

Chapter Thirteen — Our History Included Inventing “White”

And Using “White” To Discriminate

Our country has a long history that has been massively affected in both positive and negative ways by our us/them intergroup instincts. The impact of those instincts stretches back — without interruption — to the dawn of our history.

Basic sets of intergroup instincts were clearly relevant for local intergroup behavior in all intergroup settings long before the Europeans invaded the American continents, and those sets of instincts have continued to be relevant to our behavior in all of our settings today.

“Invaded” is the right term to use to describe what the Europeans did to the American continents.

As a first basic intergroup historical point that we should all recognize, we need to be clear about the fact that America was not “discovered” by Columbus or by any other European explorer.

There were millions of people living here when those first small ships full of explorers arrived on those shores from Europe. You can’t “discover”

a place that has already been populated by millions of people for thousands of years.

America was invaded — not discovered.

Tribal Behaviors Have Been Bloody In The Americas

When the first European boats reached shore on the American continents, they arrived at a place that was not only inhabited — it was inhabited by people who lived their lives and functioned every day in the context of clearly defined groups and tribes.

Each part of those continents was claimed, owned, and inhabited by people from literally hundreds of local tribes on the day that the first Europeans landed on those shores.

Every tribe had its history, culture, and clear sense of tribal territory and turf.

At the time of the European invasion, the tribes who lived here each had their own group identity and sense of group destiny — and they all tended to be in a state of at least mild conflict and historic intergroup division relative to the other tribes that were adjacent to each of them.

A look at the history of people who were living on this continent for thousands of years before the Europeans arrived tells us that there were significant and long-standing inter-tribal animosities happening in many settings. It was clear that there had been significant inter-tribal conflict and bloodshed at multiple points for very long periods of time in our pre-European collective American past.

So the Europeans did not invent tribal conflict for either North or South America. Before anyone from Europe arrived on those shores, we had many Native American tribes who lived in their own distinct tribal territories. Those territories spread across both American continents. The tribes who lived in all of those settings had at least some history of defending their territories against incursion and invasion by other tribes.

There were tribes everywhere. Tribes here did exactly what tribes do everywhere that tribes exist. Those tribes who lived on those continents all tended to have conflicted relations with the other tribes in their relevant geographic areas.

The Sioux and the Ojibwa and the Apache and the Navaho peoples each had their long-standing inter tribal wars and inter-tribal battles with the tribes that were contiguous to them. The tribal battles in North America

seldom rose to genocidal levels, but the behaviors of the Aztecs and the Incas in the Southern half of the hemisphere sometimes included wide scale patterns of intertribal conflict that involved significant shedding of intergroup blood. Those local conflicts in some of those settings sometimes did achieve genocidal proportions.

The European tribes who began invading both American continents roughly 500 years ago, did not invent intergroup conflict and they did not introduce intergroup bloodshed to those continents.

But, at least in North America, the invaders from Europe significantly escalated the level of local intergroup conflict that actually existed in those settings at that point in history.

They took the intergroup conflict levels that were happening in North America from long-standing border skirmishes and small-scale intergroup battles that were happening sporadically between local Native American tribes into functional episodes of pure genocidal behavior involving very intentional ethnic cleansing processes that were very deliberately conducted by the invading European tribes against the original sets of Native American tribes.

Guilt-Free And Damaging Us/Them Behaviors Happened

Across Two Continents

The intergroup behaviors that happened in those settings invoked some of the very worst functions and features of our most basic and primal us/them instinct packages. Guilt-free damage was done by the European invaders to people they perceived to be “Them” across both continents.

The European invaders attacked, abused, displaced, damaged, massacred, and sometimes literally obliterated entire groups of people. The invaders from Europe actually erased the existence of a number of original Native American tribes.

Invasion Was Called “Colonization”

There were several European countries who sent people to join in that American continent invasion and displacement process. The people from Europe referred to their invasion process as “Colonization.”

Each set of Europeans created their own colonies in the Americas and then each European country populated their colonies with people from their own European tribe.

The Native American tribes who had lived for centuries in most of the invaded settings were simply forced to leave.

In some cases, the displaced peoples were given new lands to live on. Our Native American Reservation system originated from that process.

The process of intentional displacement was extremely consistent across wide areas and it was very effective as a strategy for the Europeans. The European settlers and their descendants systematically stole the original turf of the Native tribes and unilaterally forced the original tribes into limited reserved territories that functioned as their new permanent homes.

Long-Standing Battles Kept The Original Tribes From Jointly And Collectively Resisting Invasion

The fact that the original Native American tribes who were here at the time of the invasion each tended to have their own local long standing intertribal wars going on with other local tribes in each area unfortunately made those original tribes functionally vulnerable.

Those long-standing intertribal animosities made the original tribes less able to form sufficiently powerful local alliances and joint efforts of

various kinds that might have had the power to collectively resist the European invaders and defeat them back in the earliest days of the invasion.

That reluctance, unwillingness, and functional inability of the original tribes to band together with their old tribal enemies to collectively face a common new tribal enemy made those legacy American tribes significantly more vulnerable to the purely intertribal aggression that was executed and implemented across all of North America by the invaders from Europe.

If the original Native American tribes had simply banded together in the early days against the European invaders, they probably could have driven the Europeans back into the sea. That unity never happened, because the original tribes were generally all at war with each other at that point in time.

