

Mirror, Mask, and Shadow

Psychodynamic Aspects of Intergroup Relations

GARY GEMMILL

MICHAEL ELMES

Using a psychodynamic perspective on intergroup relations, it is suggested that at in-groups create enemy out-groups to avoid dealing with internally generated, emotionally laden issues—the group shadow—that exist within the in-group. In-groups develop an exaggerated view of themselves—the social mask—to sustain an illusion of harmony, homogeneity, and cohesiveness by which they can avert the group shadow. Using a specific consulting-client example, intergroup mirroring is discussed as a method by which in-groups can acknowledge ownership of their social masks and projected shadows. It is proposed that bringing both the group shadow and masking into consciousness fosters reparation within and between groups.

“My enemy said to me, ‘Love your enemy’ and I obeyed him and loved myself.”

K. Gibran, Spiritual Sayings of Kahlil Gibran

Like the woman in the cartoon (see Figure 1), we often interpret events as if only “bad people”—those largely nameless and faceless “others” who we characterize in stereotypically negative ways—commit acts of brutality, ruthlessness, cowardice, deception, and so on. It comes as a shock when “good people”—people like ourselves who we deem to be responsible, reasonable, conscientious—act in those same stereotypically negative ways. After all, “badness” is supposed to be confined to our enemies, and “goodness” is supposed to be inherent in ourselves and in the social groups with which we identify. Indeed, responding to the threat of an outside enemy is a familiar rationale for activities such as massive defense buildups, exaggerated budget requests, defensive posturing, and so on. That neither we nor our enemies are all good nor all bad but a mixture of both, suggests that our enemies do not, as many would believe, really create us but, rather, that we create our enemies.

Although the exploration of intergroup relationships could be potentially framed in many ways, for many years the central focus of both theorists and researchers has been on the analysis of perceptions, attitudes, and environmental attributes that exacerbate or diminish the intensity of intergroup conflicts (Alderfer, 1977; Coser, 1956; Levine & Campbell, 1972; Smith & Berg, 1987; Volkan, 1988). These factors have been largely conceptualized in terms of *objective* dimensions (conscious, mindful behavior that reflects rational intention and involves directly observable behavior) and *subjective* dimensions (unconscious emotional determinants that reflect nonrational behavior and the psychodynamics of defense mechanisms).

From a somewhat different perspective, Coser (1956) in his classic, *Social Functions of Conflict*, conceptualized conflict into “realistic” and “non-realistic” dimensions. Although this terminology still exists in the literature, it is our opinion that it is a misnomer due largely to the surplus meaning of the term *realistic*. Realistic denotes what actually occurs in reality; *non-realistic* conflict very much occurs in reality. Emotions, as well as thoughts, exist in reality. For this reason, we have chosen to refer to objective and subjective dimensions of conflict between

groups. In our opinion, every intergroup conflict involves both dimensions even though one dimension may have greater saliency and magnitude.

The thesis we present here comes from a psychodynamic perspective on intergroup relationship. We argue that much of the relationship between groups can best be understood as a mirror reflecting back to each group a view of itself that it has difficulty seeing within itself. Until each group is able to perceive, acknowledge, and reparate within itself the attributes reflected in the other group, the conflictual tension and mutual hostility will remain unresolved. We argue that members of a group use, in unconscious ways, other groups to manage anxiety associated with emotionally laden issues that exist within their group. From this perspective, dysfunctional intergroup relations are, in fact, manifestations of dysfunctional within-group relations. We hypothesize that generative (as opposed to regressive) intergroup relations require, at a minimum, that these dysfunctional, covert processes be brought into awareness, acknowledged, and integrated in a way that leads to group self-reparation (McClure, 1990). Unless this occurs, members of unintegrated groups will actively and passively sabotage intergroup interventions that try *only* to improve the quality of the interactions between groups. Moreover, we contend that, in this process of reparation, every group requires another group to provide a "mirror" or "looking glass" to become aware of its own internal unconscious psychodynamic issues occurring within and between group members.

