

Chapter Four — Turf, Traitor, Riot, And Alpha Instincts Can

All Have Huge Impact On InterGroup Interactions

Our us/them instincts are not the only package of instincts that affect Intergroup interactions and Peace. We have instincts to create hierarchies and to designate Alpha leaders — with their own set of instincts — to run our hierarchies.

We have instincts to form teams and we have instincts to participate in both teams and mobs.

We have instincts to create cultures and we have very strong instincts to act in accord with the guidance and the rules that are set by our cultures.

We also have a very strong package of turf-related instincts that frequently affect intergroup interactions at multiple levels. Multiple intergroup conflicts have very clear turf issues at their core.

Our traitor instincts have a huge impact on our intergroup interactions. We have a very strong set of instincts against ever being a traitor, or ever being perceived to be a traitor to our own group.

Succeeding at the Art of Intergroup Peace will require us to both recognize all of those sets of instincts, and to work with them on behalf of

Peace. We need to use all of those instincts to trigger alignment for “us” as a community and as a people.

At a very basic level, we need to take steps that allow us to have needed interactions with people from other groups without feeling like a traitor to our own group in the process.

To achieve intergroup trust, we need intergroup and direct interpersonal interactions — and it is impossible to achieve those kinds of interpersonal and intergroup interactions if we are perceived to be a traitor or feel that we are a traitor when we interact with people from other groups.

We Have Very Strong Turf Instincts

Our turf instincts can obviously have a very powerful impact on intergroup interactions, intergroup conflict, and intergroup Peace all by themselves.

We clearly have strong turf instincts.

We fight wars across the planet about issues of property, boundaries, territory, and turf.

We tend to be highly territorial. That is a very instinctive and very universal set of behaviors. Very much the same patterns of turf-linked territorial behavior exist in settings across the planet.

Tribes, clans, and nations all know exactly what they regard as their turf. Those territorial/turf related behaviors have obviously existed as long as history has been recorded because much of our written history very directly addresses issues of territorial conquest and sets of intergroup issues that directly relate to the defense and conquest of turf by various groups and sets of people.

Boundaries and property lines are everywhere on the planet. The purpose of all of those lines is to define turf at a level that supports our turf instincts in each setting.

Each nation has a clear sense of its own boundaries and nations will generally go to war relatively quickly when anyone challenges or threatens their current boundary lines.

We need to recognize the fact that our instinctive commitment to the defense of our own boundaries can easily extend to irrational and intense levels. Many very dramatic actions and even extreme behaviors in defense of our turf in various settings can feel very right to people because there is a

clear turf protection instinct at the core of that commitment and those behaviors.

There are battles going on today in the Himalaya Mountains to protect a multi-nation challenged international boundary where the piece of geography at question is so isolated and so desolate that the soldiers from both countries can barely get to those boundaries and to those disputed territories to fight.

Both countries are more than willing to shed blood to protect those far distant and functionally irrelevant boundaries. However, because our turf instincts that are applied to our nations tell us to never surrender any piece of national turf, it feels very right, at a deep instinctive level, to defend every inch of our defined turf.

In a similar vein, the British reclamation, defense, and territorial recovery of the Falkland Islands was a highly emotionally energizing issue for the people of Great Britain. That war made sense to the people of that country at a purely instinctive level.

The people of Great Britain did not want any part of “their” turf taken over by another nation — even though that particular piece of turf that was

being challenged by another nation is actually so far away that it is absolutely geographically irrelevant to the British homeland.

That set of distant islands was defined by Great Britain to be British Turf. It was instinctively protected by the British Military and it was protected with the full support of the British people.

The reality is that we defend turf at a very primal level — as individuals and as groups of people — once we believe turf to be our turf for one reason or another. Once we believe turf is ours, we are willing to both kill and die to defend it — and it feels very right to do whatever defending it requires us to do.

Various ethnic groups and tribes all tend to have a sense of what is, for various historic and functional reasons, their rightful turf.

The turf for each group often tends to be included as a key part of the cultural identity of the tribe. Groups in almost all tribal settings can easily identify exactly what pieces of geography are — or once were — their “rightful” turf.

Those specific turf alignments that are identified for specific groups of people can last for a very long time. Those perceived turf alignments can continue to maintain their power over our values, our behaviors, our

collective and individual emotions, our ownership beliefs, and our thought processes for as long as those perceptions exist.

It Is Challenging When Two Groups Instinctively Bond With The Same Turf

Major challenges to Peace exist whenever multiple groups believe they are each the rightful owner of the same exact piece of turf.

Several of the most important border and turf control conflicts that exist today in the Middle East have obviously created, defined, and triggered conflict in that part of the world for centuries.

A major problem that exists in a number of those settings is that there is more than one group of people who absolutely believe that a piece of turf is their rightful turf.

Each group believes with deep certainty that the piece of turf in question is their own group's rightful property. There is a strong sense, for each group in those settings, that the turf belongs to them — and that the other group is a trespasser, an intruder, and a wrongful usurper of the turf.

Those turf-linked wars where multiple parties feel an inherent link to the exact same piece of turf have cost millions of lives for a very long period

of time, and they continue to trigger bloodshed today. Each side in those conflicts feels, at a very visceral and instinctive level, that the contested piece of turf is their rightful ancestral turf — and that level of commitment and that definitive group alignment makes any and all behaviors that happen in defense of that turf by their group feel instinctively right.

You can't talk someone out of the energy that is triggered by a strongly solid instinctive alignment on those issues. When two or more warring groups feel that same instinctive sense of being right about the exact same and very specific piece of turf, the consequences for intergroup anger and conflict for that setting can be indefinite and almost infinite in their duration.

When the cultures and the histories of two sets of people cause them both to feel at a very deep instinctive level that they each clearly own a piece of turf, and when each group feels that the other group is trespassing, stealing, encroaching, invading, or attempting to steal that turf, the instinctive reactions for each group of people in those situations are pure and they are powerful.

People Need To Deal With The Instincts As Well As The Turf

The only possible resolution for those conflicts in those settings would need to involve having the people in each group understand the relevant instinctive reactions for both themselves and for the other group, and then addressing those instinct-related issues directly and openly — instead of simply letting their instinctive reactions and their separate sense of history dictate their beliefs and their behaviors in ways that create permanent conflict.