Some of those Native American tribes actually helped the Europeans in various settings fight the other original tribes in their area. That tended to happen in a few settings where the legacy tribe believed it could do damage to a historical enemy by creating an alliance of some sort with the Europeans.

The European Tribes Used To Be At War With Each Other In Europe

The European invaders of those continents initially brought their own European tribal behaviors and their own traditional intertribal conflicts and intergroup animosities with them from Europe.

All of the European tribes had a long history of being at war with each other as tribes in Europe. The French, the English, the Spanish, and the Dutch settlers all initially carried their original European intertribal animosities to these shores.

Some relatively small local wars actually were fought here in several settings along those historic Euro-tribal lines.

The French and the English invaders of North America had the most significant European legacy bloody intertribal battles here. The war that Americans call the French and Indian War was fought shortly before the American Revolutionary War. The English and French did battle in several American locations. The French actually had several Native American tribes as allies in that war.

The tribes who sided with the French in those conflicts were not regarded well later by the English and fledgling American forces who won the wars and ended up in control of the territory.

In any case, those battles between the various invading Euro tribes did not continue over time in North America, because the English tribe tended to end up relatively quickly to be the dominant tribe for the eastern half of the North American continent.

The English tribe ended up with control over most of the turf that had been claimed as colonial turf by the other various tribal invasions from Europe. The descendants of the colonial invaders from the other European countries who lived in those territories almost all ended up recognizing the English victory and speaking English as their daily language.

The European Tribes In This Country Intermarried

So the original set of European intertribal behaviors and European intergroup conflicts that had created centuries of very purely intertribal war in Europe actually melted away as relevant issues in this country for all of the colonists and their descendants over a relatively brief period of time. The

sets of invaders from all of European tribes functionally melded into a new American/European tribe.

Those old Euro-tribe battles faded in this country in part because the people from most of the separate European tribes actually had no separate tribal turf to defend and occupy here once England won control over that portion of the continent.

They also faded in part because the people from all of those European tribes tended to intermarry once they immigrated to America, and because people in all of the colonies began speaking English instead of Dutch or German or French as their daily language.

That process created a new “us.” Their blended descendants from those intermarriages and that shared language group identified themselves as Americans instead of continuing to perceive themselves as tribal Europeans with their primary personal legacy linkage going back to one of the European cultures.

Intermarriage tends to soften, mitigate, and even eliminate the impact and relevance of purely intertribal conflicts. That behavior pattern of making

the old tribal conflicts functionally irrelevant is particularly true for the second and third generation descendants of those intermarriages.

Intermarriage And A Common Language Made Tribal

Conflicts Fade

It's functionally very hard to maintain an ancestral animosity between the descendants of an historic German tribe and the descendants of an historic French tribe when people from both tribes stopped speaking their ancestral European tribal languages, gave up their tribal European cultural practices and allegiances, and started intermarrying with people from the other tribes.

It is logistically challenging – and sometimes impossible — for a child who is half French and half German to take sides with either Prussia or Paris in an intertribal dispute.

The single most important factor that supported the personal slide for those new Americans away from their old European tribal allegiances and tribal alignments was the fact that the immigrants to this country from Europe overwhelmingly tended to give up their legacy European tribal language in favor of speaking English.

With the exception of a couple of fairly well-known enclaves of French immigrants and with the exception of those people in the former Spanish colonial territories who continued to speak Spanish, the new tribal language for the new tribe of people who lived in North America — almost everywhere — became English.

The legal documents for the new country and the various governmental units were all written in English. The government was run in English. The new public school systems taught English as the only language taught in public schools.

Some of the churches that had been imported from the “old country” by the immigrants to this country continued to have their services in Swedish or Norwegian or Dutch — but even those churches tended to give up their legacy European language in a relatively short time in order to meet the needs of their next generation of church members who needed to hear sermons in English in order to understand the services.

A New Melded Ethnic Group Emerged

A new ethnic group resulted in this country from that pattern of intermarriage and from that collective conversion of people in each setting to

speaking a shared common language. That new ethnic group functionally eliminated linkages and allegiance to each of the prior European tribes when all of the people here from all of those tribes simply began speaking English.

Many of the new immigrants from European countries even very intentionally refused to teach their own children to speak their own native Italian or Norwegian or Gaelic languages. They made that decision to abandon their legacy language because the new immigrants generally each personally wanted to become American and they very much wanted their children to be seen as Americans and to be fully American as quickly as possible.

The sight and sound issues that trigger our us/them intergroup instincts were significantly reduced and mitigated when everyone in each community sounded and looked the same. The second generation and the third generation intermarried descendants of the European immigrants all looked very much alike and, once they all began to speak English, they also all sounded very much alike.

There were some — and still are some — regional variations in this country in the way English is spoken. The English speakers of Mississippi and the English speakers of Maine each have their own clear and distinctive

local linguistic characteristics — and even those relatively minor differences in the language used by people can cause some sense of intergroup schisms and divisions between those particular sets of people.

But overall, the new tribal language for the people in this country was English. Only English. English became the defining language for being “American.”

The New Group of People Was Called “White”

The functional result of those behaviors was that the extensively intermarried, English speaking, light-skinned descendants of all of those old European tribes created a brand new Euro-American group in this country.

The new group name that was used for those blended sets of people was either American or White. That new group was a very important historical development for this country.

