Immigration Is Causing Massive Intergroup Stress Points and Instinct-Triggered Conflicts in Many Settings

People from a number of European countries have told me with real concern and deep sorrow how sad, frightened, disconcerted, upset, angry, and even depressed they are about the increasing impact of immigration on each of their countries.

Immigration is changing countries in Europe in significant ways and it is triggering a new array of negative dysfunctional and damaging us/them intergroup instincts and behaviors in multiple settings.

People in France, England, Switzerland, Austria, Belgium, Denmark, and The Netherlands all have told me how sad they are that their countries are changing in major ways because of large numbers of immigrants who are choosing to bring their own ancestral cultures into their new communities rather than connecting with the culture and assimilating as immigrants to the historic culture of their new host land.

I heard very progressive people in each setting who were sad and depressed because they believed that their countries' old culture was being pushed aside and rejected as the culture of choice for many of the new people who are now immigrating into their countries.

One woman in Belgium — an activist in her youth for minority rights and for ethnic inclusion in her native land — was in tears because the new immigrant birth rate now exceeds the birth rate of her own Flemish ethnic

group and the new immigrants who now fill her community seem to have no interest in being part of the traditional Flemish culture.

"We are disappearing as a people in my lifetime," she said, "That makes me very sad."

She was, I believe, wrong about her culture actually disappearing. Her culture will survive. It will no longer be the exclusive, functional culture for all of the people who live in her specific part of her country, but it will survive.

Cultures have amazing tenacity that allows them to survive in the face of major suppression — and people in her culture will figure out how to continue to perpetuate their traditions, their values, and their cultural expectations for generations to come.

But she was right about the fact that the old days of her culture being exclusive for her community and being territorially dominant are gone forever for her country.

The Flemish and the Walloons have each fiercely protected their own culture and their own language for their own separate subsets of Belgium for a very long time — and all of that fierce local cultural protectionism for Belgium turf is now being nullified for major portions of the country by the permanent influx of new people from other cultures who clearly have no interest in converting to either of the indigenous cultures of Belgium.

New Immigrants Are No Longer Assimilating

I heard the same sets of concerns from people in a number of other countries where growing high levels of inter-ethnic immigration is the new normal.

In France, the killing of the journalists at a satirical newspaper by a couple of immigrant brothers very recently made news around the world.

Those kinds of intergroup issues are not unique to France. Major intergroup riots have taken over major parts of Paris multiple times.

A Zurich resident told me that there were now parts of his city that he personally feared to enter — and that fact shocked, offended, angered, horrified, and deeply saddened him. He found it disconcerting to have those neighborhoods now excluding him and his people as rightful inhabitants or even as welcome and safe visitors to the very same communities and settings that used to be places where he was safely an "Us."

He also bemoaned much higher levels of crime in his city and he linked the higher crime rates to the new influx of non-Swiss immigrants.

Crime rates actually are climbing in his city. That is true for all of the countries with major growth in new immigrants. The new immigrants in all of the countries do tend to have less money and fewer resources than the rest of the people in their new country and unemployment levels are often much higher as well.

Those sets of circumstances lead in almost all settings to higher rates of crime. He was deeply concerned about all of those issues and, the truth is, his concerns are echoed in multiple settings in Europe.

Europe is full of immigrants. So are a number of Asian countries and many African and Middle Eastern countries. The new immigrants tend to arrive in each setting with minimal resources. Some are prosperous and wealthy, but most of the immigrants are poor and many are extremely poor.

When extremely poor people who often have minimal education as well as minimal resources enter into a new environment and then set up communities

that speak a different language and share a different set of beliefs and different behavioral expectations than the old population of that area, the natural result of that set of intergroup interactions very understandably triggers a wide range of our us/them instincts, our tribal instincts, and our turf-related instincts in every setting where it happens.

I have seen many people who have been affected significantly by those movements of new people into new settings in new countries. My observation has been that those new intergroup situations are difficult in every setting and they are both volatile and increasingly dangerous in far too many places where growing immigration is a functional reality for many people and where many of the new immigrants, themselves, are angry about the situation they are in.

Immigration Is Triggering Us/Them Instincts

Immigration is reshaping major portions of the world. It is reshaping major portions of the world at a very rapid pace.

The U.N. estimates that there are more than 50 million displaced people in the world today. Displaced people in all settings functionally need to find a place to live. Fifty million people is a huge number of people who are moving into settings to find new places to live.

Us/Them instincts are being triggered in an expanding number of settings around the planet because all of those people are moving into all of those new settings and because those new people are creating new levels of ethnic and racial diversity that did not exist in the past in those same locations.

The long-term impact of the new immigration patterns on our us/them instincts, tribal instincts, and turf instincts are going to be massive in a great many of those settings. People in many challenged settings will now need to figure out how to create local intergroup Peace in a world where immigration is changing their local intergroup realities and where the changes that are happening now for their communities are likely to be both permanent and irreversible.