A PSYCHODYNAMIC THEORY OF INTERGROUP RELATIONS

The central psychodynamic theory of intergroup relations postulates that the creation and maintenance of an external enemy out-group serves both a cathartic and conflict avoidance function for an in-group by providing a target toward which internally generated, emotionally laden issues and tensions can be externally focused. In object relations theory (Klein, 1946), projective identification, the psychological splitting of experience into "good objects" and "bad objects," is viewed as a social defense that serves to manage anxiety and ambivalence toward one's self and others. Psychological splitting is clearly seen in intergroup relations when an in-group sees itself in terms of positive attributes (good object) while simultaneously seeing its own negative attributes (bad object) as belonging only to one out-group. With the splitting and polarization, the positive attributes become the social mask of the group ("We are..."), whereas the negative attributes are projected outward representing the group shadow ("They are..."). With projective identification, group members experience the negative attributes of the in-group as being in the environment outside the group itself—namely within the out-group. The out-group ("them") becomes the focus and container for what are experienced as unacceptable attributes, impulses, feelings, and thoughts within the group itself ("us"). This composes what is referred to as the *group shadow*. The out-group embodies all that the in-group negates in itself. The concept of psychological splitting provides a psychodynamic explanation for the undercurrent of ethnocentrism and xenophobia that various researchers have detected in intergroup relations (Brewer, 1986; Levine & Campbell, 1972). Ethnocentrism, paralleling *egocentrism*, refers to the observed tendency of a group to evaluate other groups in reference to itself and to view itself as superior to other groups. Similarly, Blake and Mouton (1961) in their early work on intergroup relations refer to this as the "natural 'superiority complex' of a group." Freud refers to it as "group narcissism."

THE IN-GROUP NEED FOR AN OUT-GROUP ENEMY

Many psychodynamic theorists postulate that, through the process of splitting and projective identification, a group selects and sustains those groups with whom it passively and actively fights. More specifically, they contend that within each group member lies a need to dichotomize, to externalize unacceptable parts of themselves and the group onto another group; they *need* to have an enemy out-group to manage their internal ambivalence and contradictions. In a sense, the inclination to blame and to avoid taking responsibility for ambivalence or the darker side of group behavior seems almost second nature to most group members. Keen (1986) expresses this in a cogent fashion when he states,

Since this process of unconscious projection of the shadow is universal, enemies ‘need’ each other to dispose of their accumulated disowned, psychological toxins. We form an adversarial symbiosis of integrated systems that guarantees that neither of us will be faced with our own shadow. (p. 21)

Due to externalization and projective identification, when an in-group looks at the “face” of the enemy, it is looking at its own shadow. As Stein (1982) so graphically states,

So long as the enemy is seen as wearing the mask which we have superimposed onto it, we inevitably must see a face we despise when we look upon the enemy. The enemy, in essence, wears our disavowed features: that is the psychic function of the enemy. (p.255)

In the same vein, Jung (Jacobi, 1970) succinctly expresses this dynamic when he states, “Whatever we fight about in the outside world is also a battle in our inner selves” (p. 156). Over time, an in-group increasingly becomes trapped in its social mask and increasingly silhouettes its shadow onto an enemy out-group. The ethnocentric boundaries of an in-group exist to (a) maintain an idealized social mask of the group, (b) exclude from consciousness its dark shadow, and (c) keep the disowned parts of the group contained in the shadow at a safe distance by implanting them into the enemy out-group.

THE GROUP SHADOW

The group shadow of a particular in-group, as conceptualized by Gemmill (1986), consists of the denied attributes, emotions, thoughts, and issues within the in-group that are experienced by members of the in-group as belonging only to the out-group. The shadow projected by the in-group onto an out-group is a defense against directly experiencing repressed interpersonal and emotional issues occurring between members of the in-group. With repression, these issues remain dormant because they are both unexpressed and undiscussable.

The group shadow projected by an in-group onto an enemy out-group functions as a social defense via the dynamic of displacement that is contained in the process of projective identification. That is, intergroup conflict serves as an avoidance of intragroup conflict.