The creation of that new group in specific geographic areas had a huge impact on the activation of us/them instincts in those areas — because it created a brand new “us” and because it left the people who either looked different or sounded different out of the new “us.”

It is important for us to understand that history and the invention of “White” as an “us” group in order for us to collectively succeed at The Art of Intergroup Peace today. “White” was an important invention. We need to understand “White.”

White became a very useful descriptive and bonding term for the majority group in this country. White became, and soon was, the new tribal name for all of those people who lived here, spoke English, and had European ancestors.

White Is An American Invention

White was basically an American invention. White doesn’t exist with any frequency as a functional group descriptor for most of the rest of the world.

People in Africa and Asia today who make reference to people who look white seldom use that specific term or label to describe any person. They almost always use each person’s European tribal name to describe any Europeans — not their racial name or their skin color name.

The local people in Asia and Africa usually refer to each person with European ancestry they describe by using their actual European tribal name — describing people as being Russian or Dutch or Danish.

They use the tribal name for those people because those national names are the most relevant and functionally useful descriptors for those people in those settings.

The skin color tends to be somewhat irrelevant as a descriptor. The actual tribes and the actual national connections for each person are, however, often important. The people in Asia or Africa or the Middle East generally find it more useful to describe someone as Irish or as Belgium than to describe them as “white.”

Likewise, the people who still lived in Europe at the time of the colonization of America did not have a history of referring to themselves as white. They seldom used that term before coming to the U.S.

Europe has always been very tribal. Obsessively tribal. People from each of the European tribes in Europe always used their specific tribal names to label themselves in their old settings.

Those people from those European tribes did not blend their identity by skin color. Norwegians, Swedes, and Danes each very much insisted on being identified by their own group name and each of those groups had no reason to refer to themselves as being White — even though some Scandinavians might be physically the whitest group in Europe.

Europeans Use Their Own Tribal Names In Europe

People in most European countries today continue to tend to refer to themselves and to other Europeans by each person's individual ethnic tribal name — not by their skin color.

That purely ethnic and historic tribal-based labeling is changing to some degree in some European settings today as the new immigration realities that exist are bringing more people with other skin colors and other racial backgrounds into those European communities.

But that particular skin color diversity situation in most of Europe is a very recent development. The term “White” wasn't needed in the past and it wasn't useful for any significant functional, economic, or political issues in those countries. So white has not commonly been used in Europe as a group name to describe or differentiate anyone in any country.

But in our country, White was used as a very functional group label and White became an important term of distinction — a group differentiation label that was subsequently defined by law and then protected by statute, practice, and custom.

White became relevant as a descriptor and as a differentiating functional tribal name in America because significant numbers of people in this country were not white — and because the white majority in this country wanted — for various intergroup benefit reasons — to make a clear distinction between the white and the non-white groups of people...between us and them.

Slavery Was A Horrible, Disgusting, Evil, Sinful, Ugly, And Inhumane Way To Treat Human Beings

The primary reason for using the term “White” in a legal sense is a reason that should generate a sense of sorrow and fully substantiated shame for our country.

Slavery was the key reason this country invented the term “White.”

A major reason for the people in power in the early days of this country to make that “White” distinction so clear in legal and functional

contexts was to help define who could and could not be enslaved. Slavery existed, and key people in power wanted slavery to continue to exist.

The slaves who were in this country 300 years ago had almost all been brought to this country from Africa. That meant that the people who were in slavery in this country at that point in time tended to be black and not White.

White people were not enslaved. White people could be held as indentured servants for defined periods of time, but White people could not legally be enslaved.

Black people, however, could be legally enslaved.

So there was a very important legal and economic reason for the use of “White” as a differentiating term and as a definitional descriptor and group label. That term identified who could and could not be enslaved.

That label was a way of defining both “us” and “them” in a context where the negative behaviors that can stem from those instincts could be targeted and limited to a clearly defined “them.” Using that label was part of a deliberate process of embedding some of the most negative impacts of those intergroup instincts into our laws.

The Process Was Functional And The Intent Was Clear

It was actually possible to look very white and to still be a slave and be legally black in this country. That was obviously illogical as an approach for multiple biological reasons — but that practice and that set of definitions had very clear us/them economic, ethical, and instinctive underpinnings.

The laws that were passed to deal with those specific issues and to maintain the property status of slaves said even “one drop of black blood” was enough to define you legally as being black and therefore subject to the legal status of being a slave.

The goal was to institutionalize a specific category and definition of “Them,” and there was no attempt to be fair or logical in any way relative to the treatment of “Them.”

The goal was actually to facilitate negative behavior relative to that “Them.”

Slavery was a horrible, despicable, cruel, disgusting, evil, sinful, ugly, absolutely inhumane way of treating human beings. It is a particularly shameful part of our American history.

People were bought and sold like cattle. People who were enslaved were abused, damaged, degraded, defiled, functionally imprisoned, and

forced against their will to do demeaning, demoralizing, and sometimes dehumanizing things. That behavior happened because the laws of this country gave the people who were defined legally as being white the power to do those evil things to the people in this country who were defined legally to be black.

Some Native Americans Were Enslaved As Well

Slavery was very literally a black/white issue for our country. Slavery has existed in many countries over the course of history. It has had different definition for who could be enslaved in a wide range of settings.