Those issues are addressed with more specific information about some of the countries who are involved in those kinds of conflicts in the sister book, *Cusp of Chaos*.

We do have our own sets of turf instincts at work in several settings in this country today. We don't have our turf instincts activated for any actual external border issue for our nation at this point in our history, but we do have those instincts activated at several points relative to pieces of group-linked turf inside our country.

We are not immune in any way from having those instincts triggered relative to our external boundaries.

We Americans would also activate those turf instincts very powerfully at an international level relative to our own external borders, if we had any functional reason to activate that international trigger relative to our borders.

We are a very powerful nation. No one is threatening to steal our turf — so those triggers relative to protecting our own national boundaries are not activated today for us as Americans.

We Americans clearly have all of our turf instincts firmly in place relative to our external national boundaries. We simply do not need to activate those instincts for our external borders at this point in time because our turf isn't being challenged at that level.

We Are Seeing Significant Ethnic Concentrations

Inside our country, however, we are seeing an increase in our ethnicity-linked turf issues. As we become more diverse, we actually are seeing significant increases in the degree of ethnic and racial concentration for groups of people in specific geographic areas.

In multiple communities, we are self-segregating by race and by ethnicity in our choices of places to live.

That has always been true to some degree and it is becoming increasingly true today as our minority groups become larger. Major areas of major communities have a very high concentration of people from specific ethnic groups.

That particular segregation of where we live by race and ethnicity tends to be both instinctive and voluntary for Americans.

Our us/them instincts cause people to feel most comfortable living with who ever we perceive to be “us.” So people tend to buy homes or rent living space in areas where the other residents feel like “us.” As our various groups grow in population, that tendency to live with “us” is clearly having an impact on various communities.

The most recent census data shows major areas of intense ethnic and racial concentrations by neighborhood in our major cities. Many people in our cities have obviously chosen to live in the areas of our cities where other people from their own ethnic or their own racial group also lives — and those areas each tend to grow in size as each local ethnic group grows in size.

People know who lives where.

People know where Chinatown is in any city with a Chinatown. Watts and Harlem are clearly communities with a high level of African American population density. Northern L.A. or West Chicago are clearly Mexican American areas. Spanish Harlem has a major Puerto Rican population living there.

Miami has major areas of the city where Cuban Americans are the dominant population group, and other areas of the city where the population density focus is African American.

The racial and ethnic population density levels are significant enough in a growing number of our communities to the point where those high concentration levels make the likelihood of having turf instincts activated today and in the future in those areas, at a group level, predictably high. Everyone living in those areas now knows the impact and the reality of that population concentration today.

We are seeing some real intergroup anger in a number of areas where growth in the number of people from an ethnic group has caused that group's "us" linked space-needs to expand — and that expansion can mean that the growth in population displaces people from other ethnic groups who already live in those areas.

There are several communities where the growing Hispanic groups have taken over living areas that had been primarily African American neighborhoods for many years. The growing Somali population in Minnesota cities has created similar turf issues with several groups.

Turf issues and turf instincts are triggered in any setting when any group displaces other groups in any geographic area — and the borders that exist between the various groups in those areas each create their own sets of intergroup issues.

We Americans need to understand the impact of those kinds of turf instincts on our behavior and our emotions, at both a macro level and a micro level, if we are going to achieve InterGroup Peace at this point in our history. We need people to understand those issues and we need plans to deal with those sets of issues going into the future.

Nations fight over turf. So do individual people and so do groups of people.

Gangs Create Their Own Turf Issues

Gangs in our cities create some very real turf issues for a number of people. Major parts of major cities have areas where groups feel like they control turf.

Gangs who functionally control neighborhood turf in our cities sometimes kill people from other groups who “trespass” on their turf.

That level of intergroup conflict with links to turf can become important at a very local level when local groups are armed.

The city of Oakland has major areas of the city that are now defined to be gang turf. Oakland now averages one killing every three days. Gangs in that city kill people from other gangs and they often kill people from other groups who enter their turf.

The gangs of Detroit and the gangs of Richmond have a similar significant impact on intergroup safety levels in that city. People who live in those areas are sometimes at risk if they simply enter into the areas controlled by another group.

A growing number of cities are facing major growth in the power of the gangs — and the intergroup behaviors that result are primal at a very basic instinctive level.

There are no multi-ethnic street gangs or prison gangs. To achieve full Peace in America we will need to defuse the owner and impact of gangs in a number of settings.

We Need People To Be Safe Everywhere

Creating intergroup Peace for this country will require us to create intergroup safety. That issue is relevant to turf instincts because activated turf issues can damage safety. We need to be a country where people can feel safe in every setting regardless of their group and regardless of the geographic location that each person is in.

We need to make intergroup geographic violence a non-issue for our people in each of our cities.

We need people to be able to interact with people from all groups without personal safety being an issue in any setting. We need safe turf for all people. We also need people to feel safe interacting with people from other groups.

As we design our political solutions in communities going into the future, we need to recognize the fact that we have groups of people who feel group affinity to neighborhood turf — and we need to put in place an array

of activities that bring people together in every setting — interacting across both group lines and group boundaries — to create a broader sense of “us” in each setting.

We need to have a community sense of “us” as well as a group sense of “us” to have intergroup Peace in all settings.

We Instinctively Hate Traitors

Creating that sense of community us can be difficult to do for a number of people — for highly instinctive reasons.

We have a number of instinct-related barriers that exist in a number of areas that can make it difficult, or even impossible, for people to interact at a personal, 1-to-1 level with people from other groups. We need interpersonal interactions to happen between people from various groups for a number of important reasons, and we need to overcome those barriers where they exist.

To achieve intergroup Peace, we need healthy levels of intergroup understanding. We need people to understand and trust other groups of people. We need people to interact with one another to build that trust. Intergroup understanding at the group level is much harder to achieve if we have people from each of the relevant groups who are instinctively avoiding

making contact and who are reluctant to make friends with people from each other group at the personal level.

