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Background

When I started to study psychology my vision was a hope that psychology could contribute to build a more viable society. I like to think that this has been with me the whole time, but that it in recent year has come to the foreground. Another theme is to get closer to real events, which I like to think of as underlying causes, or dispositional properties. This theme is dominant in the first section which mainly deals with my doctoral dissertation. Data structures often appear as a bewildering complexity, but can we say that special analyses sometimes can bring one closer to an underlying reality? Here I introduce the concepts manifest data structure vs. latent, underlying representation. Practitioners, however, often misinterpret statistical indices and thus fall victim to irrelevant rituals. I hoped to contribute to making some analytical procedures a more honest and straightforward procedure.

Section 2 and 3 more clearly reflect my concern for building a viable society. The concept manifest - latent has been further explored in my most well known Kellian contribution ‘loaded and honest questions’ (Tschudi 1977), usually called the ABC model. I also discuss an example which was taken from my own life (at that point I was too shy to admit the deep personal involvement). On the manifest level ‘A’ the person engages in unwanted behavior which she really wants to distance herself from, a symptom, and she is aware of a desirable contrast. I label these poles ‘a1’ and ‘a2’ respectively. The ‘B’ stands for elaboration of ‘A’, with ‘b1’ being negative consequences of ‘a1’ and ‘b2’ positive consequences of the desired ‘a2’. Eliciting ‘A’ and ‘B’ is usually fairly straightforward. Quite often there is an underlying ‘C’ which prevents movement from ‘a1’ to ‘a2’. The undesired ‘a1’ may also have desirable consequences, ‘c2’, and conversely the desired ‘a2’ has undesired consequences, ‘c1’. This structure is also called an implicative dilemma, and being made aware of ‘C’ may point to therapeutic steps to bring the person out of the dilemma. Searching for an underlying cause, as ‘C’ is not only useful in therapeutic settings but also more general in communication. Some examples in section 3
illustrate the distinction between openness to underlying intentions versus sticking with more superficial stereotyping.

Understanding requires that one is aware not only of differences between the other and oneself but also similarities. This, however, leads to difficulties when it is tempting to see the other as ‘evil’. Section 4 deals with restorative justice as a way to confront this dilemma. Recognizing one’s own vulnerability, may turn out to be – not a threat in the Kellian sense – but a deeply shared experience, a collective vulnerability, or ‘jointness’. Fostering such jointness is in line with the hope for ‘global ubuntu’, and I hope this chapter can inspire more PCP interest in peace psychology.

Manifest / latent structure: Dissertation

Kelly was a strong influence on my doctoral dissertation from 1973, having read his basic two volumes in the early 60’s. After a year of graduate studies at Cornell University in 1961-1962, Oslo University announced a position for an assistant professor in psychometrics at the department of psychology. Today it would be a bad joke to submit an application with the meagre background I then had, just unpublished excursions into a few topics but no qualified publications. Since we had a child in the USA, I felt a heavy responsibility as caretaker and opted for certainty in Oslo rather than to go on to take a PhD at Cornell.

Part of me is very serious. Since my job was psychometrics - ‘measuring the soul’ - I felt it incumbent to find out what psychological measurement really was. This led me to realize that much quantitative work had nothing to do with real or fundamental measurement; it was just a convenient and largely arbitrary assignment of numbers to a set of observations. I was fascinated by Coombs (1964) who put forth the view that: ‘fundamental measurement implies a theory, a model (a micro-theory) and a basic point is to test, evaluate that theory’. I took this to mean there was a latent structure underlying the observations and the point of any analysis should be to get as close as possible to this latent structure. To illustrate with an interesting question: do congenitally blind people have some kind of representation of colours which is similar to those with vision? One way to go about getting relevant observations is to ask blind persons about similarities between pairs of colour names. Given a set of similarities between all possible pairs, could one then arrive at an easily comprehensible underlying, latent structure? Admittedly this is a Platonic concept from an ideal world, and it is thus obvious that any ‘offshoots’ from such a structure in our platonic ‘shadow world’ will be infested with imperfections or noise as it is usually called. The point of a relevant analysis will then be to as far as possible to strip away the noise in order to reveal the latent structure.\footnote{An analogue from a different field is satellite pictures of planets and moons. When transmitted to earth there will be some interstellar ‘noise’. It is then necessary to have special techniques to strip this away in order to get a picture of the intended object that is as clear as possible.}