In most parts of the early history of civilization, conquered people could be and were enslaved. In some settings, entire groups of people were defined to be eligible for slavery. Russia had serfs. Ancient Rome, Ancient Greece, and Ancient Persia all had large numbers of enslaved people.

Somewhat broader versions of slavery existed even in other areas of the American hemisphere. The versions of slavery that were created in the Caribbean and in some parts of South America were extended by the European invaders of those countries to legally include the local Native American tribes in those areas as slaves.

Captured Native Americans were sold in some settings by the European invaders as slaves.

Some tribes of Native Americans in some parts of South America and in the Caribbean Islands were actually destroyed entirely by being enslaved.

Columbus, himself, personally started that process. He did it for money. He used the sale of captured slaves from Native American tribes as a source of funding for his ventures. He enslaved human beings and he actually destroyed entire tribes of people in the process on some of the islands he invaded.

The role Columbus played in our history is discussed in more detail in other books in the intergroup trilogy, but there is no doubt that Christopher Columbus personified some of the worst us/them instinctive behaviors that exist. It is clear that his invasions of those lands and this hemisphere exemplified intergroup cruelty and a complete and utter lack of conscience relative to his treatment of “Them.”

Columbus did truly horrible things to whoever he perceived to be “Them.” Enslaving Native Americans was a key part of his legacy.

That practice of enslaving Native Americans was not, however, part of the history of the United States or of North America.

In our own country, the Native American tribes who lived here were not enslaved. Native Americans in our own country were displaced, exiled, abused, disenfranchised, and sometimes killed — but those tribes were not enslaved.

Slavery In North America Was Limited To One Group

Slavery in North America tended to be limited to those people who were legally defined to be black — and not white — and black was defined to be people who had ancestry of any degree from Africa.

So white as a group name was a differentiating term of convenience in this country that actually had legal status because it was a tool that was used for many years to help people enslave other human beings.

Our history on that issue has a lot of elements that we should be deeply ashamed of and sad about as part of our national heritage.

Our national heritage on intergroup issues gives us a very mixed legacy.

We have been saints and we have been sinners. Our total history as a nation has its wonderful and enlightened elements that we should honor and celebrate and it has elements of pure evil that we should reject and mourn.

On one hand, our ancestors created a land of wonderful opportunity for many people. The American Dream was based on enlightened principals. The American Dream was very real for very large percentages of the people who lived here and those people have benefited immensely.

On the other hand, many people who lived in that same land of opportunity and freedom have been intentionally denied access to the American Dream for hundreds of years. At our worst levels, some of our people in this country were forced in extremely evil, degrading, cruel, and unconscionable ways to be the property of other people.

Slavery was actually legal in this country. That was true for a very long time.

Slavery Was Not Unique To America

America did not invent slavery.

Slavery is not unique to America or to American history. Slavery has been happening in many settings and cultures for a very long time. The Bible refers to slaves in both Israel and Egypt.

Every country in Africa and Asia and Europe had slaves. Rome had very large numbers of slaves — many enslaved by force of arms as the result of Roman conquests and then kept as slaves for generations. The same history and that same set of enslavement practices were true for Greece, India, China, Egypt, and ancient Persia.

Slavery has been a common practice across many countries — and slavery has been an us/them ultimate behavior in every setting where it has been practiced.

The Norsemen who settled Iceland did it with slave women they purchased in Ireland on the way to Iceland. Those women on those tiny ships did not go voluntarily to that cold and inhospitable climate. They went as property.

Ireland once had thriving slave markets. So did Rome and Damascus.

So slavery happened just about everywhere on the planet. The truth is that all people have slave ancestors.

Having slave ancestors is not unique to Black Americans. The logistical facts are — as a result of that very long history of slavery that was in place in all of those settings for so many years across the entire planet — that the basic genetic truth and the shared genetic legacy is that every single one of us actually has slave ancestors from one setting or another.

There is no logistical way — given the full historical extent of slavery for so many people that extended across all of Europe, Asia, the Middle East, and Africa for so many years — for any of us Americans of any race that originated in other parts of the world not to have some ancestors who were owned as property as either serfs or slaves.

The only possible exception to people who live in those continents today who might not have at least some direct ancestors who were slaves might functionally be some people who are purely Native American.

Many of the tribes that existed on this continent before the European invasions actually did have some partial history of intergroup slavery. That early slavery was usually based on the intergroup capture of people from other tribes in times of tribal war.

But some of those original American tribes had no significant history of slavery — so it is possible that some people in this country who are purely Native American and who have no ancestors from Europe, Africa, or Asia might have that rare legacy of having no slave ancestors. It is also possible that some of the indigenous people who now live in some of the more remote areas of South America have no slave ancestors.

Slavery did exist on both American continents before the Europeans invaded, however. The Incas and the Aztecs and the other locally dominant tribes in South and Central America all tended to enslave the people from the tribes they conquered.

The slavery in some South American settings even involved using captured and enslaved people as human sacrifices at some religious events.

So, it is highly likely that even the people from those relevant areas of our two continents probably each also have some slave ancestors as well.

Slavery Is Not An Issue Where Forgiveness Is Possible

Slavery is, in any case, clearly not unique to this country nor was it invented here. But slavery was a major part of our history and the intergroup

consequences of that slavery still have echoes in our intergroup perceptions and our intergroup interactions today.

Those issues are relevant to *The Art of Intergroup Peace* because the intergroup anger that has been a long-term consequence of that slavery still makes it difficult for some people to achieve unencumbered interpersonal or intergroup interactions today.