Too often, that is exactly the situation and the problem we face today in intergroup settings. Many people do not feel comfortable or even feel safe creating the kinds of intergroup friendships we need to make to create intergroup understanding and intergroup trust.

We have those barriers because we have histories of groups doing negative things to people from other groups. Our intergroup instincts create our intergroup histories, and our histories influence our future interactions. We can be trapped in that cycle in a very self-reinforcing way.

We define people from other groups based on our intergroup history — and that history makes it hard, in many settings, to reach out to have direct relationships with people from other groups.

Our memories can be too long and too clear to make interaction at a personal level either easy or natural.

We need to be willing to look past those elements of intergroup history to create new and direct relationships with other people that are based on the new interpersonal history that those relationships create.

We need to make deliberate and intentional enlightened choices to create those kinds of relationships as a foundation for interpersonal trust and intergroup trust.

One of the major problems and challenges that we have relative to using those kinds of direct relationships, to help build a culture of intergroup Peace in any setting, is that we each have a strong set of instincts relative to being traitors. Those instincts too often keep us from interacting in needed ways with people from other groups.

We Hate And Punish Traitors

We hate traitors. We punish traitors. We have very strong internal aversions as individuals to ever personally be a traitor, and we do not personally want to be seen as a traitor to any group that we feel part of as an “us.”

We have very strong negative instinctive reactions to traitors, and those instincts can make achieving Peace difficult for several reasons.

Traitors are hated everywhere. Traitors are punished everywhere. Traitors are executed in many settings. In some countries, people who personally and voluntarily try to simply change their personal religious

affiliation away from their religions of birth can be executed for being seen to be a traitor to their original specific religious sect.

In most of those cases, the original personal religious alignment of the person who is executed for converting to another religion was one they acquired at birth simply by being born. Those people did not acquire that initial link to their religion by any choice of their own at any point in their lives.

Our traitor instincts are so strong that people are burned, imprisoned, and executed in some settings, even today, for simply attempting to change the religion they were born into. The people who are executing them clearly feel right in doing the executions.

That sense that it is right to punish, and even kill traitors has great power when it is triggered. In gang settings in this country, people who try to leave their gangs are often killed for being perceived to be a traitor to their gang.

Armies often publically and visibly execute their traitors. That has been true as long as armies have existed.

Famous traitors — like Benedict Arnold, Prime Minister Quisling, or Judas Iscariot — tend to be reviled for very long periods of time for their individual behavior and for their acts as traitors.

The universality of that energy level of those anti-traitor behaviors, and of that value set, tells us clearly that our reaction to traitors is also a reaction that is instinctive at its core.

None Of Us Want To Be Traitors

We tend to despise and even hate traitors. That hatred of traitors is directly relevant to *The Art of Intergroup Peace* strategy set and is included as a key point in this chapter because of the barrier that particular package of instincts, too often, creates relative to intergroup understanding. That instinct can keep us from reaching out to make links with people from other groups when and where reaching out to those people is needed to create intergroup trust.

That set of instincts and our decision to avoid those relationships is often reinforced by other people in our own groups who can become angry with us if they think we are acting as a traitor to our group. Our groups put pressure on us not to betray them — and we put pressure on ourselves not to betray our group.

At a very basic level, none of us wants to be a traitor. We each very much do not want to feel in our own hearts that we have been a traitor to our group. We don't want to be a traitor to our family, to our country, to our town, to our team, or to whatever alignment we feel is the appropriate focus and the rightful recipient of our loyalty.

That particular instinct can obviously make intergroup dialogues difficult. Those instincts can make some personal 1-to-1 intergroup friendships almost impossible.

That instinct package can keep kids at school from interacting with kids from other groups — and it can keep people in various official and leadership capacities from reaching out to people from other groups simply because reaching out to those people, might possibly, somehow either benefit the other groups or because that behavior by leaders can be perceived by their own group to be the behavior of a traitor to our own group.

People who want to depose a leader inside a group can sometimes generate significant energy against a leader who has relationships with other groups by persuading other members of the group that the behavior of a leader who creates any kind of bridges has made that leader a traitor to the

group. Leaders run that risk, and that makes it hard for some leaders to reach out to create bridges to other groups.

When we perceive people in another group to be a “Them,” our us/them instincts call for us to do damage to the other group — to fear, distrust, and avoid the other group —and not to create a benefit of any kind for any “Them.”

It’s harder to create Peace at any questionable level when we have those particular instinctive factors involved.

We Need To Create Intergroup Trust

But the truth is that we need to reach out across group lines to make Peace real and sustainable. We need to create intergroup trust — and a very useful step on the road to creating intergroup trust is to create interpersonal trust.

So we need to overcome those instinctive behaviors that are linked to traitor instincts. We need to create those kinds of intergroup linkages and those levels of interpersonal relationships at a level that will let us build understanding and create and justify trust.

When our goal is intergroup understanding, intergroup alignment, intergroup truth, and intergroup Peace, our deep-seated instincts never to be a traitor to our own group can make even the very basic intergroup and interpersonal information exchanges problematic, and it can make some basic intergroup and interpersonal problem solving impossible.

Simply giving this book as a thought resource to someone from a group that we perceive to be a “Them” could cause some people to feel like they might have aided and abetted an enemy of our “Us” by simply sharing the book.

Providing any assistance of any kind to “Them” can feel like a “Traitor” behavior to someone who hates “Them.” It can feel that way even when our basic goal for reaching out to the other person actually is Peace for our own group.

Knowledge Is Power Relative To That Instinct

Knowledge very much is power relative to that instinct. We can control and diminish the direct power of our traitor instincts when we understand what those instincts are and when we know how they work.

A key Art of Intergroup Peace strategy is to teach all people that the traitor instinct exists and influences our thinking — and to teach all people how to deal with the traitor instinct at multiple levels.

Reading about that set of instincts often helps people get a sense of how they work and that can make it easier to recognize and address those instinctive reactions when they are activated.

That instinct about us never being a traitor loses a significant amount of its collective influence over us — it loses much of its power over us as individuals — once it is clearly recognized as an instinct.

It loses power over us when our direct emotions that result from the instinct are understood to be simply triggered by an instinct.

