taken from “Faces of the Enemy” by Sam Keen) and asked to identify which image goes with which nation. This is a powerful tool for showing the universality of enemy images across time, place, and leadership.
4. **“I am the Enemy”.** This activity consists of a set of questions that help guide reflection on the idea that we are an “Enemy” to someone else. It fosters realistic empathy with the “Other”. The exercise allows the presenter(s) to use an “other” group most germane to the audience.
5. **Realistic Empathy.** In this exercise participants experience the challenge of coming to an agreement with the “other” when they come from very different frames of reference. The resolution of this dilemma involves the creation of realistic empathy.
6. **The Changing Face of the Enemy.** This historical list of U.S. “enemies” reveals the fickleness of enemy images. Reading at a fast tempo through our rapidly changing list of political enemies adds a dash of humor, creates a sense of historical perspective and stimulates hope by showing that relationships of enmity are highly malleable.
7. **SARAS Scale.** This “trick” test appears to measure the attitudes of Americans toward Soviets during the Cold War era. The audience will be surprised to learn that the statements are actually opinions expressed by the Soviets at that time. Either the entire scale or the selected items may be used. The test helps audiences to grasp the concept of mirror imaging and to see how unrecognized biases complicate relationships between groups of people. This vivid example of mirror imaging can be a catalyst for discussing a more contemporary example of mirror imaging of enmity.

---

## Who Said It?

---

**Goals:** (1) to show that enemy images have been cultivated in various eras and by prominent U.S. leaders;

(2) to invite the audience to step outside of the current situation and to view enemy images in historical perspective;

(3) to stimulate a sense of irony and skepticism regarding enemy images by giving an illustration involving England, which is now one of our closest allies.

**Procedure:** Tell the audience that the following description of a foreign nation was given by a President of the U.S. Ask them to identify both the President and the nation to which he is referring. Then read this passage:

“...[This nation is] aiming at the exclusive domination of the [world], lost in corruption, of deep-rooted hatred towards us, hostile to liberty wherever it endeavors to show its head, and the eternal disturber of the peace of the world.”

Answers: The president was Thomas Jefferson and the nation he was referring to was Great Britain. He wrote this description in 1795 after his term in office. It is cited in P. L. Ford (Ed.), *The writings of Thomas Jefferson IX*. New York: Putnam, 1848. P. 519.

**Points to be considered:**

1. If even so knowledgeable and intelligent a person as Jefferson could fall prey to enemy images, going so far as to conclude that the British were the eternal disturbers of world peace, the rest of us should realize that we too may not be above the tendency.
2. Imagine if nuclear weapons had existed at the time. We might never have lived because of a nuclear war between two nations that eventually came to be close allies.

---

# Drawing an Enemy

---

- Goals:** (1) to personalize the concept of “enemy”;
- (2) to increase awareness of the features typically attributed to enemies;
  - (3) to increase awareness of one’s own thoughts and feelings about enemies;
  - (4) to help the participants to express their feelings about enemies.

**Materials:** Each participant will need to have at least one sheet of paper and a pencil.

**Procedure:** Ask the audience members to spend ten minutes drawing a picture of an enemy. Tell them that they may draw a personal enemy, an historical enemy, or whatever they like. If the audience needs to be enlivened, you might encourage them to make the enemy as mean and horrifying as possible.

**Suggestions for discussion:**

1. Ask for volunteers to show what they drew, to describe it briefly to the audience, and to say what they liked least about the enemy that is pictured. After several volunteers have presented their pictures, point out recurrent visual features and themes.
2. Ask for volunteers to describe how they feel about whomever they have drawn. After several volunteers have done so, comment on the common feelings such as fear, anger, mistrust, and loathing that tend to recur.
3. To stimulate reflection on the feelings that enemy images can evoke in us, ask questions such as “What would you think and feel if the enemy you have drawn asked you to go out to lunch?”, “...was waiting to board an airplane with you”, etc.

---

## Matching Enemy Images and Nations

---

- Goals:** (1) to show the universality of enemy images;
- (2) to increase awareness of the characteristics typically ascribed to “enemies;”
  - (3) to demonstrate the process of dehumanization and its emotional impact;
  - (4) to increase awareness of the powerful impact of posters and political cartoons.