That legacy of anger about that history of slavery can create some real barriers to some of the interpersonal and intergroup interactions that we need today that can benefit us all in the cause of Peace.

We need to be able to deal with those specific issues, understand their history, acknowledge their horror, and not have them cripple us today in our interactions.

The goal is not to somehow forget or forgive slavery. Slavery is not an issue where “forgiveness” is possible. No one should forgive anyone for owning slaves.

Slavery was a sin and it isn't a sin to be forgiven.

We should not, however, blame the descendants of slave-owners today for their ancestors' sins.

The sin of owning slaves is not at all genetic. The sin of slavery, itself, is neither hereditary nor ancestral. It is a functional sin... committed by a person as a reality of their actual lives.

That sin of owning slaves is both direct and situational. It is a sin of personal and direct commission.

That sin relates to the people who owned slaves and it very directly relates situationally to those people. Slavery was very situational when it happened and it is historical now.

Slave ownership is not a current sin that is being committed today by anyone who is alive in our country today.

Some other countries on this planet still do have some slaves. There are actually large numbers of slaves in various settings in the world today. In some parts of the world, additional people are being enslaved in intergroup conflicts.

Some countries still have entire groups of people who have been enslaved for generations.

The United Nations tries to deal with those issues in the places where they are realities and has had varying levels of success. So slavery does

continue to exist. Slaves by birth and slaves by capture do exist today elsewhere in the world.

There are none here now, however, and there have been no slaves here in this country since the Civil War.

Guilt Should Be Assigned To Slave Owners

We very much need to affix a sense of guilt directly and explicitly on the ancestors who actually were slave owners. But we should not assign the legacy of that guilt to any descendants of those slave owners as personal guilt today for those people with slave owning ancestors. We should not assign guilt or blame for slavery today to any living people who have not personally committed that sin.

That point is mentioned in *The Art of Intergroup Peace* because some people do believe that we should assign ancestral guilt to people, and that we should now delegate ancestral guilt in some way to the people in this country who have slave-owning ancestors.

Some people believe that if your ancestor committed a sin, you should be blamed today for that sin.

That thought process doesn't increase personal accountability. It dilutes and diminishes personal accountability. If we believe that each of us should be accountable for what each of us does — that creates a direct link between our behaviors and our accountability.

We need that link to exist. We each need to be accountable for what we do.

Any assignment of ancestral guilt to non-slave owning people who are alive today and who have slave owning ancestors doesn't actually link guilt in an accountability-based way to the specific behavior that should trigger guilt in a person who is alive today.

We Need To Set A Standard Of Personal Accountability

If a major goal for our behavior today is personal accountability — and if we believe that each person today is accountable for using their intellect and values now to make enlightened and ethical choices about our own behaviors now — then we need to keep guilt at a very personal and direct level for each person, and we need to base guilt on each person's personal behaviors.

The Art of Peace believes in personal accountability at a core level. Each one of us is affected and influenced by our instincts and by our cultures. We need to each make our own choices about our own behaviors and we each need to be accountable for the choices we make.

We each need to be personally accountable for our own personal behaviors. Ancestral guilt is not a logistical component of that context of direct personal accountability.

Assigning a level of ancestor-based link to guilt for slave owning behavior to people who never personally committed that sin could actually be a barrier to some needed relationships today. We need people to be able to interact with other people and we need to not allow the behaviors of ancestors for any of our people to impede the 1-to-1 relationships that we need to have between people living here today. Assigning ancestral guilt to people who have never owned slaves because of their direct ancestors' behavior could impede the functional levels of intergroup interactions that we need in a number of settings today.

Ancestral Guilt Is A Seductive Concept

Ancestral guilt feels like it should exist to some people. Ancestral guilt, as a concept, feels right to a number of people.

Our most basic and customary us/them thinking approaches at least partially supports that thought process.

We tend to think of people as groups and we tend to lump people in groups based on their appearance. It particularly feels like some level of guilt should exist for some people today for that set of sins because some people today look, as a group, very much like the people who owned slaves. That linkage to those old slave owners seems even more powerful if those people are, in fact, actually descended from those slave owners.

We tend to lump people together in broad groups when we do our us/them thinking. It can be easy and it can feel right to simply lump people together in a longitudinal linkage over multiple generations on that specific issue.

That is not the most appropriate way of assigning guilt to people if we want guilt to be a working tool to directly influence people's current behavior.

Guilt and blame both need to be based on actual behaviors and guilt needs to be both real and relevant to a person when specific behaviors by that person warrant that guilt.

Assigned guilt or designated guilt or ancestral guilt has less value as a motivator of actual behaviors than personal behavior-based guilt.

That sense of ancestral guilt being relevant to people today is an issue we need to successfully address now as clearly as we can, because that concept can cloud our thinking about interpersonal and intergroup relationships today, and it doesn't help us solve and resolve the real intergroup issues we need to resolve today.

Us/Them Instincts Have More Impact Today Than A Legacy Of Slavery

The functional instinct packages and the basic set of instincts that allowed slavery to happen and that caused slavery to be defended when it happened in this country are more important to us, at this point in time, than our pure history of slavery.

Slavery happened. It was horrible. It was unconscionable. It was evil. And it was ended.