Growing Numbers of Countries with Internal Ethnic Conflict

If various countries do not learn how to deal with those issues, then there will be an expansion of the parts of the world where people are at war with themselves as dueling, interethnic citizens within their own country.

All of the old intergroup conflict sites continue to exist and they are being supplemented in many settings by whole new levels of intergroup anger, division, and conflict.

Immigration is currently the most important new key intergroup instinct trigger factor. Immigration has become a major trigger for the activation of very serious levels of those instincts and those behaviors in a very wide range of places.

When I started to look at the issues of instinct-linked intergroup conflict on that sunny day in Wales, I had only a very vague sense that immigration might begin to create its own levels of key instinct-related issues in many countries.

I did believe at that point that the country in the world that would have the biggest set of issues to face relative to immigration would be us. I did not have any sense in 1990 that Europe would be hugely impacted by immigration. I did know that we had immigration issues in some areas of the U.S.

We Americans clearly do have our own immigration issues and they are significant — but I now believe our issues pale in comparison to some of the other challenges I have seen immigration creating for people in multiple other countries.

The World Is Full of Refugee Camps

Major areas of Africa have significant numbers of displaced people who are now refugees in other countries. Most of those countries are setting up refugee camps for those refugees. Those countries use camps for those refugees, in part, to keep the people in the camps isolated, rather than inviting those new people to mix

with the general population and potentially to join their nation at some future point as new citizens.

Almost no countries in that particular part of the world want their refugees to become new citizens and permanent residents.

Those refugee camps exist in a number of African settings.

The Middle East is also full of refugee camps, with millions of people in that area of the world displaced by ethnic conflict and living in camps set up by the countries they have fled to. Central Asia has significant numbers of those camps as well.

India also has some sizable refugee camps that are full of displaced people from neighboring countries.

The pattern in most of those settings is for the host country who is receiving the refugees to set up refugee camps and then to keep the refugees basically locked in to those camp settings. Those countries do not want to extend the hospitality of their home territory to those displaced persons beyond the physical setting of the camps to allow the camp refugees to become permanent immigrants or long-term residents of any kind.

The status of the people who live in those camps tends to be permanent refugees — and the host countries almost unanimously want the refugees in each camp to return to their home settings as soon as that return to those settings can be safely arranged.

Those camps that are created in various countries each set up their own us/them instinct activation packages for obvious reasons. The people in the camps are not an "Us" to the local population and the people in the new countries are not perceived to be "Us" by the refugees.

The camps, themselves, are often poorly funded and can be both unpleasant and unsafe for the refugees. Those camps tend to be a source of both significant and unwanted expense and deep unhappiness for the host countries. There have been a significant number of occurrences of intergroup damage in multiple

settings where people from the host countries have committed acts of violence against the refugees.

That whole set of circumstances involving refugee camps and forced group incarceration is sad and deeply challenging for all of the parties involved.

Europe Didn't Use Refugee Camps

Europe has taken a very different approach to the refugee issue. There are no refugee camps in Europe. Refugees who enter countries in Europe are generally allowed to live in local neighborhoods with other residents of each country.

Refugees in Europe can generally go to any site they choose to live. Given that free choice of living sites, the refugees in each setting generally try to live with each other in specific neighborhoods where they instinctively and strategically can be with other displaced people from their own ancestral country and from their own specific ethnic group.

Some of the new immigrants in Europe have moved to the European settings because they are forced out of their old setting. Some of the new immigrants have moved to Europe for jobs and economic opportunity and for the chance to give themselves and their children better lives than the lives that exist in the old settings.

In both cases — voluntary and involuntary immigration situations — the people who immigrate to Europe tend to end up in cultural and ethnic settings that are very different than their places of birth, and all of the intergroup instincts that are triggered by those kinds of factors are being triggered for both the refugees and the people from the host countries.

The tendency for many of those refugees is to band together in each setting and to try to recreate the culture of their ancestral settings in the new country and the new communities where they now live.

Immigrants Used to Assimilate

Immigration has changed.

Immigration between countries has always existed — but it used to happen in much smaller numbers. Most people who actually immigrated in past years as individuals into another country also tended to assimilate very intentionally and very quickly into the new culture and the new setting. Assimilation was the normal practice for most immigrants.

Immigrants worked hard in most settings to become part of the local "Us." That wasn't always successful, but it was almost always the goal.

People who immigrated into new countries used to very deliberately blend in to their immigration destination and — to support that blending-in process — the laws of many host countries for new immigrants used to clearly and explicitly require various levels of their specific assimilation by any new members of their community.

Today — for a number of reasons — the immigration levels we see are higher, but the assimilation levels we see are much lower. The total impact of that growing level of non-assimilating immigration on our us/them instinct behavior packages is to be clearly causing problems caused by immigration to have a negative impact on local Peace in multiple settings.

Fifty-Five Million Refugee Immigrants

There are currently 55 million people in the world who have been displaced by their home countries. That is a record number. Those people were basically driven from their country of birth for ethnic and tribal reasons.