It also loses power when those specific emotions that we feel in those circumstances are not just seen or believed by us to be an actual, factual, and legitimate moral judgment about our own behavior in that situation that affirms and confirms our personal wrongdoing for interacting in some way with the other group.

When we each realize and recognize that the “traitor” instinct impact exists on our emotions and our thought process — and when we each realize that the stress aversion and the guilt emotions that we can each feel from

some of our interactive behaviors relative to other people actually result purely from that particular instinct being triggered, and not from us actually doing a bad or traitorous thing – then we can individually choose not to let that instinct change our behavior on particular interactions in ways that keep us from dealing with people from the “other” group.

We can choose — when we clearly understand those issues — not to let that instinct subconsciously give us internal feelings of guilt for interacting in a person-to-person setting with people from other groups. Knowledge truly is power relative to that particular instinct.

Peace Is In The Interest Of “Our” Group

In fact — when we fully understand the mutual benefit context that is created by real Peace and when we understand the win/win strategy that is the foundation for the Art of Intergroup Peace — then we can feel good about those interactions instead of feeling that they make us a traitor to our group.

The truth is — our own group actually wins when we create those relationships with people from other groups in the interest of Peace. When we have a win/win collective outcome for everyone, everyone wins. We are

much stronger as a country with win/win outcomes because we benefit as a country from everyone winning. Every group wins when every group wins.

So even helping another group win isn't being a traitor to our own group — it is being an asset and a support resource for our own group.

The power of that traitor instinct to keep us from making friends with people from other groups can clearly be mitigated to a significant degree when we individually and collectively all intellectually and cognitively recognize that achieving Peace between groups actually is very much in the best interest of our own group.

Our group does very clearly win when Peace happens. That is extremely important to recognize and understand.

The truth that we all need to understand is this — our “us” group — the group we are each most loyal to as our basic and most fundamental “us” — can and will directly benefit from Peace and our most basic us group will benefit from a collective culture of Peace when that Peace is our shared reality.

Intergroup Friendship Can Foster Peace

When we get to know people from other groups as people and not just as depersonalized and sometimes dehumanized stereotypes, then the likelihood of Peace improves and the likelihood of survival and success for our own group – our own “us” — is enhanced. Enhancing Peace is a good thing to do for our core “us.”

The Art of Intergroup Peace calls for us to have people from various groups actually get to know each other as people – and not have people from each group simply stereotype each other as depersonalized symbols of the group they represent at a depersonalized level.

Intergroup friendships can solidify Peace and can create highly enriching levels of work group understanding. So not feeling like a traitor in the context of those relationships needs to be part of our strategy for achieving Peace and a key strategic component of *The Art of Intergroup Peace*.

Sun Tzu Valued Traitors

In *The Art of War*, Sun Tzu addresses traitors, spies, and informants very explicitly. He actually values traitors — in a very manipulative way — because he deliberately recruited people to be traitors on his behalf against their own group.

Sun Tzu believed that persuading people to be traitors to their own side in a war and then rewarding traitors for their treachery is a good strategy that can create major benefits. Sun Tzu believed that having very real traitors help him in treacherous ways could sometimes give his own side a significant wartime advantage over the enemy at important levels.

That benefit from treachery for a group who is supported by traitors obviously can be true in a war setting.

That means that in that us/them, win/lose war-linked negative intergroup context, as described in *The Art of War*, the worst fears that are triggered in each of us by our own traitor instincts were entirely legitimate. Those kinds of traitorous behaviors do happen to groups and those damaging behaviors done by traitors are actually why those fears exist for all of us. They are legitimate fears in war settings.

But we do not need to let those traitor-linked insights run our lives or cripple Peace today. We can't afford to let those instincts create real barriers to intergroup interactions. When our goal is to have both sides win — instead of creating a situation where one side needs to lose — then we need to all recognize that our interpersonal intergroup relationships are very useful and that they directly benefit our own side in each setting.

The Art of Intergroup Peace calls for people to reach out and to make the interpersonal linkages that will cause people to enhance success levels for their own group — not cause their group to be defeated. *The Art of Intergroup Peace* involves teaching those concepts and giving people insight that can defuse our traitor instincts and help get people focused on win/win solutions as opposed to focusing only on achieving the defeat of the other side.

Our Mob Instincts Can Also Damage Peace

Another major barrier to peaceful and positive intergroup interactions is our unfortunate sets of instincts to form mobs and to do negative things to other people in the context of a mob. Our instincts to form mobs bear a partial resemblance to our very powerful and very useful instincts to form teams.

Our team instincts tend to be very powerful and useful. The team instincts allow us to create teams in various settings and overlook other group differentiation factors for people when their team instincts are collectively achieved.

Our team instincts allow us to set aside our other dividing factors and to function together in an aligned way — with internal team loyalty — to do basic team related functions.

That is a positive set of instincts. Our team instincts and their uses are described in more detail in Chapter Seven as one of the six triggers we can use to create alignment in various positive ways.

When people function as team, the likelihood of success increases for various team activities — and the people on the team not only accomplish things together — they tend to overlook other differentiating and divisive factors and definitions, while the people are in team functions and engaged in team behaviors.

Unfortunately, we also have a much more negative set of instincts that can also trigger more damaging collective behavior.

We have much more negative instincts to form mobs and to interact with other people in the context of riot behaviors. In the interest of intergroup Peace, we need to freely use our instincts to form teams, but we need to work very hard to never activate our instincts to riot and to damage people as mobs.

Avoiding riots and mobs is not a theoretical issue or a hypothetical concern. Riots happen. Riots kill people all over the world every year. Every major police department in the world has policemen who are trained in handling both riots and mobs.

That universal police capability to deal with mobs and that consistent police force readiness level for mob behaviors across the planet isn't coincidental.

That capability exists for all of those police forces in all of those settings because there are periodic situations where people gather together in mobs, trigger riots, and then do damage in mob context to other people. When people are in mob situations, very real damage can be done.

Some mobs destroy property. Some mobs loot and burn. Some mobs rape and pillage.

Mobs in Paris burned more than 1,000 cars a couple of years ago. Mobs in Sri Lanka burned the homes and businesses of the group they collectively hated just last year — and those particular mobs killed people from other groups with the horrible suspension of ethics and elimination of moral standards that are triggered far too often by full activation of us/them instincts.