Our us/them instincts, however, have not ended. We still all have those same us/them instincts today that allowed our predecessors as Americans to own slaves and that allowed the tribal invaders from Europe to purge and expel our Native American tribes from their ancestral turf.

Our us/them instincts clearly have a much greater immediate impact on our intergroup behaviors and intergroup interactions today than any residue legacy impact that spills over at some level from our history of slavery.

We are each under the influence of our basic instincts to divide the world into “us” and “them.”

When we do that dividing, we need to understand that we all tend to act and feel differently about whoever is a “them”. That set of intergroup reactions will potentially be triggered in this country as long as people in this country have the ability to differentiate between any groups of people.

As noted earlier, we build and identify us/them distinctions all the time — and we will continue to do that as long as we have the instincts we have, and as long as there are potential group instinct activation factors in any setting.

We Need A Fresh Start And We Need To Recognize The Damage And The Pain

At one level, we need a restart — with everyone from all groups committing to the basic enlightened values of an American Us and then agreeing to do what needs to be done to make that collective approach and those shared values a success.

We need a fresh start and we need clarity about what we collectively believe in order to make that happen. We need to base that fresh start for America on a clear sense of where we are now and on a clear sense of our collective interest in creating mutual success and intergroup Peace.

We now need to go forward as a people to build the right set of relationships and the right set of behaviors in a win/win context. But we need to recognize the reality of the damage and the pain that was created for groups of people for our entire history by many of our old, less enlightened, behaviors.

Sun Tzu said that the heads of armies need to recognize the full situation each army is in in order to create a winning strategy going forward.

That need to clearly understand the full situation we are actually in today on intergroup issues is very true for Art of Peace as well.

“White” Became A New “Us”

A basic point we do all need to understand is the undisputed historical fact that White Americans created a new blended intertribal group called White Americans. We all need to recognize the fact that White Americans have defined the majority group of people in this country for the last couple of centuries.

As described earlier, the “White” group has tended, in many ways, to discriminate against each of the various other ethnic groups and racial groups that found themselves to be in minority status in this country. Us/them instinctive behaviors have clearly massively influenced the actions of that “White” group.

The various laws and behaviors that favored white people at the expense of our other groups of people are a clear part of our collective history. We need to recognize that there has been significant prejudice and discrimination against each and all of the minority groups in this country who either look or sound different from the White American us.

There Has Been Discrimination Against All Groups Other Than White

Asian American, Hispanic Americans, and every other group of Americans with different skin colors or physical features than the majority group American White tribe have faced clear and damaging levels of discrimination.

We need to acknowledge the pain and damage created by those behaviors for all of the affected segments of the people of this country. We can't ignore those overall patterns of intergroup discrimination in our history.

We need to look clearly at how those instincts have influenced our historical behaviors. We need to understand why we have segregated and isolated so many of our minority groups in so many deliberate ways.

We need to recognize that the white invaders of this continent drove the Native Americans in almost all settings from their lands into reservations.

The first sets of Hispanic settlers and invaders in many areas of the country who had themselves often actually dispossessed earlier generations

of Native Americans generally found themselves, in turn, dispossessed of their lands when the new American country founded in the English speaking colonies took control over the continent.

The Hispanic Americans who had created their own colonial-triggered communities in many parts of the country were generally politically disenfranchised when those lands that had first been invaded by Spain and by France later became part of the United States.

Later generations of Spanish speaking people who were living in those areas tended to be disenfranchised in that national expansion process by the new White Americans moved into the regions and who spoke English as their tribal language.

Us/them behaviors and us/them values were evident everywhere in all of the settings where Hispanic Americans lived.

Several newer sets of Hispanic Americans have also immigrated to this country in relatively recent times. High percentages of the new Hispanic Americans have no historic link to those early “settlers” on this continent or to the first waves of us/them prejudicial behaviors that happened in various parts of the country.

Each Hispanic Group Has Its Own Legacy

Each current group of Hispanic Americans has its own history, legacy, and cultural alignments. As noted in the chapter about various categories of intergroup alignments, the various Hispanic groups that exist in this country are not identical and do not represent a single culture or group functionality.

Hispanic is a very broad label that includes very diverse components. It is very different to be Mexican American, Cuban American, or Puerto Rican.

All of those groups tend to be labeled today under the Hispanic group category — but each of those groups has its own culture, history, and identity as a set of people.

Each Hispanic group also has its own very real set of discriminatory stories to tell. Those painful and consistent stories of discrimination are also not identical, but they all have the same basic components of intergroup damage and major intergroup difficulties, prejudices, and problems.

That exact same history and pattern of discrimination against other groups of people has been true for the people who have immigrated here

from China, India, Vietnam, and from all of the other non-White areas of the world that have given us immigrants.

We have been a nation of immigrants, and the immigrants in this country have arrived here from a wide variety of sources.

The acceptance level for the immigrants has varied widely — based on the us/them intergroup instinct packages that have been relevant to each group.

Prejudice Against New Immigrants

Each set of immigrants from every legacy country has faced its own challenges in this country in ways that could be predicted by anyone who understands how us/them instincts work. Sight and sound both trigger those intergroup instincts in all settings, and the consequences that happened for each immigrant group were heavily influenced by those trigger factors.

The same us/them instinctive behaviors that created multiple levels of discrimination against non-white Americans were also all usually activated against the first generation immigrants from each of the European tribes.