I called this purification. What steadfastly kept me pursuing this notion was Kelly’s basic inspiration that a good construct needs a contrast. The obvious contrast to purification is distortion. As a contrast to latent I chose to call the original observations manifest. We can never expect the analysis to capture the latent with complete fidelity. However, we can hope that the analysis at least moves us closer to the latent, and does not lead as astray. Such reasoning leads to a meta-model (Figure 1) from my dissertation.
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The output $G$ can be translated to the same form as the manifest data $M$. The results of such computations are called reconstructed values and it is straightforward to compute some measure of the distance between $G$ and $M$, called $AF$ (apparent fit) but which is usually called ‘goodness of fit’. The distance between $L$ and $M$ is called $NL$ (noise level). Figure 1 serves to illustrate my critique of most of multivariate statistical analysis. The traditional emphasis is on finding acceptable (usually small) values of ‘goodness of fit’. If however there is much noise in the data, this is not acceptable. We need the output $G$ to be as close as possible to $L$. A promising result from this point of view is illustrated in the figure, and here a bad apparent fit is just what we want since there is a relatively large $NL$ (distance between $L$ and $M$). For a given $NL$ there will be a close to perfect inverse relation between $AF$ and $TF$. A seemingly ‘good’ $AF$ implies a ‘bad’ $TF$, which is the opposite of what we really should be aiming for!

The major task with my dissertation was to work out the details of this model. Do we really get purification and under what circumstances and to what extent? This required knowing the latent structure which was a question of defining a suitable set of such structures plus defining various noise levels and finally to compute the resulting $M$’s and $G$’s, and the distances $NL$, $AF$ and $TF$. Since the mathematical problems of defining the proper distributions are rather forbidding, I had to resort to what is occasionally called ‘the poor person’s statistics’, or simulation studies.

Thinking back to the late 60’s I remember spending hundreds (or thousands) of hours pursuing such issues. There were many late hours where I would hope that a submitted deck of punched cards would bring me a step further. As likely as not however, the resulting computer listing would carry the message ‘job aborted’. I then had to go back to the punching room, identify and correct the ‘offending’ cards and hope that the operator would soon submit the deck of cards to yet another run. This was a long time before the personal computer! What is important in the present context is that all the hours were a labour of love and it felt good to give a warm thanks to the computing staff in the preface of the dissertation.\(^3\)

I had another strong dissatisfaction concerning conventional use of numbers. It seemed to me that the categorizations of ‘goodness of fit’ were quite arbitrary and I wanted decisions about how close the output was to the latent structure to be based on maximally comprehensible illustrations. I thus made illustrations of various degrees of fit. My youngest son who was then 5 years old could readily identify the different levels which are illustrated in Figure 2.

In the wake of this kind of work I have a deep suspicion of novices who seem to be happy with consulting a cookbook and just read from a table how ‘good’ their results are as if the cookbook is a revealed holy scripture. My favourite contrast to mechanical
applications of recipes is 'indwelling' or love which is further elaborated in my work on sketching a common terrain for quantitative and qualitative methods (Tschudi 1989)

There are two remaining questions about the meta-model (Figure 1) which need comment. What has happened to distortion? From Figure 1 it is readily apparent that distortion will be represented by $G$ moving away from $L$, such that the distance between $G$ and $L$, the true fit, will be larger than the distance $G$ and $M$, noise level. I mainly dwelled on distortion by contrasting dimensional structures with hierarchical tree structures. These are different kinds of animals (in spite of some similarities). If a data set generated by a dimensional model is analyzed by a tree structure model distortion will occur as it will if generated from a tree structure model and analyzed by a dimensional model. A basic difference is that for a dimensional model every element will have a value on every construct, whereas this will not be the case for a hierarchical structure.

Should I then say that there is obliqueness in most grid research since tree structures are excluded by usually foreclosing ‘not applicable’? The primary reason for not taking this stance is metaphors. By liberal use of metaphor, interpretations of just about every construct can somehow subsume any element. Bannister and Mair (1968) struggled with this possibility for a number of years. Their prime example was whether ‘false teeth’ could be subsumed as religious or atheist, or whether ‘false teeth’ was outside the range of convenience of religious - atheist. Finally they reached the conclusion that, everything said and done, ‘false teeth’ had to be rated as atheist!