With displacement, the in-group’s unresolved, difficult, threatening, and “undiscussible” interpersonal issues are placed outside the group boundary. In this way, members of the in-group distance themselves from taking any responsibility for the creation and sustaining of the unresolved interpersonal issues within the in-group. Social anxiety is diminished within one group while anxiety toward the out-group is correspondingly amplified. By projecting negativity onto the out-group and away from the in-group, members of the in-group begin to perceive the source of their anxiety, insecurity, and hostility as the enemy out-group. As a result, the internal struggle between in-group members tends to smolder and intensify often outside of members’ awareness. In-group members direct their attention and energies toward being vigilant and watchful of the enemy out-group. The greater the felt threat of the in-group’s shadow breaking

into members' awareness, the greater the felt need to project the shadow onto the menacing foe represented by the out-group. The projection of the dissociations onto the out-group functions not only to keep out of awareness the dreaded qualities and issues (the enemy within) of the in-group but also to *retain* these qualities and issues within the view of the in-group but at a fixed distance (Group for the Advancement of Psychiatry, 1987). When both the in-group and out-group trade dissociations, each group focuses on whatever the other is but cannot acknowledge.

THE GROUP SOCIAL MASK

The in-group's exaggerated view of itself in only positive terms constitutes a social mask that blocks out the group's shadow. It is a facade that covets up the projection of the group's shadow onto the out-group. The tendency for an in-group to perceive itself in only exaggerated positive terms constitutes a harmony illusion. The illusion is operating within a group when (a) the in-group perceives itself only in exaggerated positive terms, (b) the out-group is depicted *only* in exaggerated negative terms, and (c) the in-group imagines the out-group would depict the in-group in negative terms only.

The social mask of a group when it is based on only exaggerated positive attributes, functions as a harmony illusion for the group. It is a form of narcissistic grandiosity in which the group overidealizes itself. When the illusion is at work, members of a group deny and avoid discussing emotional negativity and cognitive differences that occur between each other as they work together. What is denied and avoided goes into the shadow and is displaced onto the out-group. The illusion itself represents a social mask that members of the group are a harmonious family with no real intellectual differences, emotional negativity, or conflicts. In-group members tend to describe themselves in "glowing" terms stressing only positive attributes— real, imagined, and those they wish were present— while simultaneously disdaining the existence of any tensions or negativity.

The tendency for psychological splitting to occur within a group is reflected in the research on in-group processes that indicates that there is a marked tendency for an in-group to more favorably evaluate in-group performance than out-group performance (Hinkle & Schopler, 1986). Jerome Frank (1980) suggests that this might reflect an archetypal image of the us-versus-them, in-group and out-group dynamics. He states:

This image is remarkably similar no matter who the conflicting parties are. Enemy images mirror each other—that is, each side attributes the same virtues to itself and the same vices to the enemy. *We* are trustworthy, peace-loving, honorable and humanitarian. *They* are treacherous, warlike and cruel. (p. 951)

The in-group interprets its behavior as preparation for defense and interprets the out-group's behavior as preparation for offense.

Members of an in-group tend to see more homogeneity in the out-group and to treat out-group members in a stereotypical, undifferentiated manner. The stereotype usually reflects actual and imagined differences contained within the other group. Regardless of the frequency of interaction, members of an in-group tend to perceive more dimensional variability within the in-group than in the out-group; "*They* are all alike but *we* aren't" (Quattrone, 1986). Psychological splitting explains not only the differential perceptions but also why members of the in-group do not assume that the out-group is just as variable.

GROUP REPARATION

Learning how to incorporate an awareness of the psychodynamics of the mirroring process so that each group can acknowledge ownership of its social mask and projected shadow is, we argue, a critical factor in achieving generative, creative intergroup relations. Group reparation refers to the process by which the split-off parts of an in-group that are projected onto an out-group are acknowledged and integrated. For the group reparative process to occur, a critical mass of in-group members must become aware of their connection via projective identification to the out-group. Klein and Riviere (1964) postulate that the path for reparation is continuous throughout life and that it comes from a wish for wholeness. As Hirschhorn (1988) states,

Although people labor to avoid anxiety by splitting their consciousness and by projecting their bad feelings onto others, they also wish to restore their own sense of wholeness. But to do so, they must take back their projections and therefore see others (and themselves) as whole and real people who are both good and bad. (p. 8).