The clear prejudice that existed against the first wave of Irish immigrants was very obvious in many settings — as was the clear prejudice

that existed in most areas against the new immigrants from Norway, Poland, and the new arrivals from a number of other European countries.

The same exact two key differentiation triggers — sight and sound — were activated against those first generation immigrants from each of those European countries. Sound was the major differentiation trigger factor for immigrants from those countries.

Those first generation immigrants from each of those countries tended to dress differently than the White Americans. More importantly, they clearly spoke a different language. It was easy to hear that they were not English speaking White Americans. They spoke accented English when they spoke English at all.

Both visual and audible us/them cues and triggers existed for those people and intergroup prejudices and intergroup discrimination were the norm for each group.

That intergroup prejudice generally disappeared relatively quickly for those immigrants who had European ancestors, as soon as those people and their descendants sounded like the American White “us.”

Immigrants Often Trigger The Sight And Sound Instinct

Packages

Looking “different” from the majority group American White “us” has been a main source of intergroup instinctive behaviors for all immigrants who looked “different.”

People from the other non-European groups who sent immigrants to this country continue to look different from the long-standing majority group of White Americans for all of their future generations and that difference in appearance has continued to trigger those instinctive reactions from White Americans.

Immigrants from Asia, the Middle East, Africa, and South America all have increased the complexity of our diversity and all of those groups of people look different from the traditional majority “us.”

Because those people tend to not look like the White American “us” groups, each of those groups has continued to trigger various levels of intergroup instinctive reactions within their own group and in all of the other relevant groups as well.

Those instincts cause people to feel affinity within each group as an “us” and it causes people to have a sense that other groups of people are some level of “Them.”

We need to deal successfully with that issue and with those intergroup reactions as a country. We can do that more effectively when we intellectually recognize what issues and what information consistently triggers our negative us/them instincts.

We need to recognize that our instincts to perceive anyone who looks different from us to be a “Them” create problems — and we need to recognize that we can overcome those us/them thought processes that are based on appearance when we give ourselves another way of defining ourselves as an “us.”

We haven’t tended to create that high level sense of “us” as a deliberate strategy for intergroup interaction in America. We have not realized that we could use that strategy and we have not recognized the need to use that strategy in order to keep us from tribalizing based on our more primal definitions of “us.”

We need to become a “values-based” us.

If we intellectually recognize now that we can use a shared set of values to create a new American “us” that is based on our basic beliefs rather than on our ethnicity or our race, then we can both understand our instinctive behaviors and we can use our intellects and our basic values to make us successful as an entire people in ways that we really do need to be aligned to succeed as a people and a nation.

We Need All Groups To Recognize The Impact Of Instincts

If we take Sun Tzu’s advice and if we clearly understand the terrain we are on relative to these issues, it is clear that we will need to begin by recognizing all of those historical issues going forward.

We need all groups to recognize the impact of “us” instincts on their group and the impact of “them” instincts on their group.

It is clear that people from every group — minority and majority — will benefit significantly by recognizing the impact both of the us/them behaviors that have happened to each group in this country over time and the impact of our us/them emotions and perceptions, legacies and the intergroup challenges that we face in our increasing complexity and growing diversity today.

We need people in this country who are not part of the White group to recognize that the prejudices and the discriminatory practices that have been aimed against each set of people have had deep instinctive roots.

There was not an overall negative master-plan conspiracy that was created to do damage to each of the immigrant groups — but each group clearly triggered its own negative instinctive reactions from White Americans and it is very true that local conspiracies did exist for White Americans in each community, state, and setting in the context of those instinctive intergroup reactions.

We need to collectively understand that all of that consistently discriminatory behavior against all of those groups was less conspiratorial than behavioral — with our primal intergroup instincts sculpting our perceptions and guiding our behaviors.

We need to recognize that those old and damaging behaviors do not need to be either forgiven or forgotten — but we need to do a fresh start now that sets up a fresh context where our behavioral judgments now about how we behave from this point on will be based on our current behaviors.

We Need To Deal With Our Instincts And Make Them An

Asset

Since we have no way of eliminating any of the instincts that have created our history and our culture, the functional truth is that we need to deal with them. We need to make those sets of basic instincts work for us instead of against us. That is a core strategy for The Art of Intergroup Peace.

The truth is, we can use our instincts to achieve our goals or we can allow our instincts to divide and possibly destroy us.

We need to recognize the dangers we face as a nation today. Destruction and impairment as a nation would be the likely outcome of letting ourselves as an increasingly diverse nation be divided in very negative us/them ways and then fall into growing levels of instinct enhanced intergroup conflict.

We need to make all of our instincts work in our favor to achieve Peace and we cannot allow our instincts to sink us into new levels of anger and future levels of conflict at this point in our history.

“White” Is No Longer A Term Of Legal Privilege

As noted earlier, we have made some real progress in multiple areas. We have relatively recently managed to write an array of laws that make discrimination relative to some behaviors illegal.

Slavery, itself, has been gone for more than a century.

We now have declared formally, officially, and legally as a country as a point of national policy for us all that the American Dream and all of the opportunities of this country should extend to all of us — to people from every race or ethnicity who are part of this country.

We need to agree across all groups to now go the next step and we need to remove the key remaining intergroup barriers to progress and behaviors to Peace that still remain.