The reader may have been puzzled about the relevance of my approach to real data. In practice we do not know the latent structure (if we did, what would be the point of research?) and how can we then give meaning to true fit and noise level. I recommend collecting two or more data sets, say A and B, assuming that there is the same L (underlying structure) - partly or completely - for both sets. It is then straightforward to use reliability as an estimate of noise level. This provides possibilities for estimating $TF(A)$ and $TF(B)$.4

Concerning the epistemological status of latent structure5, I am fully aware that this is a provocation to some post-modern approaches that take a disdainful if not downright contemptuous attitude to thus bowing to a notion of ‘real truth’. I have noted that the distinction between the ‘offshoots’ we observe and the underlying dispositional properties we try to construe (cf. Heider, 1958) is similar to the distinction between manifest data and latent structure. Kelly elaborates the fundamental postulate by emphasizing that the events we try to anticipate are real events out there – although our constructs are equally ‘real’.

For me this is a stance with a strong emotional investment. If we do away with the notion of truth we are left with a notion we cannot deconstruct - power. In Tschudi (1989) I quote arguments that power without truth may open the door for cruel regimes, as for

---

4 This way of thinking has been a major driving force for the thousands of hours I have spent on MULTIGRID, how to analyze several grids where constructs and/or elements are the same. I now plan to complete applying MULTIGRID to two major research projects (in addition to several previous ones), and then write about the intentions and the accomplishments. Furthermore I plan to cooperate with Richard Bell so that we can pool our resources for a ‘state of the art’ product.

5 In the last pages of the dissertation I discuss critical views about ‘recovering true configurations’ and argue that a ‘softening’ of the concept latent structure can draw support from a variety of fields.
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instance the German Nazi regime\(^6\), and inspired by Don Campbell we should strive to uphold precious norms.

**Manifest and latent levels in the ABC model**

In my ABC model (Tschudi, 1977) the main ideas have a deep similarity with the major ideas in my dissertation. The ‘loaded question’ (problem or symptom) corresponds to the manifest, surface level while the underlying advantage of the symptom corresponds to the latent, deeper level. To honor Harold Greenwald\(^7\) (1973) who has been the major source of inspiration for the ABC model I use one of his favorite stories to demonstrate the model.

A person with strong politically left beliefs had a predilection for indecent exposure (a1) but did not really want to do this (a2) because it might bring him to jail (b1), which he wanted to avoid (b2). Greenwald enjoyed heading directly for the underlying level by the straightforward question ‘what’s the payoff?’ In practice it is probably the exception that this brings forth a viable answer to the basic question of ‘what is the person really after?’ In this case the answer, the advantage of a1, was *to express contempt for the bourgeois* (c2) vs, *being a conformist* (c1). His dilemma was that he saw no way to both restrain indecent exposure (a2) and express contempt (c2).

Through humour Greenwald made this an untenable position for the person. He pointed out the person was really playing into the hands of the despised majority, supporting their deep conviction that ‘commies are nothing but sexual perverts’. Together with the client they arrived at a more viable road; viz. to express contempt by writing vitriolic comments on various vagaries of local government. This ‘outlet’ made the wish for indecent exposure superfluous.

Quite often students are dissatisfied with this account feeling there must be something more going on. My answer is to bring to the foreground the notion of the personal scientist. The therapist helps the client to design more satisfying experiments (cf. the Kellian notion that ‘behaviour is an experiment’). If the client is satisfied with his new behavior it would be unduly condescending to tell him that ‘you have not really solved your problem’. On the other hand it might be presumptuous to rule out the possibility of deeper

---

\(^6\) I once had a strong argument with Ken Gergen - who veers in the direction of ‘dismantling’ the notion of truth - on this point. Our arguments came to a close when I ventured to suggest that his ignorance of the Nazi regime – living far away from Europe – might be due to his distant relation to this. True to his convictions he was willing to open the door for this possibility. Striving for a conciliatory stance I note that there are three dominant philosophies of science approaches to construing the possible relations between theory and data: *Correspondence theory* - a more or less complete match of theory and data. This is the *realist* position. The alternatives are *coherence* theory – striving to avoid internal contradictions in the theory, and finally the *pragmatic* stance. My own position mixes the first and the third: I find strong pragmatic reasons for a realist position (Tschudi (1996)).

\(^7\) I went to a seminar Greenwald gave in Bergen in the early seventies and was completely enthralled by his undivided attention to and respect for the client who had volunteered for a demonstration of his approach. What specifically excited me was that as a matter of course the client was present and free to comment under the ensuing discussion of his therapy. This was to me an exemplary illustration of the Kellian stance of seeing a client as having the same epistemological status as the therapist!