The difficulty of perceiving the human wholeness of a group can be seen in the common refusal to perceive humanity as a single species rather than diverse ethnocentric tribes and nations. Rather interestingly, Jung (1958) in writing on the phenomena of reported flying saucers, hypothesizes that the reports of UFOs represent an intrapsychic longing for wholeness and unity that seems impossible to achieve in our existing world (earth). People become alienated from their true creative and vital life force that pushes for reparation and project it outward so that they see it coming to them in an alien form from outer space. The longing for reparation is projected via a quasi-hallucinatory process where it is perceived as alien to the self, or extraterrestrial. Jung contends that aside from whether UFOs objectively exist, it is clear that they subjectively exist in the experience of many humans in a wide variety of cultures. The largely unconscious wish to restore and achieve wholeness through reparation of psychological splitting moves members of a group closer to escaping from artificial ethnocentric boundaries that are used to differentiate their group from other groups.

INTERGROUP MIRRORING AS AN INTERVENTION

It is our contention that for intergroup relations to become creative and constructive, the unconscious issues underlying emotional tension between the groups must be worked through by each group reclaiming its shadow. We have argued that what appears at first glance to be a simple problem between groups is, on further exploration, a deep-seated and largely unrecognized emotional conflict within the group and within its members. In effect, both groups use the surface problem as a social defense against the anxiety of having to face the real underlying causes of the tensions between them. In the extreme, a group may wish to keep surface problems alive and unresolved as a means of containing the anxiety inherent in their solution (Gilmore & Krantz, 1985). One must not only focus on the real or imagined threats between conflicting groups but also on the threat that a resolution of the conflict would pose.

Although it is not our purpose here to present a detailed set of procedures for surfacing and analyzing group shadows in intergroup relations, we do wish to provide an illustration of how it can be approached using a fairly well-known human relations technique called “group mirroring” (Gemmill & Costello, 1990). In our opinion it provides an open process tool for identifying and exploring issues associated with the shadow of each group. The use of the term, *group mirror*, is close to the literal meaning of the word *mirror*—a surface capable of reflecting an actual image of an object placed in front of it. The usefulness of group mirroring as a developmental tool is based on the idea that every in-group needs an out-group to provide itself

with a mirror of its shadow. The presence of an out-group provides the opportunity for the in-group to externalize denied emotions and issues contained in the group shadow so that they can be easily identified. Paradoxically, the in-group can become aware of these denied elements within the group only through examining projections of its group shadow onto the out-group. Although projections initially contained in the shadow operate outside the immediate awareness of group members and are usually unexpressed and inaccessible, through mirroring they have the potential of being moved into awareness and being discussed.

**MIRRORS DEVELOPED BY
CONSULTANT SYSTEM**

**MIRRORS DEVELOPED BY
CLIENT SYSTEM**

HOW WE SEE OUR CLIENTS

HOW WE SEE OUR CONSULTANTS

Tough cookies
Closed
Distrustful
Defensive
Having conflict among themselves
Troubled
Angry

Wanting to be in control
Confused
Nervous
Aggressive
Disjointed
Antagonistic
Floundering

HOW WE IMAGINE OUR CLIENTS SEE
US

HOW WE IMAGINE OUR
CONSULTANTS SEE US

Pushy
Not being totally open and honest
Screwed up
Manipulative
Attacking

Troublemakers
Hostile
Defensive (even though we're not)
Apathetic
Just going through the motions

HOW WE SEE OURSELVES AS
CONSULTANTS

HOW WE SEE OURSELVES AS
CLIENTS

Assertive
Confident
Faced with a challenge
Honest
Open
Willing to take a risk

Open
Enthusiastic
Questioning
Friendly
Protective
Bold
Pensive

Figure 2: Using Group Mirroring to Analyze the Group Shadow

Under the mirroring technique, members of each group that are a party to an intergroup relationship are instructed to work together within their group to provide responses to the following three questions: How do you see the other group? How do we imagine the other group

sees us as a group? How do we see ourselves as a group? The data provided by each group provides a basis for analyzing the group shadow.

Figure 2 provides an illustration of how group mirrors can be used to analyze the group shadow. The set of group mirrors presented in Figure 2 was produced from an actual client-consultant system during a graduate seminar in organizational process consultation (Gemmill & Wynkoop, 1990). Both the consulting group and the client group consisted of seven participants, most of whom were practicing human resource managers who were doing, or planning to do, organizational development work within their respective organizations. The seminar was a 40-hour experimental one focused on exploring the dynamics of the consulting process. Mirrors were developed after initial entry of the consulting group into one client system.