Those sets of involuntary immigrants already have had their own us/them instincts activated at the individual and group level by being attacked and expelled from their home countries because of their tribal alignment, and they came to their new countries with a high level of defensive group identity instincts fully activated.

214

Because those particular new immigrants are involuntarily displaced refugees, they tend to have the weak and inadequate personal economic resources that involuntary refugees often have as their reality. They are often broke and they tend to be undersupplied with material possessions when they reach their new countries.

The current sets of immigrants then tend to set up neighborhoods in each country that are full of other immigrants who speak their language and who share their culture and their religion. People cluster together for comfort, safety, and support. Those new clusters tend to define their new communities, and the people who live in those ethnically concentrated neighborhoods tend not to try to assimilate culturally into their new country.

Because of deliberate decisions that are being made by people in the incoming groups not to assimilate, there is often a clear and growing backlash from the original people in each setting whose own tribal group has lived in those settings for centuries. Those people from the original tribal groups increasingly feel invaded.

I have looked at several of those settings and talked to people from several more. The patterns are obvious, painful, and clear.

The original inhabitants of those settings are increasingly angry about the invasion they see happening to their own people and communities. That backlash and those behaviors from the original people in each of those communities is exactly what we should expect from the activation of people's basic us/them intergroup instincts at multiple levels in all of those settings.

The Immigrants Use the Internet as a Connectivity Tool

The changing array of immigration issues that exist today in multiple settings have all been made more challenging by the emergence both religion and the Internet as group conflict and division factors. The Internet is a key, persuasive, powerful, pervasive, and effective communications tool that people in each of those groups use with growing ability to create connectivity inside each group.

The immigrants in most settings are using the Internet to communicate with themselves and to coordinate both approaches and activities with other members of their group. The growing role for the Internet in those intergroup interactions relative to fueling and supporting intergroup interactions of many kinds at many levels has become increasingly obvious to me as I looked at how the groups in each of those settings was functioning to create both group identity and coordinated efforts.

The Internet was not relevant at any level for my thinking in the early 1990 versions of this book. I did personally use an early version of the Internet to do some of the research about a couple of relevant issues in those book drafts through some academic files that were made electronically available in early Internet days by some foreign universities.

The search system that I used in those early Internet efforts was called Gopher. Using Gopher to find information was a slow and crude — but sometimes very useful — process.

Instantaneous InterGroup and Interpersonal Interaction

Times have changed. The Internet has gone from being a pure and almost idiosyncratic pure research tool to being a massive and widely used vehicle for instantaneous communication and instantaneous intergroup and interpersonal interaction. For more than a decade, the Internet has been a major and growing factor for both issue triggering and issue activation for people who have their intergroup instincts activated.

The Internet now functions in many settings very effectively as a group instinct activation and group alignment tool. Angry people in many settings use the Internet as a kind of weapon — and it can be a very powerful and effective weapon to use.

Today, when people in a given setting are angry or in a state of conflict, the Internet tends be used to exacerbate the anger and to increase, amplify, focus, and coordinate the level of conflict.

In some situations, the Internet is also used by cooler and less inflamed people to help deactivate or mitigate incipient negative beliefs, emotions, and behaviors. That can be a very good way to use the Internet and we need to get better at doing that.

But more often then using the Internet to support Peace, any local intergroup conflict situation that exists today tends to have direct Internet support for the conflict and for the behaviors, thought processes, and emotions triggered by the conflict.

Hate-Based Websites Abound

The Internet is now clearly a major reality factor for intergroup interactions — for both good and evil — and each level of our intergroup challenges has relevant Internet usage embedded in it.

Hate-based websites abound. Anyone who doubts the level, nature, and extent of the intergroup hatred and anger that is described in my books can simply go to the Internet and find easy proof that both the hatred and the intergroup anger do exist.

I can still remember clearly my personal sense of both alarm and horror when I saw the first hate-based websites more than a decade ago. I realized when I saw those first sets of sites how that kind of negative and selectively anonymous use of that particular powerful communication and connectivity tool could very easily take negatively instinct-activated people to very bad and very dysfunctional places.

My worst fears were exceeded. People who want to influence other people and who want to use the Internet as a tool for persuading people to collectively and individual hate and damage other people are becoming increasingly adept at those evil uses for that tool.

An alarming number of people who have joined terrorist groups and who have chosen to function in damaging ways with other people who share hate-

focused belief systems were recruited to those beliefs and those behaviors by Internet-based communication tools.

The Internet can and does very clearly support both the anger and the conflict that exists in too many sites today. That set of tools is among the most effective tools that exist for discriminating hate and intergroup negative interactions.

We Need Peace-Based Websites as Well

The only way to deal with some of those seductive and damaging instinct-triggering emotional and intellectual enticements is to have Internet tools that counter the hatred and guide us to intergroup understanding, intergroup trust, and Peace.