Greenwald came to be a cherished friend. Once I told him that he had misconstrued aspects of the life story of a good friend, I have rarely seen him as serious as when he immediately said: ‘Tell her that I am sorry that I got her wrong’. True to style, however, he could not resist from making a joke (on himself) ‘I try to learn from my mistakes. That is how I have come to know so much; I make so many mistakes’.
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levels. It is, however up to the person with the loaded questions to decide whether further exploration is worthwhile or not!

One story that illustrates the ABC model is from my own life (Tschudi 1977). The latent, intentional level (c2) dealt with ‘the freedom of a child playing at the beach’. The manifest, surface level stated the offshoot problem as ‘can’t handle money’ (a1) whereas what I wanted was to ‘handle money well’ (a2). The contrast to the child playing at the beach (the pole preventing movement) was revealed as ‘bourgeois, trivial, dull sticks to the rules’ (c1). While handling money is not a major problem today there is now another haunting ‘offshoot’ of the child playing, viz. not being able to keep things in order. Countless hours are spent in often futile search for important items!

The construct ‘freedom of the child’ vs ‘sticks to the rules’ plays an important part in much of my current work. Specifically I am quite skeptical about strict rule adherence (Tschudi 2004). For many years I struggled with a rejoinder to Mischel’s (1964) critique of Kelly (Tschudi 1983). I found Mischel’s argument for rule adherence as a contrast to Kelly’s personal scientist model almost a personal affront. To me Mischel was undercutting the joy of exploring the world with an open mind. For one of his major examples ‘I take an aspirin because I have a headache’ I argued that contrary to Mischel there is an implied prediction here, viz. ‘and the headache will be relieved’.

In a paper I presented at a World Judiciary Conference in India in December 2007, (Tschudi 2007a), there is a theme which strikes a similar resonance in me. While the conference intends to hail international law I find myself about as antagonistic to the International Criminal Court as to Mischel’s thesis. Laying down the law implies strict punishment is necessary when there have been serious ‘crimes against humanity’. Sometimes an implied prediction is stated: ‘and reconciliation and peaceful rebuilding will be furthered’, but often there is a Kantian categorical imperative here. I try to curb my predilection of spewing forth acerbic comments on ‘arrogant western cognitive imperialism’, and make a plea for combining indigenous and restorative practices with possibilities of criminal procedures if other measures fail.

Surface and depth (underlying intentions) in understanding

Concerning understanding I have found the construct surface / depth useful and this construct is similar to my basic construct manifest / latent. Understanding roughly corresponds to getting to the depth or intentional level, while misunderstanding implies that the person has failed to get to this level. Any utterance takes place in a more or less transparent context and the context may be a help or a hindrance in getting to this level. The topic of deception deals with how people sometime create a context which serves to hide their true intention. When a deception is successful the deceived person has arrived at a distorted construction but there are lots of situations without deception when it also is fair to say that we arrive at distorted construction. Here we concentrate on situations where deception is not the major focus.

---

8 An offshoot of a work by Swedish auditors Øhman et.al. (2006) was a paper arguing for appeal to higher order principles, vs. sticking to concretistic rules. Complex environments such as nuclear plants and tracking companies ‘social responsibility policy’ were emphasized (Tschudi 2004).

9 I have not seen any convincing general evidence for this. Criminal proceedings are not less likely to have no discernible effect, and may in some cases even serve to make matters worse.

10 Interestingly this topic has received a special attention in evolutionary psychology. This is because getting at the true intention can be a matter of life and death, especially for people living in tribes without the benefits of a protective state.
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Depending on your perspective, failure to get at the level of intention may be humorous, tragic or just bizarre. I hope the reader joins me in enjoying the following Peanuts strip:

Pat calling Chuck: I’m having trouble in school again, Chuck. Do you have any suggestions?
Chuck: Do your homework. Don’t sleep in class, and never try to give a report on a book you haven’t read
Pat: I hate talking to you, Chuck.

Needs permission

Kelly was concerned with misunderstanding and one if his favourite examples is the teacher who construes her pupil as ‘lazy’. This might well signal a biased construction and just signify the pupil is not doing what the teacher wanted him to do. Kelly did not find ‘lazy’ to be a particularly helpful construction since it does not address the question as to what the pupil’s intention is. Of course the teacher might be perceived as being more or less locked in her own world and thus distancing herself from the pupil. From this point of view understanding requires being close to the other, while misunderstanding implies remaining at a distance.

Understanding / misunderstanding (or not understanding) is tied to the sociality corollary which states that to the extent that one person construes the construction processes of another, he may play a role in a social enterprise involving the other (Kelly 1955). To ‘construe the construction processes of another’ implies joining in a social enterprise and building a viable society. This is contrasted with non-social relating which only construes ‘the behavior of the other’ or ‘treat others as behaving mechanism or object’ not caring about what the person really is after (Tschudi & Rommetveit 1983).