Rapes, assaults, violence, and group murders in mob settings feel justified to the people who have the depersonalized values and entirely ethics free sets of behaviors that can be triggered far too easily by our mob instincts.

Mobs are, for obvious reasons, a threat and impediment to intergroup safety and intergroup Peace.

People across the planet clearly have the destructive instincts to riot and to do evil and damaging things to other groups of people in the context of a mob.

Riot instincts are another set of instincts that we need to understand, manage, and then both avoid and suppress successfully if we intend to achieve InterGroup Peace in this country.

It can significantly undermine our collective ability to bring people together in any setting for the common good — for our children, for our health, or for our prosperity — if we create mobs and then damage people in clearly intergroup ways in the context of those mobs.

It chills and destroys intergroup trust when groups of people band together to do damage as mobs to other people from other groups.

Riots Are Unique To People

There are times when group anger in a setting is triggered by an incident or by a precipitating event.

Protests, demonstrations, and public gatherings to express unhappiness, concern, and even anger all have their place as part of our intergroup communication processes. We need to recognize the legitimacy of the group anger when various events in a setting are negative and deserve group anger. But we need to keep that anger in each setting from turning into riots and into mobs.

Forming mobs is an instinct that seems to be unique to us. There do not seem to be very many parallel behaviors that are the equivalent of riots for riots in other species. Stampedes happen — but they are not the same as riots.

Feeding frenzies and pack attacks by dogs and wolves do bear some resemblance to riots. But those behaviors seem to be more related to hunting activities, and not related to intergroup activities.

Swarms do happen in some other species. Locusts and ants both have swarming behaviors that create collective and aligned large group

movements. But the collective anger that sits at the core of mob behavior for people doesn't seem relevant to a swarm of locusts or a horde of ants.

We, however, do have those instincts that have intergroup anger at their core. Our military forces in every country have training in mob control. Police departments in every significant city in the world tend to have both mob control equipment and mob control training.

History also has ample evidence of mobs at multiple times in our historic past. The reality today is that intergroup mobs can happen in a number of places and very similar behavior patterns occur when that happens.

Paris, London, Sri Lanka, Los Angeles, and Oakland, California all have had mobs and riots in recent history.

Mobs can form for a variety of reasons in a wide range of settings. There are lynching mobs that form to do damage in very evil ways to very specific targets, and there are larger street mobs that form with more of a collective intergroup target set.

When mobs do form, there is a set of very unfortunate mob behaviors that result that sometimes can do huge damage to people at multiple levels.

Pillaging, burning, physical damage, rapes, beatings, and killings all happen in various settings across the planet when mob instincts are in gear.

A number of other countries have been facing some massive riots in recent history. The relatively recent riots in Paris a couple of years ago involved a million people. The recent riots in London were also large and were clearly hate-based for many people. Those riots created real intergroup fear and serious damages for very large numbers of people in that setting.

Listening to recordings of the speeches that were given during the riots by the riot leaders in London on the Internet can give an easy sense of both the anger levels and the clear intergroup targets of that anger.

The recent intergroup riots in Sri Lanka have killed significant numbers of people and the people who trigger those riots expect to kill more people before the rioting there ends.

Those riots are all relevant to *The Art of Intergroup Peace* because the riots in all of those settings tend to be triggered by intergroup issues and they tend to cause intergroup damages and long-term intergroup hatred and anger whenever they happen.

In all of those settings, the people in the mobs have been collectively and very intentionally damaging some local category of “Them.” The

patterns of the intergroup riots we see in all of those other countries are amazingly consistent. The mobs hurt “Them.”

Only the name of the specific “Them” who is relevant to each setting and who is victimized by each riot changes from riot to riot. The behaviors and behavior patterns echo one another with depressing consistency.

Riots Destroy InterGroup Trust

We have obviously had a number of serious riots in our own country. Historically, a number of our major cities have had serious “race riots.” Chicago, Boston, New York City, and L.A. all have had serious collective damage inflicted on portions of those cities by mobs.

In each of those instances, intense group anger is surfaced by a triggering event — like the Rodney King Police Trial in Los Angeles — where the collective anger of a group explodes into mob behaviors that cause people to collectively both express that anger, and do damage to whoever is perceived to be the target of the mob.

The consequences of riots tend to be functionally bad for Peace for each riot setting because the riots create such clear intergroup division, and because the people who are personally damaged by the riots tend to never

forget or forgive the damages they experience from the other group who make them riot victims.

Riots leave scars. Riots can destroy intergroup trust and they can make intergroup respect disappear forever for some people who have personally been adversely affected and damaged by the power and the functions of a mob.

Riots Can Signal Underlying Intergroup Anger

The only positive impact of a mob can be that the readiness of people in a setting to participate in an event-triggered mob can be a clear barometer of the existence of intergroup anger, and tension in a particular setting that might be much less visible in that setting without the spontaneous energy exhibited by the mob.

People in a community who were unaware of the existing simmering levels of intergroup anger and stress are forced to recognize that those angers exist when they erupt through the channeling of protest — including protests that turn into riots and mobs.

When mobs do form — generally triggered by an inflammatory event — then the best outcome at that point can be to keep the mob from the levels

of violence and intergroup damage that too easily can occur from those sets of instincts, and to channel the energy and the anger into a “demonstration” or “protest” rather than a “riot.”

A demonstration can serve the cause of Peace. The perceptions and belief systems that exist for the people who are demonstrating in a setting deserve to be understood — because those people would not have gathered together in that way in that place without a shared sense that there was a legitimate reason to gather together.

Those issues that trigger demonstrations deserve to be understood — and for the sake of intergroup Peace, all parties in a setting need to figure out Peaceful ways of recognizing and resolving those issues.

Soccer Mobs Have Killed People In Several Cities

There is a seductive side to mob behavior that can, unfortunately, cause some people to favor and even seek out mob participation.

Mobs actually can — for a very small number of people — be addictive. Some soccer fans from some countries seem to have acquired almost a personal mob instinct addiction.

Those particular soccer fans who have that addiction go from venue to venue looking for opportunities to trigger these instinctive behaviors, emotions, and reap their neurochemical rewards.