I have a very strong sense that we now need to use the Internet to support Peace, as well. We need to do that work to support intergroup understanding and Peace in many layers and many ways.

We need to do that at an overarching level by helping people understand the value, benefit, and desirability of Peace as an overall commitment and goal and we need to do it in each inflamed setting to make Peace happen when crises flare up and cause people to damage other people under the umbrella of dysfunctional and damaging instinct activated emotions and negative beliefs.

At this point in time, each of the countries who face major pressure from their immigrant populations need to learn to use the Internet well and frequently in their countries to create better local understanding and better intergroup linkages and communications in the various local settings. That understanding needs to include all parties in those settings and it very much needed in many settings to both prevent crisis and to defuse crisis.

We Need to Use the Internet as a Tool for Peace

We clearly need to use the Internet as a tool to help educate people in times of Peace. We also need to use the Internet to calm people in times of crisis or stress.

We need to use the Internet to inform people about all of the issues covered by the research that I have shared through these books.

We need to use that tool to create an exchange of knowledge, insight, and wisdom about a wide range of key issues — so that people can have information that people need easily available in ways that make that information visible and effective for our personal learning and intergroup interactions. We all need to be better informed and smarter about those key issues, and the Internet is a great tool to use to create access to that learning.

That point and approach is covered in more detail in both *The Art of InterGroup Peace* and the *Primal Pathways* books that are sister books to this one.

That point about using the Internet as a tool for Peace is relevant to the issue of growing immigration levels around the world because the anger that is felt in many of the immigration flash points that have occurred has been exacerbated, fed, amplified, triggered, activated, and enabled by the Internet. The perfect storm of intergroup anger that is building in many settings is happening to a large degree because the Internet creates linkage tools to make local flash points into explosions and into very focused and intentional intergroup damage.

In all of the areas where there are large numbers of immigrants, we need to understand how significant and powerful the Internet can be as a tool of inflammation for any bad thing that happens to the immigrants in any relevant setting.

An intergroup incident that happened in a local immigrant community ten or twenty years ago might have, at best, affected a small number of angry people in a very regional and limited geographic setting — generally with relatively low and weak levels of actual information sharing even between the people who were actually in that setting and even weaker information flow between that site and various other related sites about the inflaming issue. That same incident today can now be exposed and expanded widely to many sites and to many people on the Internet and that information sharing can be triggered in minutes and fully activated in hours. The Internet has almost unfathomable reach and speed.

That fully exposed and inflammatory information about any intergroup incidents that occur — often fed by videotapes of actual inflammatory incidents — can be shared immediately by the new immigrants in any setting with themselves and in some cases, with millions of other relevant readers or viewers in many other settings where other immigrants with similar issues and a similar sense of intergroup alignment live. We see similar use of the Internet when we have intergroup situations in our country — where there is damage done to anyone in a way that causes our intergroup alarms to go off and our intergroup instincts to be activated.

Religion Is a Key Division Factor

Those intergroup issues are all being exacerbated in many settings by the fact that the new immigrants in major European settings also have a different religion than the original set of people living in each country.

The original inhabitants in all of those countries tended to be either non-religious or Christians. The new immigrants from North Africa, the Middle East, and Eastern Europe tend to be Muslim. Large percentages of the new immigrants are Muslim — and a significant number of the immigrants who face inter-ethnic and intertribal discrimination and problems in their new European countries believe that they face that discrimination because of their religion and that because of their tribe.

I have looked at intertribal and interethnic discrimination in enough settings to know that the tribal issues tend to trigger those instincts very directly, but the people who are feeling that intergroup division tend to believe that religion is a key factor in those behaviors.

That can obviously become a self-fulfilling belief.

When people believe the discrimination and discomfort they face has religion as a key factor — and when people from that religion tell people that they are being attacked for their religious beliefs — then that set of factors makes religion extremely relevant.

Internet Recruiting Happens

The people who believe religion to be a major trigger for both internal group alignment and for conflict with other groups have become particularly skillful at using the Internet to support their communications, recruiting, and strategies.

Inflammatory and persuasive Internet tools use the six alignment triggers that are described in this book and in each of my other intergroup books for creating alignment in any setting to bring people who were not angry, inflamed, or committed to the cause of an angry group to feel the pull and draw of those instincts in ways that can change people's lives. People use the Internet to tee up demonstrations to coordinate protests, and to recruit people to their causes. The Internet can reach into homes to make recruits who otherwise would never have either known about the options or been able to connect with them. Hundreds and thousands of people from both European countries and the U.S. have been enticed to go to the Middle East to join militant groups there in conflict situations with the Internet serving as a key tool in that recruitment process.

We live in volatile times. We have new tool kits that should and can be used to smooth out the volatility. We need to do that work and we need to do it well.

It has been obvious to me that those tools currently tend to be used more often now to inflame and incite people into anger and into various levels of negative intergroup behaviors that stem from anger. That trend of using the Internet for those negative purposes will continue and it will create its own sets of consequences that we will need to address.