From my point of view there is a failure to understand in the way some of my PCP friends construe Skinner’s psychology. It has been a favourite game to put PCP theory at a safe distance from ‘the stimulus – jerked puppet of learning theory’. In the late 60’s I struggled with some of the chapters in the monumental seven volumes ‘Psychology, A Study of a Science’ edited by Sigmund Koch.. It was then a pure delight to encounter someone who rejected the straightjacket Koch (1959) tried to impose on the contributors, imploring them to outline the philosophical background of their theories. The delightful encounter was with your archetypical ‘stimulus – jerked puppet’, B. F. Skinner (1959), who started by saying that he did not know much about theory, and doubted if he had missed much. Consequently he preferred to ask his readers to imagine him to lie on the couch and then try their best to make sense of his associations. Understanding Skinner = understand his contribution! A joke which pleased Skinner was the cartoon with the rat.
triumphantly saying: ‘boy have I got this guy conditioned, every time I press the lever I get a pellet’. Yes, that is just how it is!

Life however may assume any level of complexity when the varieties of schedules of reinforcement and also the variety of reinforcers are considered. Pondering the meaning of this variety Skinner found a cumulative record of results to be a valuable common denominator and on issuing a collection of his papers, what more appropriate title than ‘Cumulative Record’ (Skinner, 1961) could there be? Rhetorically, who can match that for reflexivity? I have occasionally thought about ‘reflexivity’ among prominent psychologists and balked at the fact that I cannot remember having seen anyone in the PCP tribe honouring Skinner for reflexivity!

Buttressing these reflections is a memorable encounter I had with Skinner when he once visited Oslo in the early seventies. For some reason none of my colleagues felt it incumbent on them to take care of Skinner during the evening so I was equipped with a license for a meal at a posh restaurant. I have never set myself the goal of being an expert on the vagaries of schedules of reinforcement so I spent some time with ‘Cumulative Record’ to see what might be likely to be of mutual interest. At that time Albert Schweitzer was about as close to universal sainthood as Nelson Mandela is today. So when Skinner expressed a sharp criticism of Schweitzer, I ‘pricked up my ears’ (to indulge in an expression Kelly used when writing about learning theory).

Skinner’s criticism was that Schweitzer by concentrating on helping others one by one succumbed to immediate reinforcement, the satisfaction of right away seeing results of his actions. If he – as a gifted medical doctor with interest in the plight of Africans – instead had been working in an institute of tropical medicine he might have been of help to ‘not thousands – but literally billions of people’ (Skinner, 1961a, p. 250)

This was the first time I was confronted with the problem of the enticement of immediate reward vs. being under the aegis of a more uncertain and delayed reinforcement. This general problem deserves universal attention.

Skinner was happy that I had picked up this, and lamented that few persons had noticed this point. I remember that in this mood he expressed dissatisfaction with his students. He had decided to close down his laboratory and my impression was that this was (partly) due to the fact that they were almost exclusively concerned with immediate results of their research, getting degrees and so forth. Skinner however was basically concerned with the plight of society at large. So in effect, to criticize someone like Skinner is similar to the teacher who construes the child as ‘lazy’. It does not reflect a real attempt to find what Skinner is after, to get at his intentions and thus the underlying deep structure.

In ‘Honest and Loaded’ questions I mention that even for a die-hard Skinnerian it may be permissible to use the short hand expression “motivated by’ in this context. To honour Skinner I avoid using ‘motivated’ here, and settle on the quaintier ‘under the aegis of’.

The most salient example is really working on efficient measures against the long term ill effects of global warming. I hope work being done on the problem of succumbing to immediate reinforcement may be helpful. Concerning G. W. Bush’s reticence I am reminded of a joke where a serious businessman flatly states ‘We can’t afford to save the earth’.

His view of the good society can be found in his novel Walden two. Creative performance in any field is here highly valued. Concerning work which needs to be done, he has an excellent suggestion. Those who had tedious work should be required to work quite few hours – then more time for leisure – whereas those with fascinating work would have to spend longer hours at work. Skinner deplored rumours that his daughter was ‘raised in a Skinner box’. The parent did their best to provide a hospitable environment for a small child, and Skinner was very happy that his daughter chose to work as a creative artist.
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Sticking to the surface and avoiding the deeper layer is not what I consider honest. To make the point as sharply as possible: On the face of it obsessive behaviour may seem rather stupid. I cannot conceive of anyone in PCP who would point a finger at the person with a derisive ‘ha, ha how stupid’. Here charitable constructions can be taken for granted. Why can I not take such constructions for granted when it comes to alternative approaches to psychology? First, I cannot bring myself to think that the critics think their diatribe will bring the antagonists to ‘mend their ways’ and become converted to a PCP perspective. It is by now elementary psychology that such criticism will rather lead to increased antagonism, not dialogue which in my mind should be the goal when there are important disagreements. This is a primary goal in peace research of which I will say more later.