White is no longer a term of legal privilege. White, however, still differentiates a significant portion of our population. White clearly can still create its own set of positive group-linked opportunities and functional favoritism for people in that group — but White no longer creates official and automatic legal standing or legal advantage in any formal way.

That does not mean that equality has been created. It also does not mean that the old and long standing intergroup angers, tensions, or interaction challenges have disappeared.

We need to deal with our history and we need to carefully guide our intergroup behaviors — and we need to recognize both the anger and the pain that some of those behaviors have created.

We also need to make a collective commitment to having all Americans who commit to the core values of America and who support full inclusion into the American Dream to benefit from being American. We need a win/win commitment and strategy. We need everyone to win.

We Need To Start With An Honest Look At Where We Are

Now — And We Should Acknowledge The Pain

That process of creating win/win solutions and win/win approaches for all groups requires clear communications between the parties involved.

Doing any win/win process well requires an understanding of each party's interests and even an understanding of each party's history and current context by the other parties.

We need to each make the personal commitment in each setting to be creative and supportive of the win/win solutions that we need to build for all groups in all settings.

At this point in time, there is a high level of misunderstanding and even confusion about some major issues that still need to be addressed. We all need to understand those issues and the stress and pain that they still create for many Americans.

White Americans Need To Recognize The Residual Pain

We need White Americans to recognize the reality created by those instinctive behaviors for so many Americans.

For white Americans to go forward today with the goal of building a new American reality of intergroup Peace without recognizing and clearly understanding the collective pain, the collective anger, and the deep unhappiness that has been created in each of the other groups in this country by centuries of discrimination against our Native American, African American, Asian American, and Hispanic peoples, would reduce our likelihood of collective success as we go forward to create that new Peace.

White Americans need to recognize and understand the anger and the stress that is created today by other groups having lower economic resources, less education, higher incarceration rates, and lower life expectancies. Some of the life expectancy issues are addressed in the book *Ending Racial, Ethnic, and Cultural Disparities in American Health Care*.

White Americans need to understand the impact of those realities. White Americans need to recognize those perceptions, those functional group based disappointments, and those negative intergroup behavior patterns.

Our intergroup patterns have created significant levels of intergroup anger that exists today for many people. That sense of anger needs to be respected for what it is, acknowledged as a real set of issues, and then explicitly addressed in the context of creating a collective future that will be better than our collective past.

There Were Saints And Sinners

We can each decide to embrace and celebrate our common humanity. We can each decide to make achieving intergroup Peace and intergroup success a personal goal that guides our beliefs and our behaviors.

We can transcend, understand, and channel our instinctive emotions to the outcomes we want to achieve — and we can use our “Us” based packages of instincts in more inclusive and accepting ways — to bring us all to levels of ethical behavior that we can feel personally proud to have as a reality for our lives.

The truth is that we will need to do that work of inclusion and acceptance intentionally and consciously in order to get us to the levels of Peace between all groups that we need to achieve as a country.

Our legacy and our reality as a very diverse country requires us to acknowledge, understand, and reflect on the historical issues of our diversity and to make decisions now to never again allow ourselves to descend to the levels of treating other people as “Them.”

We need to acknowledge and celebrate our saints and we need to acknowledge, understand, and move beyond the sinners in our collective past.

We need to collectively decide right now not to allow the worst features of that history and the worst elements of that legacy to keep us from achieving Peace today.

We also need to recognize what we need to do to become more effectively inclusive in responding to our increasing diversity today.

Our History Included Some Very Negative And Damaging

Us/Them Behaviors

We have put some of the basic pieces that are needed to be the groundwork for Peace in place. Now we need to go the next step and make intergroup Peace our goal.

We then need to put in place the strategic overall agenda that will help us achieve that goal.

We also need to clearly recognize the undeniable and painful fact that our history as a nation clearly has included ethnic cleansing, slavery, massive discrimination, and some very damaging and dysfunctional us/them behaviors.

We need to recognize that our exploding diversity needs to become a strength instead of a source of internal conflict and division.

We need to collectively agree on a set of enlightened values and behaviors that will keep us from reverting back to the worst behaviors in our historical legacy and will allow us to go forward to having our diversity be

an asset instead of a source of behavior that generates regret and even shame.

We need to judge people from each group today based on the behaviors of each group today – and not just judge each group based on our historic intergroup behaviors.

We Need People From All Groups To Recognize The Value Of Peace

We should feel regret and sorrow that our legacy has those negative elements in it, and we should do now what needs to be done to keep those truly negative behaviors from recurring.

Our basic goal at this point should be to create intergroup Peace. We need people from all groups to recognize that we will all be better off as individuals — and that we will be better off as a nation — when all groups agree to inclusion for everyone in the American Dream and when all groups support and achieve win/win outcomes for all groups.

We need a basic culture of Peace for all groups. We need to recognize the damage done by our instincts and our behaviors — and we need to agree that we now want all groups to prosper and succeed.

To do that, we need a shared commitment to the core values of America. We need a commitment to honesty and we need a commitment to clear and open communications between people.

We need commitment to use our intellect to steer our behaviors to positive consequences.

We can create a culture of Peace for America. And when we do create that culture of Peace, then we will need to defend it against all of the risks that Peace will face.

That is the next chapter of this book.

Let's create Peace and let's keep it as who we are and what we do — resisting all of the people who want Peace to fail and who would rather be in war instead of in Peace.

The risks are real. We need to see them for what they are.