**Materials:** Each participant should have a copy of the following three pages, which include two pages showing numbered images of the enemy and an answer sheet. The answer sheet will be easiest to use if it is not attached to the other pages. Only the presenter should have the answer key that follows the two pages of images.

**Procedure:** This exercise is designed for a sophisticated and possibly adult audience because it uses historical images.

Tell the audience that in order to understand enemy images, it is best to see real examples of them from popular media. Then invite the participants to play a game in which they try to match which enemy image goes with which of the nations listed at the bottom of the answer sheet, writing their choice in the appropriate blank. Also ask them to notice the symbols and features used in each picture to construct an enemy. After several minutes have passed, and most people have completed the task, go through the list and ask the audience for the answers, an exercise that typically evokes curiosity and diverse emotional reactions. Then engage the participants in discussion.

### **Possible Points and Questions for Discussion:**

- (1) Note that enemy images are universal—they occur in many different times and places and under different leaders.
- (2) Ask what are some of the symbols and techniques used by the artists to make the enemy seem evil or threatening.
- (3) Ask the audience to identify two examples of dehumanization (Figures 11 and 12 are obvious examples, but dehumanization is also at work in many of the others). Then ask why dehumanization plays such a powerful role in enemy images.

## Matching Enemy Images and Nations/Source Answer Sheet

Using the list at the bottom of the page, identify the nation/source in which the cartoon was published by writing the answer in the appropriate blank.

- Picture**
1. \_\_\_\_\_
  2. \_\_\_\_\_
  3. \_\_\_\_\_
  4. \_\_\_\_\_
  5. \_\_\_\_\_
  6. \_\_\_\_\_
  7. \_\_\_\_\_
  8. \_\_\_\_\_
  9. \_\_\_\_\_
  8. \_\_\_\_\_
  9. \_\_\_\_\_
  10. \_\_\_\_\_
  11. \_\_\_\_\_
  12. \_\_\_\_\_

- Choices:**
- Germany, World War II
  - U.S.
  - Nationalist China
  - U.S.S.R.
  - Netherlands
  - Egypt
  - Catholic Church

## Matching Enemy Images and Nations

### Answer Key

1. **Germany, WWII.** This image shows Bolshevism, the killer of Germany. Note especially the savage-like quality of the mouth, teeth, eyes, and eyebrows.
2. **U.S., WWII.** The Tokyo Kid with enlarged teeth, dripping blood, and saw blades and knife suggesting a killing machine.
3. **Nationalist Chinese Image of Mainland China.** The Communists have no conscience; they drive good people to the battlefield to die in their “human sea” onslaught. Note that the enemy is very big and the people plead and pray yet are slaughtered.
4. **Catholic Church (16<sup>th</sup> Century).** This image shows Martin Luther speaking with the voice of the devil.
5. **U.S.** The atheistic communists tear down Christianity. Note the enlargement of the hands. This image is by Edmund Duffy of the Baltimore Sun won a Pulitzer Prize in 1930.
6. **Netherlands, 1985.** The Reagan Horror Picture Show.
7. **Origin unknown.** This reverse image identifies the warrior with Christ.
8. **U.S.S.R.** This figure, which represents the Pentagon, wears white gloves, which cannot hide the bloody deeds that it perpetrates. Note the enlarged hands.
9. **U.S., WWII.** The barbarous Jap.
10. **U.S.S.R., 1907.** The Jew as terrorists and subversive.
11. **U.S.S.R.** Tito.
12. **Egypt.** Indira Gandhi.

The figures are from Sam Keen's *Faces of the Enemy: Reflections of a Hostile Imagination*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1986.

---

## “I am the Enemy”

---

**Goals:** To increase realistic empathy with the “Other”.

**Materials:** If the exercise is done in the group as a whole, no materials are needed. But if breaking into discussion groups is advisable, an overhead with questions on it or enough pages with the questions on them for each small discussion group are needed.

**Procedure:** With a large or inhibited audience, it may be useful to divide into discussion groups of about six people. After everyone has had time to discuss the questions below, thoughts and feelings from everyone can be summarized in the entire large group. But, more often, the questions can be asked one at a time by the presenter(s) and discussed in the large group without breaking into small groups at all.