As a counter, we need to use the Internet to help people understand the reality and the pull of instinctive behaviors. We need to help people avoid the seductive pull of negative instinctive intergroup behaviors and we need to help people create a collective understanding of the key factors that can cause people to come together in various settings to create real coalitions for achieving InterGroup Peace.

The leaders in each of the troubled settings need to stand back from their knee jerk negative reactions to other groups to set up new local approaches that restore intergroup Peace to each local setting.

Overall, the immigration related issues that exist for the world are large and they are growing. There are a number of major irreversible trends that each needs to be understood and then addressed by the countries that are affected by those trends.

Europe Is Becoming More Multi-Ethnic

Europe, in particular, needs to understand how to deal with the massive change that is being created by immigration. The countries of Europe have always been proudly and even fiercely tribal. Each European tribe has had its own language, culture, and turf.

The current boundaries for each of those traditional countries have been set long ago by law and by old intergroup wars. Those boundaries and the standard ethnic concentration for each of those countries has been in place for a very long time and they seldom change. The functional consequence of those current national boundaries over the centuries has been to keep people who speak different languages in the settings where their national tribal languages are the "right way" for people in that setting to speak.

French is spoken in France. German is spoken in Germany. Italian is spoken in Italy. The Spanish speak the language of Spain. The Swedes speak Swedish. The Danes speak Danish. The Norwegians all speak Norwegian.

Very few people, over the centuries, have migrated between any of those legacy European countries. The number of people with Swedish ancestry who live in Norway is pretty small, even though the two countries share a very long border and the pure logistical and functional barriers to immigration are extremely low.

I have spent time in each of those countries. The patterns are the same everywhere. Those Norwegians are proud of not being Swedish.

In Norway, the people take great pride in the culture, history, legacy, and territorial reality that is Norway.

He Lost the "E" for Love

My own family name, Halvorson, came from my Norwegian grandfather. His father, Jorgen Halverson (George the First), brought his family over from Norway. The spelling of Halvorson that I use today, however, is the Swedish spelling of the name.

There actually are variations on the name "Halvorson" in Sweden, Norway, and Denmark. Each group spells the name differently. The Swedes spell Halvorson with two Os. The Norwegians use an "e" in the middle. The Danes use an "e" at the end.

We use the Swedish spelling of the name today because my grandfather fell in love with a Swedish girl in Northern Minnesota – Francis Gustafson. Her family were proud first generation Swedes and they did not want their friends back in Sweden to know that their daughter had married a Norwegian. So they asked my grandfather to change to the Swedish spelling of the name.

My grandfather used to say he lost the "e" for love.

He is buried next to his brother and the tombstone for his brother has the Norwegian spelling. That used to puzzle me. His brother had died many years earlier and I had assumed when I was very young that someone had made a mistake on his brother's tombstone and that my family was too frugal to have his stone redone. Frugal was always a core part of our family culture.

I was delighted to learn the more romantic version of that story. I mention that here because I have told that story to several people in both Norway and Sweden, and no one has been amused by the story in either setting.

The Norwegians were insulted that my grandfather knuckled under and made that change. The Swedes seemed to believe I was an imposter of some kind, visiting their country, and using a false spelling to pretend to be a Swede. Only the Danes were amused.

I am telling that story here in a chapter on significant internal ethnic conflict in Europe today to make the point that the legacy of European countries has been to be very tribal and to be very territorially insulated. All of the intergroup instincts were in place and people from each group carefully mentioned their own separate status as a tribal group. That insulation level between groups changed a bit when the European Union was formed. The laws of the new Union very intentionally and deliberately functionally eliminated many of the old border-based barriers to migration within Europe. The new Union dropped the old immigration barriers between European Union countries with the goal of allowing all of the people from all of those countries to live anywhere in Europe that they wanted to live — just like American law allows each of us to live in any state.

The European Union Made the Decision to Detribalize Borders

The European Union made the ideological decision to detribalize Europe a bit relative to turf. All of the people from all of the European Union countries now have the right and the option to simply immigrate to any other European Union country.

That was a very enlightened law. It was clearly, intentionally, and explicitly designed to help de-tribalize Europe.

In reality, however, as recently as last year, less than 1 percent of the internal immigrants we now see in Europe have been people from the original set of European nations who have moved to another country. People are choosing not to blend or migrate. Those people from the various legacy European tribes are not moving very much or very often to other European countries.

Europe is actually full of immigrants — but the high volume of migration levels that have happened in Europe in the past decade have not been Germans moving to Italy or Danes moving to Spain. The new migration that is changing Europe is the influx of people from Africa, Asia, the Middle East, and Eastern Europe who are now moving into various European countries and who are

taking up permanent residence in those areas for all of the reasons mentioned earlier.