Our team instincts are discussed in Chapter Five of this book as one of the six key tools we can use to bring people together into alignment as groups. Our team-linked group behavior instincts can function well to bring us together — but even our team instincts can also create problems when the fans of any given team exhibit riot behaviors against other fans of other teams in any setting.

Sadly, there are also a small number of people in our own country who go to mob sites when trigger-events make it likely that a mob will form to exacerbate and inflame mob behaviors, and to damage property and to literally loot at the mob site.

Some people who want to steal things or break things know that the mob setting could possibly give them a chance to break store windows, or break into homes and steal goods and property from those settings. In a couple of recent riots, the majority of people who were arrested for looting were from outside the zip codes for the site of the riot.

Having the looters in a riot coming from other zip codes is another very clear us/them behavior reality. Local people in many settings are less likely to loot “Their” own communities businesses. Outside looters see the businesses in a community purely as “Them” and feel no guilt in taking property through direct and blatant theft.

Again — as with our other negative instincts — the key challenge we need to address is that some very damaging behaviors can feel entirely justified and “right” to the people who are in each mob.

People whose normal behavior is to be civil, polite, considerate, and personally decent in their actions and behaviors relative to other people can sometimes do things under the influence of their mob instincts that are – at their core – damaging, destructive and sometimes purely evil.

We Need To Avoid And Defuse Mobs

So if we do want Peace to be our state of being in this country, we clearly do not want to activate mob behaviors in any setting.

We need to avoid setting up trigger-events that cause mobs to feel relevant to angry people in any setting. When mobs seem to be forming for

any reason in any setting, we need to take the steps that are needed in that situation and in that setting to keep them from being activated or inflamed.

The intergroup residual damage that can be created by street mobs — and also by lynching mobs — should not be underestimated.

Lynch Mobs Have Done Great Evil

Lynchings have often involved mobs. There have been a large number of very damaging and very evil lynching mobs at multiple points in our history. Those pure lynching mobs in our country are not recent, but thousands of those mobs existed over the years in various settings and they still leave scars today.

Those mobs created to lynch people exemplify pure intergroup evil and pure intergroup hatred. They prove beyond any doubt that the intention of one group to damage another group exists at a very evil level and can result in truly evil behavior.

That proof is visible to anyone who might doubt how badly our us/them thinking can distort our values and influence our behaviors. The damage from those most negative instinctive behaviors is very real. Victims of lynchings tend to be dead. Their survivors are scarred.

People who are killed by other categories of mobs are equally dead, so we need to be very careful to keep all levels of mob instincts from being activated.

One of the reasons that The Art of Intergroup Peace calls for us to very intentionally avoid having mobs triggered, is that the people who have been personally victimized by mobs often have a very hard time ever forgiving the groups of people and the individual people who did the evil and damaging things that were done while those people were under that mob instinct behavioral influence.

As part of The Art of Intergroup Peace, we need leaders for all groups to be willing and able to defuse mobs when they begin to form. We need leaders who practically and functionally help to keep mobs in our settings from happening.

We need to recognize the angers and the emotions that can trigger mobs, but we need to take steps to keep those angers from degenerating into mob behaviors.

Our Groups Instinctively Create Hierarchies And Select

Leaders

Our instincts to have and follow leaders are also highly relevant to the Art of Intergroup Peace. We instinctively name leaders to all of our settings. Our leaders have a major influence on our collective behaviors. We need leaders in every setting to be committed to Peace and to take steps as leaders to increase the likelihood of Peace happening.

Too many leaders prefer conflict and even war as their context for leadership. When we have leaders in any setting who are war chiefs rather than Peace leaders, creating Peaceful intergroup interactions is much more difficult.

We create hierarchies at an instinctive level in just about all settings.

Hierarchies are everywhere. Wherever we get together as a group in some way — in clans, tribes, companies, military forces, governmental units or even nations — we tend to put a hierarchy in place.

We tend to feel stress in settings where there is no hierarchy and we also tend to feel stress in those situations where the top position in the hierarchy for that setting is currently unfilled.

Chiefs and Alpha leaders of various kinds are a common component and feature of hierarchies. Almost every group ends up with a “chief” of

some kind for the hierarchy. There are tribal chiefs, war chiefs, and chiefs of state.

Corporations and businesses tend to be headed by a CEO — or “Chief” Executive Officer. The “C-Suites” in companies are full of chiefs for each lead position in those hierarchies.

Our armies have levels of officers ranging up to generals and — at the top of each army — there is usually a chief. A senior general. A Commander in Chief.

We instinctively design hierarchies to have someone in charge. Captains can fill the same Alpha role and function as chiefs in many settings. Our ships have captains — as do our athletic teams and even our debate teams.

A ship without a captain can very quickly trigger feelings of both instinctive stress and functional concern for the members of any currently leaderless ship’s crew.

Agreements Need To Be Reached By People With Legitimate

Standing

That particular instinct to have a chief and be led by a chief is relevant for the behavioral terrain that exists for *The Art of Peace* for multiple reasons.

A major goal of The Art of Intergroup Peace is to achieve Peace between groups. Chiefs in each setting have a major impact on group behavior. That means, at a very functional level, we are more likely to succeed if we have aligned chiefs in each setting who function as a key vehicle and supporter to help make Peace in each setting.

Groups of people tend to follow their chiefs and groups of people tend to accept the decisions that are made and the deals that are done by their chiefs.

Agreements between groups in any setting that are not blessed by the relevant chiefs for each group have less chance of succeeding. Chiefs are often needed to be the people who actually negotiate agreements and to be the people who formally reach agreements.

Chapter Six discusses the eight most common approaches we can use to bring groups of people into structured interactions. It takes leaders working with leaders to make each and any of those structured intergroup interactions function and happen.

The list of intergroup interactions in that chapter includes ceasefires, truces, agreements, confederations, mergers, consolidations, and extends all the way to full intergroup assimilation.

Each of the eight intergroup interactions requires local people from each hierarchy interacting to figure out the best alignment model for the situation and to put in place the processes for the groups in that setting to make that alignment model happen.