*Read and reflect on the following statement:*

To those in some groups I AM THE ENEMY. The “Other” group we will focus on today is \_\_\_\_\_ (e.g. Islamic Fundamentalists, Iraqi Moderates, etc.).

Now answer the following questions:

1. How do I feel about being seen by people in this group as the Enemy?
2. In what ways do they perceive me as a threat?
3. To what extent am I really a threat to them? How specifically?
4. Are there better ways my group could be dealing with them?
5. What is it that they don't understand about me (us)?
6. What do I most want them to know about me (us)?
7. What don't I know about them? What might I possibly learn about them that would allow me to see them in a new light?
8. What would it take for me (us) to be less of a threat? What might I (we) have to give up? What might I (we) gain?

Adapted from an exercise used by Diane Perlman, PhD



---

## Realistic Empathy

---

**Goals:** To demonstrate the challenge of having realistic empathy for the “other” in a fun and experiential way.

**Materials:** Two containers to hold water. One metal object, such as a metal bowl, cabinet, etc. Hot water and cold water.

**Procedure:** Ask for two volunteers for the exercise. Once selected, have them leave the room. Fill one container with hot water and the other with cold water. Place the containers on opposite sides of the room. Place the metal object in the center of the room. Inform the audience that the two containers have water of different temperatures. Have the two volunteers come back and ask them to dip their hands in one of the respective containers of water, but do not tell them that the other container has water of a different temperature. Then tell them to determine the temperature of the metal object through touching it and through discussion with the other volunteer (loud enough for the audience to hear). The person whose hands were in hot water will find the object colder than room temperature, and the person whose hands were in cold water will find the object hotter than room temperature. Tell the audience to listen to the discussion of the two volunteers, and ask them to suggest ways to resolve the situation.

**Possible Points and Questions for Discussion:**

- (1) This exercise illustrates the difficulty people have if they are unaware that the “other” comes from a different background and perspective.
- (2) The act of trying the other person’s water symbolizes the attempt to see the situation from the perspective of one’s counterpart. It symbolizes an attempt to gain what Ralph White has called “realistic empathy.”

---

# The Changing Face of the Enemy

---

- Goals:** (1) to demonstrate that enemy images are pervasive features of U.S. history;
- (2) to show how rapidly enemy images can change;
- (3) to create a sense of the absurdity and historical folly of enemy images.

**Materials:** One list of dates and enemy relationships on the following three pages for each reader.

**Procedures:** Hand out the following two pages to the members of the audience and ask them to read them quickly to themselves. Or read the pages aloud yourself at a rapid pace, using rhythm and gesture to add a touch of humor and to accentuate the absurdity of enemy images. Another way of adding humor is to read the reversals in sequence, pointing out, for example, that in 1940 we loved the Finns and hated the Russians, whereas in 1941 we loved the Russians and Hated the Finns. You might note that the term “love” and “hate” are perhaps too strong, but their use does not change the essential point that our relationships and images flip-flop rapidly over time.

**Points for Discussion:**

1. This list ends in 1964. What should be added to update the list?
2. Enemies often seem implacable, and our situation often seems hopeless. Yet the historical record, including the dramatic changes in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union in 1989, indicates that enemy images do in fact change rapidly over time. There is room for hope, and we need to ask ourselves what we can do to improve a relationship that is currently locked in hostility and enmity.
3. Are their psychological benefits of having enemies that encourage the formation of so many enemy images? Do we need enemies?