Some of the Immigration Followed Colonial Linkage Patterns

Interestingly — and for understandable logistical and linguistic reasons — the immigration patterns for quite a few people into the new European settings have followed the old colonial linkages for those countries. France ended up with large numbers of people from a couple of former French colonies who are now making France their new home, for example. The Algerian neighborhoods of Paris now take up major portions of that city.

The British have had similar patterns of people moving — with large numbers of people entering Britain from their colonies and former colonies and moving into major British cities.

London now has significant neighborhoods where the first language spoken isn't English, but those people in those neighborhoods tend to be from countries where English was their second language.

As I mentioned earlier, I have heard very clear and deep concern in all settings from people from the original ethnic groups in those countries in each city about the changing nature of their populations and their communities. The people I talked to in those countries about those issues are clearly triggering their own us/them instincts in multiple ways that are sometimes clearly both sad and negative.

The change in some settings in Europe has been dramatic. Most of the new residents of those European communities do not look like or sound like the legacy population in each country and their impact is visually obvious in many settings that used to look and be extremely homogenous.

New Religion and Ethnicity Create Major Challenges as a Package

The issues of having different religious beliefs truly has made the situation more complicated and different. The new immigrants in most of those cities also tend to be from a different religious base than the old residents.

As noted earlier, Old Europe was overwhelmingly Christian or non-religious. The populations of most European countries ten to 20 years ago when I started looking at those immigration issues were almost entirely either Christian or the direct descendants of Christians.

By contrast, the majority of new immigrants into each of those European countries today tend to be Muslim — and conversion to Christianity is not a path that those immigrants are on.

Conversion is not the current immigration pattern and it is not likely to be a future pattern. It is easy to see from looking at those situations in multiple settings that the new immigrants in those European cities are not intending to either convert or assimilate.

So what we are seeing in multiple countries is major new geographic areas where entire neighborhoods, communities, and specific suburbs of major cities are looking very much like and sounding very much like the legacy cities and historic home countries of the new immigrants. Those neighborhoods also have a new religious composition — and people are going to mosques instead of churches in a growing number of settings.

The new sets of people who live in each of those settings intend to have those settings look the way the look now going into the foreseeable future. I have looked at several of those neighborhoods. Those settings do not look like historic Paris or historic Zurich.

The Immigrants Tend to Have Lower Education Levels and Less Money

To make matters even more challenging for achieving positive intergroup interactions, the new immigrants often have a weaker set of economic resources.

They are often poor. They are sometimes destitute. That means that there also tends to be significant economic differences between the various groups who now live in each of those countries.

Unemployment is invariably higher for the new sets of people. Education levels tend to be lower. So the reality that much of Europe is dealing with is that the new immigrants in most settings are facing significant challenges relative to education, jobs, and the new arrivals are facing challenges relative to political status in their new communities.

Unemployment levels are painfully high for many of the new immigrants — particularly for the younger people. Crime levels are also significantly higher than the crime levels were in the old ethnically pure European communities. The new immigrants in France are still less than 20 percent of the total population, but they currently make up about half of the people in French jails.

France has had some major levels of anger and confrontations with the new immigrants. Major riots have happened several times. More than 10,000 cars were burned in Paris during one set of intergroup riots.

I was in Paris after both of the two largest riots. The anger levels for both those traditional French people and the new immigrants were extremely high. I had immigrants in Paris tell me the French are the most racist people on the planet and I had a native French store manager in Paris tell me, in an almost conspiratorial undertone, "The only way to deal with this situation is to have our paratroopers with machine guns go to them and kill their leaders. They don't want to be French. They should not be in France. Only death will end this."

He did not appear to be a violent man. He was a quiet storekeeper. I suspect he believed himself to be a man of Peace. I was sad, but not entirely surprised to hear what he said. His words were exactly the words and the thoughts that tend to be triggered wherever we activate our us/them instincts and whenever we feel at a visceral level that someone is a "Them." We suspend conscience and we often very much want to do damage to "Them" — generally in defense of

whoever we perceive to be "Us" when we believe that our "Us" is threatened in any way.

That storekeeper in Paris knew exactly who was Them and who was Us. So did the rioters who had burned the 10,000 cars in Paris that month — saying that what they really wanted was revenge for what the immigrants had perceived to be a wrongful death of two young Muslim men.

Killing the Journalists Was Us/Them Behavior

I also visited Paris immediately after the shooting of the satirical newspaper. The two brothers who shot and killed the journalists had the worst sets of conscience-free intergroup instincts in play. They felt no guilt in killing people they perceived to be "Them" — and, in fact, celebrated doing the killing.

The change in intergroup stress levels and intergroup animosity have been growing in France. People from the majority group are moving from anger to a level of despair — believing that they may have lost forever major elements and parts of the overall Paris that they love to other people. Many people from the original French population can't imagine building any sets of solutions that will reduce the future intergroup anger levels and intergroup division in the country they love.

Many of the Jewish residents of Paris are considering leaving what had been a safe place to live and moving to Israel for safety. Thousands may make that choice.