Failure to construe by similarity and exclusively stay with construal by difference may be at the root of many serious problems. George W. Bush post 9/11 may be taken to epitomize this stance when drawing the contrast between ‘America as the brightest beacon for freedom and opportunity in the world’ vs. the attackers who were described as ‘evil flesh, bone and blood’ (cf. Jordanger and Alapack (2007) for and in depth analysis of US response to terror. A relentless fight is thus necessary – a fight which currently just seems to spell more disaster. Bush does not appear to be able to construe any important similarities between his own self-righteousness and the ‘terrorists’.

In the Tomkins tribe one reaction to 9/11 was to ask ‘what have we done to make them hate us so much that they can do such a thing?’ This is consistent with a view that if we were the victims of an equally terrible treatment as we have subjected them to we might feel inclined to ‘match’ the 9/11 heinous act. Somewhat to my surprise Blair has voiced a similar reaction, suggesting ‘the dragon’s teeth are planted in the fertile soil of wrongs unrighted, of disputes left to fester for years’ (quoted from Kaldor 2003) which I take to imply taking some responsibility for having planted ‘the dragon’s teeth’.

In the Kellian tradition there is a vivid interest in both the difficulties involved in understanding people committing serious crimes (for instance serial killers) and the possibilities of overcoming these difficulties. David Winter is trying to engage the ignominious British serial killer Ian Brady in dialogue (personal communication), and has explored ‘Construing the construction processes of serial killers and violent offenders’ (Winter 2007). He identifies ‘threat’ as a major obstacle and quotes Kelly (1955) that ‘they (evildoers) may exemplify what we might all too readily become if only we dared or were less vigilant’ and in a courageous self-reflection closes his essay by taking to heart that ‘to find the source of evil.. we need look no further than ourselves’.

Threat can thus be seen as a major obstacle to understand and join the other in a social enterprise. Perhaps inspired by the Jungian concept ‘shadow’, Kelly (1955) saw distancing oneself from ‘evildoers’ as ‘making us feel a little safer from the looming shadow of ourselves as evildoers’. In line with criminological thinking about the stigmatizing of offenders as basically a way to buttress a shaky identity of law abiders Kelly saw punishment as ‘having a deterrent effect against evildoing – our own evildoing! It helps to clarify our stand as a non-evildoer by making it clear that the evildoer is not one of us’.

Restorative justice and the road towards global ubuntu?

Recognizing an agonizing gap between ourselves and the evildoer raises the basic question of ways to close the gap, viz. integrating the evildoer instead of ostracizing such a person. This is a prime issue in the currently blossoming field of restorative justice (RJ),
While this is my dominant current interest I have, however, not found current PCP of much help here. I do hope that this will change, especially since the underlying value system will be shown to be highly congruent with PCP.

A major source of current interest in RJ comes from studying indigenous practices. Maoris in New Zealand and Indians in Canada have been especially important. During a study trip in 1998 I got to study how Maori inspiration had evolved in Australia and have especially enjoyed inspiration from my friends David Moore and John McDonald and have been happy to help introduce their work in Norway. The basic procedures are described in Moore and McDonald (2000), Neimeyer and Tschudi (2003), Tschudi and Reichelt (2004)and Tschudi (2007c), so I will just give the barest sketch here.

When harm has been done an impartial facilitator talks with and prepares the persons most involved for a meeting, a conference. This implies not only ‘offender’ and ‘victim’ but also persons who can support both these parties, and others who may have a special stake in the happening. It is very important that persons are seated in a circle; this is to avoid any hierarchical structure in the meeting. There is no table to ‘hide’ behind and note taking is discouraged. A primary task for the facilitator is to avoid anyone from dominating and/or intimidating others by way of status, sex or personal power. This egalitarian outlook in conferencing is highly congruent with Kelly’s theory (Warren (1992). Furthermore the personal scientist model and the sociality corollary imply that the scientist has the same epistemological status as the subject (Tschudi and Rommetveit 1983).