## **Changing Allegiances**

- 1755 We loved the British and hated the French. (French & Indian War)
- 1776 We loved the French and hated the British. (American Revolution)
- 1799 We hated the French. (Sea Battles with the French)
- 1812 We loved the French and hated the British. (War of 1812)
- 1840s We loved Southerners and hated Mexicans. (War with Mexico over Texas)
- 1861 We hated the Southerners and the British. (Civil War)
- 1898 We hated the Spanish. (Spanish-American War)
- 1899 We hated the Chinese and the Filipinos. (Conquest of the Philippines)
- 1900 We loved the Japanese and hated the Chinese. (Boxer Uprising in China)
- 1904 We loved the Japanese and hated the Russians. (Russo-Japanese War)
- 1914 We hated the Mexicans. (Marines land at Vera Cruz)
- 1914 We loved the British & French but hated Austrians & Germans. (Beginning of World War I)
- 1915 We loved the Italians. (Italy joins the allies)
- 1916 We hated the Mexicans (Pershing invades Mexico)
- 1917 We loved the Japanese and Chinese but not the Russians. (Russian Bolshevik Revolution)
- 1918 We loved the Italians and hated the Russians. (U.S. troops invade Russia)
- 1927 We loved the Japanese and hated the Chinese. (U.S. bombards Nanking)
- 1935 We hated the Italians. (Italy invades Ethiopia)
- 1936 We loved the Chinese and hated the Russians. (Communists despoil China)

1939 We loved the British & French and hated Germans and Russians. (Beginning of World War II)

1940 We loved the Finns and hated the Russians. (Russia invades Finland)

1941 We loved the Russians and hated the Finns.(Russia fights Germany and Finland)

1941 We loved the Chinese, British, & Russians but hated the Germans, Italians, and Japanese. (World War II)

1942 We loved some French and hated others. (Vichy Regime)

1943 We loved the Chinese, Russians, and British. (World War II continues)

1945 We loved the French and hated the Germans, Italians, and the Japanese.(End of World War II)

1947 We hated the Russians but loved the Germans and Italians. (Beginning of the Cold War)

1951 We hated the Chinese and loved the Japanese.(Korean War)

1959 We loved the Cubans.

1962 We hated the Cubans.

1964 We hated the French. (French Opposition our Vietnam Policy)

---

# Soviet-American Relations Attitude Scale (SARAS)

---

**Goals:** (1) to demonstrate mirror imaging (using the example of Soviet-US relations during the Cold War era);

(2) to promote exploration of contemporary examples of the mirror imaging of enmity.

**Materials:** Each participant should have a pencil and a copy of the following six-page questionnaire. Or, if the presenter(s) chooses to simply use this questionnaire to promote discussion of current examples of the mirror imaging of enmity to audiences who were not old enough to remember Cold War dynamics, an overhead transparency of the SARAS will be sufficient.

**Procedure:** This exercise is best for audiences comprised of adults old enough to remember Cold War history. Distribute the questionnaire and ask them to complete the survey without discussing it, allowing approximately ten minutes for this task.

After everyone has completed the survey, you may reveal to the audience that this is a “trick” questionnaire—all the statements were opinions expressed by Soviets during the Cold War, mostly about Americans or the West. Mirror imaging is evidenced in the fact that most Americans who have taken the SARAS have believed that the statements applied to the Soviets during that era, while many Soviets believed that the statements applied to Americans then.

**Points for Discussion:**

(1) Ask the participants to re-read the statements with an eye toward understanding that many Soviets actually saw things that way. As a means of uncovering hidden assumptions and biases, ask participants to identify which statements seem most surprising in light of what they now know.

(2) Having told the audience that the psychological process at work here is mirror imaging, ask them what effects that psychological process might have on any current enmities.

## SARAS

During the Cold War, Americans had many beliefs, feelings and opinions about the Soviet Union and the Soviet People. Try to recall your views at that time and indicate your degree of agreement with the following statements by marking the scale beneath each one as if you were completely this questionnaire during the 1980's.

1. If more of them would visit our country and meet us as people, they would understand and like us better.

Strongly Disagree                      Disagree                      Undecided                      Agree  
Strongly Agree  
|-----|-----|-----|-----|

2. As a people they are warm, out-going and peace-loving, but their leaders are militaristic, self-serving and aggressively opportunistic toward us.

Strongly Disagree                      Disagree                      Undecided                      Agree  
Strongly Agree  
|-----|-----|-----|-----|

3. If they knew more about our complex history they would have a better understanding of our problems today and how we try to solve them.

Strongly Disagree                      Disagree                      Undecided                      Agree  
Strongly Agree  
|-----|-----|-----|-----|

4. They do not appreciate the degree of success we have had in making a nation out of many different groups of people spread across a continent.