There is significant irony in the fact that moving to a place where rockets are killing people with some regularity for reasons of intergroup hatred is perceived to be the safer place to be than Paris.

Religious Difference Will Not Go Away or Disappear

When you look at the newly diverse population of France, the largest portions of the new immigrants are Berbers from Algeria. Roughly 2 million of the

residents of Paris and its suburbs are Berbers. Their neighborhoods do tend to look very much like the immigrants' Algerian legacy communities.

Algerians also tend to be Muslim. Muslims now make up at least half of the growing foreign ancestry community in Europe.

One of the basic intergroup issues that will now need to be addressed very directly by each of the European countries will be how to deal with the various practices of the Muslim faith. Those issues will obviously continue to grow because some of the practices of that faith are not the practices that were part of the culture of old Europe.

In some cases, the responses from the local governments to those sets of issues have been negative. Laws have recently been passed in some European settings to outlaw the wearing of burkas by Muslim women.

Some settings have even banned minarets — the platform on the mosques where the call to prayer emanates. As I mentioned in the last chapter, even Switzerland has had its own minaret oversight and control political wars.

The Second Generation No Longer Assimilates

The traditional pattern for immigration into our own country has been that the first generation of immigrants tends to be tied to their old cultures and then we see the next generations from each wave of immigration joining the new American culture they have moved into. The Melting Pot has been a theme, a dream, a goal, and a functional practice for American immigration.

In Europe — with a very different reality — many of the settings where the second and third generation immigrants live are becoming even more separatist and more militant than the first level of immigrants.

Anger between groups is actually increasing over each generation in a number of settings. In a number of cases, the anger between the groups is being fed and encouraged by increasingly militant group leaders for the new populations and by political parties in the countries that have taken on various

anti-immigrant tones and themes. Anger feeds anger — and both exist in ways that can cause it to feed on itself in a very damaging way.

Separatist Schools Teach Separation

I heard the exact same story from a professional woman in Brussels and a professional woman in London. They both told me about specific neighbor boys who were Muslim who had been good friends of their family and who had interacted well and often with their own kids for many years.

In each case, the neighbor boys went off to spend a few years in separate Muslim boarding school settings. In each instance, the women told me, the friendly and open boy who left for the school in the fall came back as an angry, militant, and separatist young man in the spring — deeply committed to a changed value system and to a set of interpersonal interactions that were much less accepting of their prior friends and prior relationships.

Both of the women who told me those stories were clearly sad, more than a little frustrated, and basically and deeply discouraged by those experiences.

"I miss the boy who used to live next door," one of them told me. "He isn't the person who returned."

Some of the more significant street violence that occurred in the riots of London was created by the second and even third generation immigrants — clearly more driven by growing anger about instinctive us/them issues than by a sense of being personally tied in a positive, collective, and increasingly inclusive way to the people of Great Britain.

The current sense of "Us" that is being created for the sets of people who are being influenced by separatist leaders in their groups clearly is now creating linkages for many people with more of an international "Us" instead of being linked with a local and neighborhood "Us."

The new sense of people in local minority status bonding with an international "Us" is often now very directly religion linked. The wars in Iraq and

Afghanistan were often cited by the rioters in London as a cause for their anger and as a trigger for their violence.

Those wars were presented by the rioters as being wars against the Muslim faith and not as tribal wars in distant settings. Those specific riot triggers and motivation factors were not anchored by local wars that had happened on British soil. Iraq and Afghanistan are many miles from London.

The relevant "Us" linkage that was being felt and embraced by those angry people who were rioting in those London streets was clearly not based on a local definition of us and them.

Paris Had 150 "No Go" Sites for Police

In Paris, a couple of years ago, the division between the groups was so intense that the police labeled 150 sites in that city as "No Go" sites for French police — 150 sites in their own city that police of Paris would not enter alone on their own volition.

The implications of having local police limiting themselves to a large number of "No Go" sites in Paris ought to make us all sad.

Other countries in Europe are facing similar problems. Germany has millions of workers from Turkey, and there have been significant tensions, hostilities, and some damaging behaviors in that setting for those workers and their communities. Austria has similar sets of problems — and a right wing, anti-immigrant group has picked up votes in elections there.

Belgium May Be Kept Together to Face a Common Enemy

Belgium is a place where ethnic conflict and intergroup stress points have been a major factor for a very long time — but the ethnic conflicts in Belgium have been home grown and very local. As noted earlier, Belgium has long been split into two very different ethnic groups — each with their own language, culture, and turf.

The separate groups in Belgium too often seem to have direct levels of animosity against each other. I have interacted with people from Belgium for years and I was initially surprised at some of the stress and the dislike levels that exist there between the groups.

One fairly senior executive told me 20 years ago — "If I had a heart attack driving through their territory, I would put my briefcase on the gas pedal of my car before I passed out in hopes that my car would get me back to one of our medical sites."