There is a twofold aim of the conference; to find out how (to what extent) the harm done can be ameliorated and how to prevent similar harm from happening again. Harm implies that a ‘rift’ has been made in a community and the aim is to heal this rift and furthermore strengthen the social web. Basically this is a holistic view where healing is the major focus and not imposing a ‘just punishment’. It is often the case that the ‘victim’ (this implies the ‘bereaved’ in cases where someone has been killed) will tend to see the ‘offender’ as ‘dehumanized’, as an object, or as ‘it’ in the Buberian sense. How can the gap between such a view and the other be closed?

First it is necessary to give negative emotions a free outlet (barring physical violence). Unlike a court procedure, which usually limits the context to just the immediate harm and the degree of culpability of the ‘offender’, whole persons are in face to face contact on an equal basis in the conference. What might in other contexts seem trivial happenings can in such circumstances touch ‘core constructs’ and bring about healing emotional experiences. In a conference in the wake of a young woman lethally hitting another girl during drunk driving, a moment came to pass when a picture of the accident was passed around.

As the photo slowly made its way around the room, a reverential silence fell over the group, punctuated only by occasional sob of a participant. This, in the words of the facilitator was the point of emergence of collective vulnerability, experienced as a sense of physical deflation. As the community of participants joined in the

14 In a conference one will never use the terms ‘offender’ and victim’, but ‘person who performed act x’ and ‘person who experienced act x’. Partly this is to avoid further stigmatizing, but also because there are many cases where one who is an ‘offender’ from one perspective may turn out to be a ‘victim’ form another perspective

15 The power of seeing a picture in ‘humanizing’ the other was brought forth by Nils Christie in his study of Norwegian guards in a concentration camps for Serbians during WW2. After the war the major difference between those not indicted for torture vs those indicted was that the former had been shown pictures of the prisoner’s family.
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poignant recognition of the frailty and brevity of life, their new sense of coherence was cemented (Neimeyer & Tschudi 2003).

Collective vulnerability is the feeling that ‘we are all in the same boat’, what might be called “jointness” and this experience is a turning point which paves the way for mutual understanding and cooperation. The sense of deflation was facilitated by a growing realization among those persons that the driver was not the only one to blame. Several others could have played a part of stopping her the fatal evening. In a variant of restorative justice (ho‘o pono pono in Hawaii) all participants are asked the question ‘what could you have done to prevent the harmful event?’

In cases where the ‘offender’ is alive an important turning point may be that the ‘offender’ is brought to shame in a way which points to re-integration (cf. Braithwaite, 2002). Shaming by authority persons psychologically distant from the offender is, however, likely to lead to further distancing by the offender. This is one important reason for having support persons for the ‘offender’ participate in a conference. Concerning punishment, Kelly (1955) hoped ‘...that (the ‘criminal’) will see that it is only a part of him that is condemned’. Such a hope is much more likely to come true when persons close to the ‘offender’ in a conference may come to distance themselves from the harmful act, while at the same time emphasizing that ‘this is basically a good person’.

Where there is distance between people who feel concerned by a certain policy and the person responsible for the policy’s influence, it may be useful to think in terms of a chain exerting indirect influence. Braithwaite (2002) uses the example of being ‘required to shame some military adventurism of a US president’. His suggestion is ‘placing a story of human dimensions on the media which touches the heart of a Chelsea Clinton that causes someone like her to say, “Dad, you must pay attention to this story”’. The general hypothesis is that the closer a person is to an ‘offender’ the more influence this person may have. Not a startling proposition from the point of view of common sense, but often requiring much ingenuity to turn into practice. How to influence Bush from stopping the war in Iraq?

A looming shadow is not only connected to one’s own tendency to immoral behavior. I suggest that a more general formulation is a fear of having important weaknesses and vulnerabilities exposed. This is related to shame, a topic extensively treated in the Tomkins tradition (Nathanson 1992). While this contribution is important in describing various defenses against shame, the important topic of acknowledging shame or weaknesses has not received sufficient attention. I have elsewhere (Tschudi 2005), argued for the general importance of ‘acknowledging vulnerability’ and a concomitant warning against not only denying weaknesses but overstating one’s strength.

For some experts a realization that they do not have a viable answer to a problem within their own field may be a serious threat. Seikkula (1996) has worked extensively with alternatives to conventional treatment of psychosis (drugs, hospitalization) and describes meetings of all possible helpers in the spirit of ‘open dialogue’. Similar to ‘collective vulnerability’ such meetings may lead to a phase of depression, a common feeling of hopelessness. This can then lead to a feeling of connectedness and a realization that each one has an important role to play in an emerging plan, (see Tschudi and Reichelt 2004 for further discussion of Seikkula’s approach and similarities to conferencing).