Strongly Disagree                      Disagree                      Undecided                      Agree  
Strongly Agree  
|-----|-----|-----|-----|

5. They have some cultural traditions, literature, music, dance, etc. that I like and that are great contributions to world culture, but overall I prefer my country.

Strongly Disagree                      Disagree                      Undecided                      Agree  
Strongly Agree  
|-----|-----|-----|-----|

6. As it moves into the modern world, Russia must deal with the fact that it has been an “Asiatic and barbarous land.”

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree
Strongly Agree			
-----	-----	-----	-----

7. Because of their history, traditions, internal problems, and national personality tendencies, they have a greater tendency toward violence and disregard for human life than we do.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree
Strongly Agree			
-----	-----	-----	-----

8. In their schools, there is more emphasis on learning what the system wants them to think than on learning how to think for themselves.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree
Strongly Agree			
-----	-----	-----	-----

9. Their children are open, charming and delightful, but too often lose those qualities when they grow up, become indoctrinated, and have to live within their system.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree
Strongly Agree			
-----	-----	-----	-----

10. The information they receive is largely selected by the people who control the media.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree
Strongly Agree			
-----	-----	-----	-----

11. Their harassment and persecution of their best artists and thinkers shows that they do not allow creativity and freedom the way we do.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree
Strongly Agree			
-----	-----	-----	-----

12. Their system and philosophy of government and economics do not really work, but they are too wrapped up in them to see or admit this.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree
Strongly Agree			
-----	-----	-----	-----

13. Luxury goods in their country are often concentrated in the hands of the privileged groups.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree
Strongly Agree			
-----	-----	-----	-----

14. They should work harder at solving their internal domestic problems instead of trying to promote their system around the world.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree
Strongly Agree			
-----	-----	-----	-----

15. Their attempts to interfere in our internal affairs and enlist sympathizers make problems worse between our countries.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree
Strongly Agree			
-----	-----	-----	-----

16. Their boycott of the Olympics was a political move that served their leaders at the expense of athletes and sports fans.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree
Strongly Agree			
-----	-----	-----	-----

17. Our boycott of the Olympics was a necessary and justified decision given the adverse conditions that existed at that time.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree
Strongly Agree			
-----	-----	-----	-----



18. Their government often does things that are aggressive bluffs intended to make us back down on issues that are important to our national well-being.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree
Strongly Agree			
-----	-----	-----	-----

19. Although we were allies in World War II against the Germans, toward the end of the war their actions often had political rather than military purposes, and this cost the lives of many of our soldiers.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree
Strongly Agree			
-----	-----	-----	-----

20. I wish there were ways we could get them to appreciate more fully the grave risks of nuclear war and the devastation it would cause.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree
Strongly Agree			
-----	-----	-----	-----

21. What they call equality of nuclear and other weapons really masks their desire for superiority.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree
Strongly Agree			
-----	-----	-----	-----

22. The main obstacle to peace—and the arms negotiation are persuasive evidence of this—is their attempts to achieve military superiority.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree
Strongly Agree			
-----	-----	-----	-----

23. We do not seek military superiority and we have no intention of dictating our will to them, but we must not allow them to upset the military equilibrium that has been achieved.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree
Strongly Agree			
-----	-----	-----	-----

24. Part of their negotiation strategy is to make proposals they know we will reject, so they can claim that they want to negotiate but we are preventing it.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree
Strongly Agree			
-----	-----	-----	-----

25. Their refusal to adopt a “no first use” policy like ours adds to the tension between our countries.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree
Strongly Agree			
-----	-----	-----	-----

26. If they answered a questionnaire like this about our country, their answers would be biased by the propaganda they have received about us.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree
Strongly Agree			
-----	-----	-----	-----

27. The results of a survey like this conducted in their country would tell us more about what they want to believe or have been told to believe than the way things really are.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree
Strongly Agree			
-----	-----	-----	-----

28. The problem with confronting them with facts about their country and ours is that they will usually go on believing what they want or have been taught to believe.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree
Strongly Agree			
-----	-----	-----	-----

29. A careful, objective review of history and facts would support the opinions in this survey, with which I agree.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree
Strongly Agree			
-----	-----	-----	-----