Agreements that are made between groups are usually made by the people who lead the relevant hierarchy of each relevant group or organization.

The Art of Intergroup Peace recognizes that some of the major intergroup agreements that need to happen in some settings, can only be accomplished and can only be done with credibility and with a sense of legitimacy for each group, if they are done by whoever is perceived to be the legitimate and authorized chief — or chiefs — of the group that is reaching the agreements.

**Agreements Made By People Without The Authority To Make
Them Tend To Fail**

That is a key tactical point to understand in using the strategies that are included in *The Art of Intergroup Peace*. Agreements reached in any setting are vulnerable and can fail if done by people who are not perceived by their group to have the legitimate right and power to reach the agreement.

When deals that are done on key group issues are done by people who are not perceived to have the legitimate status and standing within their own group that is needed to actually do that particular deal, those agreements tend to either not be finalized or they simply fall apart over time.

Deals done by chiefs who aren't accepted by their own group as having the standing and the legitimate power to do the deal generally do not succeed in resolving the key instinctive intergroup issues that might exist about that decision for the members of those groups.

Some deals that are done by non-credible negotiators fall apart very quickly because people in the groups involved don't accept the agreements' that were done as being legitimate.

Others are simply ignored, because the people in the group don't feel that the agreements were made by someone who could legitimately represent the group, and who had the authority to do that specific deal.

So *The Art of Intergroup Peace* strategy calls for groups who make Peace deals with other groups to have people who have perceived leadership legitimacy for each of the parties negotiating the key deals, and then to also have those same perceived leaders explaining and selling the Peace deal that is done to the other members of their group.

Alpha Instincts Create Their Own Relevant Behaviors

As part of that entire hierarchical package of instincts, we know that when someone rises to Alpha status in any given group, achieving that status often triggers its own set of very relevant instincts and behaviors for that Alpha person.

That very basic set of chief-related instincts is directly relevant to *The Art of Intergroup Peace* because the chiefs in any setting — as the Alpha member of each group — tend to be very instinctively focused on a couple of key issues.

The top of that priority list for Alpha focus is often group turf. Alpha leaders in most settings have clearly activated turf instincts that relate to their own group turf. The book *Primal Pathways* has an extensive section dealing with Alpha instinct packages and their consequences for intergroup interactions.

The Alpha members of each group tend to have their own set of turf and intergroup conflict emotions and instincts fully activated, and they tend to act accordingly.

That means that the Alpha people in each group tend to be people who are often very sensitive to turf encroachment. The Alpha are often the people in a group who are personally most focused on both the intellectual turf and the physical turf issues that exist for their group.

In many cases, the person who is in the Alpha role for a group is in that position because he or she has a history of doing turf protection things at various levels for their group.

War Leaders Often Become Alpha

In many settings — the person who has been perceived by the group to be the best defender of the relevant group turf, or who has been perceived to be the best warrior in conflicted settings relative to various group protection issues, or who is perceived to be the best defender of the group belief system or ideology for any given group, ends up to be the person who is selected by that group to be their group Alpha.

The fiercest defenders of a conflicted group are often selected to be Alpha by a group to lead the group because groups tend to want to be well defended when conflict is relevant.

That selection process and those selection priorities sometimes create their own set of difficulties for intergroup Peace because those leaders who personally come to power based on their conflict response and war skills can sometimes have a very hard time either valuing Peace, or helping Peace to happen in any setting.

Power Can Be Addictive As Well

That is a key point to understand in each setting relative to the strategies embedded in The Art of Intergroup Peace. Intergroup alignment issues can be particularly challenging in those settings where the people who are in power and who love being in power actually personally achieved their own power by being a war chief.

The Art of Intergroup Peace also recognizes that power has its own set of instinctive reactions. Power can be addictive. Alpha people often very much want to be Alpha, and receive both strong internal rewards and strong external rewards from their Alpha status and Alpha behaviors.

Those are very instinctive behaviors and reward systems. Very consistent and very seductive neurochemicals can be triggered by Alpha status. People who achieve power in any setting tend to get the kinds of instinctive neurochemical rewards and reinforcing societal reactions that often cause them — those people with that set of rewards activated — to not want to ever lose their Alpha power.

Losing power can trigger very negative responses in people whose alpha instincts have been fully activated. The *Primal Pathways* book discusses those sets of issues in more detail.

So the reality is that the people who function as war chiefs tend to thrive in times of war — and those leaders sometimes do not like the loss of power and the loss of relative chief status that can sometimes result from the end of their war.

Some War Chiefs Make The Best Peace Chiefs

For those reasons, war-empowered or conflict-empowered Alphas can sometimes be a challenge relative to any group negotiating a Peace in any setting. It is also very true that Peace can be done very effectively in many settings with the explicit involvement of those same war leaders — and some of the best Peace deals are done by former warriors who know the

horror of war and who have credibility with their people on war issues that is based on their own battle or conflict leadership experience.

But sometimes the Art of Intergroup Peace requires finding a new set of leaders for a setting who can more easily make a transition from a time of war to a time of Peace.

In any case, groups everywhere have hierarchies. Hierarchies have leaders. Leaders personally all tend to have strongly activated turf and group protection instincts.

Those patterns are normal patterns. So selecting leaders based on their commitment to intergroup Peace rather than their commitment to intergroup war is clearly a good thing to be doing at this point for us all in the process of creating Peace.

Getting leaders in place and having leaders in the process who have the personal hierarchical credibility to reach the Peace agreements is a key and important part of the Peace strategy.

Alpha, Beta, And Theta Instincts All Structure Thoughts And Behaviors

The *Primal Pathways* book also describes what that book calls Beta and Theta instincts — the instincts that people at every single hierarchical level have to be very committed to and very aware of their own relative position in any hierarchy.

We all have instincts to know our own specific relative position — to know who we expect to salute and to know who we expect to salute us in any hierarchy.

We frankly, very consistently, resist dropping levels in any hierarchy and we generally aspire to moving up levels in any hierarchy.

Those instincts and that set of thought processes create their own set of relevant behavior for people in hierarchical settings.

People tend to feel great stress and unhappiness if their relative position in a hierarchy is ever at risk. People also aspire to promotion in the context of their hierarchy.