Might it be the case that we all have similar looming shadows but suffer a collective illusion that the shadow is unique to oneself? It then makes sense that discovering that vulnerability is not unique to oneself harbors not only deflation and depression but is at the same time a shared feeling that opens the way for viable cooperation. When working with
this chapter my partner asked me how I have personally experienced vulnerability. Returning to ‘the child playing at the beach’, what might further explorations of his background reveal?

A relevant association is an intense drive for unfettered exploration. At the tender age of three I announced to my mother at breakfast that I would do as my parents had done, go to northern Norway and my mother made me some food for the road. After scarcely a mile or so I was stopped by a lady, who upon learning my destination firmly took me home (for further details see Tschudi 2007b). This story has been told to me countless times and undoubtedly this has added layers of meaning to the event. I have thus come to think about this as a ‘nuclear scene’ (Tomkins 1991), an episode which crystallizes major stultifying life problems. What I saw as a valid exploration was aborted and the dignity of the little boy was not respected. Exploring this scene and the following script was a major factor leading me to contact the Silvan Tomkins’ tribe.

The three year old boy, later adult, who walked around with a feeling of hurt dignity for being stopped on the way to northern Norway, has tried to get support for his deep feeling of maltreatment and injustice. A prominent psychologist, Einar Dannevig - who once was my therapist - carefully pointed out to me that I should be grateful to the women who stopped me. Bad things might have happened to the small boy. I still remember my incredulity; ‘Didn’t he at all understand how hurt I was? How could he be so devoid of compassion?’ I was on the verge of leaving the therapy! This has changed. Getting older I have a few times fallen and one time on a bike, head first, it might have been serious. Every time the first person to see me has offered excellent help and support. I was recently in a position to try to help a seriously hurt woman. When later reflecting on the similarity between my helpers and me I had a profound experience that the woman stopping me at the tender age of three was not the ogre I had construed but a human being exactly like my recent helpers. I had a deep recognition of gratitude to the women who stopped me, retrospectively thanking her. Never too late to re-construe! Before this I had had some understanding – from my nuclear scene - that important projects will generally require good helpers, but not with the pronounced emotional core – joining vulnerability and community with ‘strangers’ - as I recently experienced.

In 1977 I wondered about what may happen to the ‘child playing at the beach’. Is he left alone when the sun is down? (Tschudi 1977). Fortunately not. Persons who were previously construed as mere strangers are now a (potential) ‘community of care’. There is also the joy of belonging to and extending further contact with several ‘epistemic communities’, (cf. Braithwaite & Drahos, 2000).

Such experiences serve to strengthen my compassion for the African philosophy about unity between all humans, described as ubuntu - ‘I am because you are, our humanness is inextricably linked together’ - thus celebrating universal respect for dignity. Tschudi (2007c) has a further discussion of this in the context of reconciliation after mass violence and Lindner (2006) more generally on dignity and humiliation. It seems to me that every step, however small, towards ‘global ubuntu’ must be carefully nourished and I hope that my friends in the PCP tribe will join me in searching for such steps. Considering how we have mistreated our earth I want to close this essay by drawing attention to a slogan of a prominent Norwegian peace activist and friend, Ole Kopreitan. The slogan is the title of a Festschrift to him ‘Now it is too late to be a pessimist’.

© Finn Tschudi 2008; Do not quote without permission
Figure 1. A meta-model representing the relations between latent structure (L), manifest (M) and reconstructed data (G).

NL - noise level.
AF - apparent fit, goodness of fit, stress, degree of recovery of M from G.
TF - true fit, degree of recovery of L by output G.
Figure 2. Illustrations of different categories of true fit for 1 dimensional configurations, n = 20. The upper set of points of each figure represents true positions, the lower set represents reconstructed positions. Corresponding points are connected by straight lines.

a) TF category: Excellent
   \[ C_1 = 0.04 \quad r = 0.996 \quad TF = 0.9 \]

b) TF category: Very good
   \[ C_1 = 0.09 \quad r = 0.977 \quad TF = 2.0 \]

c) TF category: Fair
   \[ C_1 = 0.31 \quad r = 0.774 \quad TF = 3.8 \]

d) TF category: Unacceptable
   \[ C_1 = 0.56 \quad r = 0.341 \quad TF = 4.5 \]
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