I asked him if he was afraid of being damaged by "their" caregivers. He said – "I don't know. But I don't want to take the risk." He was a reasonable, practical, and logical man — and he very clearly had his own us/them instincts driving his thought processes about his local "Them."

Talking to two Belgians, a decade ago, I asked a question and one said — "I don't know. I will call the office. My German-speaking staff will still be there and they can answer. The French speakers, I am sure, went home long ago."

The French-speaking Belgian then said to me, "That is probably true. The French are much smarter and quicker and probably got their work done. The Germans are a bit slower and they are still trying to catch up."

They both smiled as they responded. Both responses seemed to me to be a bit mean-spirited. That was clearly not a couple of people who enjoyed being in a bi-cultural environment.

In the vein of — "The Enemy of My Enemy is My Friend" — it is possible that the influx of immigrants from non-European settings might help the currently divided original ethnic groups of Belgium now decide to unite as allies with each other in some ways against what might easily be perceived to be a shared threat.

That whole process will be fascinating to watch. Will a common enemy unite Belgium?

Europe Did Not Set Up Refugee Camps

In any case, the impact of immigration on Europe is having a huge impact on every country on the continent — and it is an impact that can easily be predicted in each setting by anyone who understands how our relevant packages of instincts work.

The countries in Africa, Asia, and the Middle East who are setting up very clearly defined and regulated refugee camps for their various involuntary immigrants have made one set of intergroup decisions. Those refugees in those camps may be doomed to a life of isolation and separation. Each of those sets of decisions will have its own rollout into a highly challenging intergroup future for each of those sites. The us/them intergroup strategies they are using now in each refugee setting are clear. The new people are being intentionally isolated.

Europe is facing much more challenging situations then the countries who are keeping refugees in camps because Europe is allowing large numbers of immigrating people from multiple countries to live in their cities and to ultimately end up as permanent residents of each European countries.

Each Country Needs an Internal Alignment Plan

At this point, that whole series of events is happening without the countries of Europe having a good and grounded plan to deal with those relevant issues. The issues tend to be too politically volatile and too ideologically challenging for people in those governments to move past reaction to pro-action and strategic response.

Each of those countries now needs their own immigration response plan to keep matters in each country from getting worse.

The countries of Europe will now each need to figure out how to be multi-ethnic at a very new level. To stop the riots and to defuse the intergroup anger, the leaders of each country will need to figure out how to create internal alignment for their growing diversity at some functional national level and to create less us/them instinct activation at each local level.

That will not happen on its own. Strategies are needed in each setting — and leaders who understand instinctive behaviors will be needed to create strategies that have a good chance of successes.

Alignment Plans Do Not Exist

Well-designed efforts to create those needed levels of internal alignment between the increasingly diverse populations in those countries are not underway now in very many of those settings.

The divided and angry groups that we see in multiple European settings tend to be far down the slippery slope to instinctive us/them behaviors, thought processes, and emotions — with some people in some settings damaging other people and feeling good about their own negative and damaging partisan behavior.

Partisan behavior — trying to win as a group and trying to do bad things to the other group — is a very seductive set of instinctive emotions. Too much of Europe now has those high risk and dysfunctional levels of energy in play.

Emotions are being fed in those settings in dangerous ways. Doing bad can feel good. People who have their intergroup instincts activated in a dangerous way can feel a kind of exhilaration in doing things to harm whoever they perceive to be "Them."

We need to wean people away from those behaviors when people have those thought processes and belief systems steering their lives.

The World Is a Mess — Modern Technology and Primal Behaviors

Overall, as I looked at all of the issues being created by immigration and by the ending of colonialism and the ending of the Soviet Union control mechanisms and by an upsurge in the levels of negative religion-linked intergroup interactions, it was clear to me that we live in a very troubled modern age and that we are being influenced in very primal and basic ways by ancient instincts and by ancient patterns of behavior.

We need to understand how that entire set of issues is playing out in all of those other countries because we need to use that knowledge to keep those kinds of intergroup reactions from damaging us here.

We need to be very honest with ourselves about what is really happening in those other settings. We will not be able to steer our own people to Peace until we understand clearly what is going on in the rest of the world.

The next chapter describes that situation in those other countries in more detail — outlining sets of problems by groups of nations with the goal of us both seeing our own pathway to intergroup Peace in America and avoiding being damaged by the intergroup stress points, angers, and conflicts that define so much of today's world. As I put all of the pieces together for all of those countries — and as I looked at the directions that historical developments are steering us — I come to a very clear conclusion.

The world is a mess.

We are at risk.

We need to understand why we are at risk — and we need to know what we can do about it.

I have been terrified many times looking at the truly cruel and damaging behaviors that happen in our own country and around the world when people in any setting activate our worst intergroup behaviors and get swept up in their momentum and negative energy flow.

We need to rise above those issues here in very intentional and deliberate ways. We need to not let ourselves because just another multi-tribal nation at war with itself.

There are too many of those nations now.