Leaders at the Alpha level can expect to be obeyed by people who have their Beta and Theta instincts activated — but Alpha leaders can also find themselves at risk if they weaken in any way that lets the Beta people in their hierarchy depose them and take their Alpha status.

Peace can be hard to achieve if the people in Alpha roles are insecure in their internal political support and are afraid of having their aspiring Beta leaders accuse them of intergroup weakness, or of being a traitor to their group.

Those issues need to be dealt with situationally in many settings as part of *The Art of Intergroup Peace* in order to create both the agreements that can define the Peace, and a sense of legitimacy for each group relative to the component parts of any Peace agreement that might be achieved.

Any time we bring people together in a setting, we are well served by making sure that people have their needs met to have their relative status known and protected.

Cultures Are Everywhere, As Well

The Art of Intergroup Peace calls for cultures as well as leaders to be key tools for the Peace process. We have very powerful instincts to create cultures in each of the groups that exist. We need to use our cultures as a tool for Peace.

Today, our cultures in most settings function as the tools of our instincts, and our cultures generally help us achieve our instinctive goals in each relevant setting.

Building cultures is another highly instinctive and universal behavior. We have tribal cultures, family cultures, ethnic cultures, and organizational cultures. The groups that form even in almost spontaneous settings often tend to create their own almost spontaneous setting-specific cultures.

The next chapter of this book addresses cultures in more detail as a primary factor for intergroup interactions and as a key tool for the Art of Peace.

We Can Use All Instincts For Peace — And For War

The basic reality that we face relative to The Art of Peace is that nearly a dozen of our basic instinctive behavior packages can cause us to inflict damage onto people from other groups and to distrust and dislike people from other groups. Each of those instinct packages can make achieving Peace difficult in any given setting.

Our instincts to tribalize — to create and defend turf, to activate Alpha instincts against other groups of people, and to function in mob-like settings all can create barriers to Peace.

Each of those instinct packages — with the exception of mob instincts — can also be tools for Peace as well as tools for war.

We need to understand all of those instinctive behaviors and we need to channel each of them well if we want to achieve Peace. We need to understand both the thought processes that those sets of instincts trigger and we need to understand both the patterns of behavior, and the specific behaviors that they create.

Pattern delineation and discernment is an important skill we need to have. As a package, we need to collectively channel all of those instinctive behaviors toward Peace.

We can't channel those specific behaviors toward Peace with full effectiveness if we simply deal with each intergroup incident that occurs in each setting as an isolated and separate incident. We need to understand our patterns of behavior and not just focus on the pieces and incidents that are relevant to each situational activation of those instincts.

We Need Strategic Approaches To Peace

One insight from *The Art of War* that is shared by *The Art of Intergroup Peace* is the belief that if you have a good macro strategy, and if you have clear macro goals in place, your chance of success is significantly enhanced.

But if you only have situational and reactive tactics in place for each incident and for each occurrence, and if you rely on entirely situational and tactical responses to each incident and if you have no overall strategy that is guiding your overall efforts, you will very likely fail and Peace will not be achieved in your setting.

Sun Tzu said that armies who had strategies would win — and he said very clearly that the armies that were grounded only on tactics and situational reactions as their approach to war were doomed to fail.

The same is true for Peace. We need strategies and not just tactics to also achieve our Peace. That need to have an overall overarching strategy and not just rely on situational tactics to deal with intergroup issues is a very real concern for both winning a War and creating a Peace.

Peace Is More Than A Tactical, Situational Set Of Responses

Wars are won by generals who understand the physical terrain. Peace can be won by leaders who understand the behavioral terrain that is created and channeled by our instincts.

A Peace strategy that takes into account all of our key instinctive issues and instinctive behaviors has the potential to use that specific terrain far more successfully than an approach that treats every problem, issue, and intergroup confrontation and conflict as though each issue is a unique problem that needs situationally tactical and incident-based responses.

Our Overall Strategy Needs To Be To Use Our Instinctive

Behaviors For Peace

The basic overarching strategy of *The Art of Intergroup Peace* is to use our instincts and the behaviors and values they create to generate a collective sense of “us” for this country that will allow us to be at Peace with ourselves. *Cusp of Chaos* and *Primal Pathways* both point out how that can be done in more detail.

We need to very explicitly address and utilize our us/them instincts as a key part of that strategy. We need to have our “us” instincts support us in achieving Peace. We need to create an opportunity for interaction and trust

between people who are not feeling intergroup trust today. We need to activate our team instincts and we need to collectively trigger a sense of “us” at a higher level that has win/win goals as a key collective belief.

We Need To Use The Entire Set Of Instincts For Peace

Cultures need to be part of the tool kit for Peace. We need to use our tendency and ability to create, impose, and use cultures to build explicit and intentional new values into each of our cultures. That will give Peace and win/win outcomes a higher likelihood of success.

We need to use hierarchies, because they inevitably exist, to achieve the agreements we need, and we need to use our hierarchies to implement them successfully. We need to have our hierarchal and Alpha leader supported behaviors and commitments that are credible to each group that will directly support our goals of intergroup Peace.

We need to deal with our turf instincts — and we need to recognize that any Peace approaches in any setting that ignore any group’s basic turf instinct realities will have a much lower sense of succeeding.

We need to overcome our very powerful and often invisible instincts against being a traitor — and we need to make sure that our mob instincts are never functionally activated.

If our packages of instincts are somehow activated at the level where people are treated as “Them” in the context of a mob, we need to defuse and de-energize those behaviors and instincts very quickly before permanent damage is done in any setting. We need demonstrations — not riots — when groups are angry with other groups.

Overall, we need to put structures and processes in place to reinforce any agreements or understandings or Peaceful relationships that we might achieve. Chapter five of this book addresses those issues.

At a core level, we need to make sure that the people who are working for Peace in each setting can do that work for all of us without feeling like they are being a traitor to their initial definition of “us.”

Creating Peace Is Both A Personal And Collective Agenda

Peace cannot happen in a vacuum. Creating Peace needs to be purely intentional, very specific, and directly based on both tactics and strategies that reinforce the Peace agenda and the Peace culture.

The next chapter explains the role that culture plays in that process.