In Figure 2, it seems clear that each group saw the other group in essentially negative terms. On one hand, the consulting group saw the client group as “tough cookies,” closed, distrustful, defensive, conflictual, troubled, and angry. On the other hand, the client group saw the consultant group as wanting to be in control, confused, nervous, aggressive, disjointed, antagonistic, and floundering. Both descriptions of the other group contained predominantly negative connotations. Although each group viewed the other group in negative terms only, each group viewed itself in predominantly positive and glowing terms. The consulting group described itself as assertive, confident, faced with a big challenge, honest, open, and willing to take a risk. The client group described itself as open, enthusiastic, questioning, friendly, protective, bold, and pensive. There was a clear split in both groups where each in-group perceived itself as having all the *virtues* and each out-group all the *vices*.

In terms of reparation, each group needed to become aware of and acknowledge the shadow it was projecting onto the enemy group. Members of the consulting group needed to explore how they considered *each other* “tough cookies,” how they were closed and defensive with each other, how they were troubled about the group, and how they were angry about things taking place in the group. The client group, on the other hand, needed to examine within the client group how they were dealing with each other’s wanting to be in control, what they were confused about within their group, what they were nervous about within each other, how aggressiveness was being dealt with in the group, how they experienced the group’s being disjointed, and how they were antagonistic to each other.

The question of how each group imagines the other group will perceive it surfaces more elements of the group shadow whose reclamation is also important in the reparation process. The question allows group members an opportunity to express things about their group that they find difficult to express directly. That is, group members can deny ownership of the images because they are asked to report how they imagine the other group perceives them. However, these images frequently reveal how the group actually views itself.

In this case, the consulting group imagined their client group would see them as pushy, not being totally open and honest, “screwed up,” manipulative, and attacking. The group shadow aspects for the consulting group involved examining how they were being pushy with one another, how they were not being totally open and honest with each other, how they felt screwed up as a group, how they experienced manipulation within the group, and how they were responding and wished to attack each other within the group.

The client group imagined that their consultants would perceive them as troublemakers, hostile, screwed up, defensive (“even though we are not”), apathetic, and “just going through the motions.” Mirrored on the consulting group, the client group’s shadow issues entailed examination of who the troublemakers were within the group and how they were being dealt with, hostility within the group, how the group was screwed up, how they were dealing with defensiveness within the group, how apathy within the group was handled, and how members

were just going through the motions.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Aside from providing a group with insight into its own shadow, the group mirror technique can also be used as part of an ongoing attempt to both open communication and do reparation work between groups within an organization. In our experience consulting with groups within organizations, we have found that real learning and change require that groups have at least some level of commitment to examining their own group processes and a willingness to try to comprehend their within-group dynamics and its connection to dynamics occurring between groups. Each group needs to have a genuine interest in developing a learning community rather than sustaining “warring tribes.” This is not necessarily an easy objective to secure because, as Jung so aptly states,

TIME PERIOD I

		Group A (In-group)	Group B (Out-group)
Description of:	Group A	All Positive	All Negative
	Group B	All Negative	All Positive

TIME PERIOD II

		Group A (In-group)	Group B (Out-group)
Description of:	Group A	Positive and Negative	Positive and Negative
	Group B	Positive and Negative	Positive and Negative

Figure 3: Assessing Reparative Work Within and Between Groups

For the primitive anything strange is hostile and evil. The line of division serves a purpose, which is why the normal person feels under no obligation to make these projections

consciously, although they are dangerously illusory. War psychology has made this abundantly clear: everything my country does is good, everything the others do is bad. The center of all inequity is invariably found to lie a few miles behind the enemy lines. Because the individual has the same primitive psychology every attempt to bring these age-old projections to consciousness is felt as irritating. Naturally one would like to have better relations with one's fellows, but only on the condition that *they* live up to *our* expectations—in other words, that they become willing carriers of our projections. Yet as we make ourselves conscious of these projections, it may easily act as an impediment to our relations with others, for there is then no bridge of illusion across which love and hate can stream off so relievingly, and no way of disposing so simply and satisfactorily of all those alleged virtues that are intended to deify and improve others. (Jacobi, 1970, pp. 153-154)

Making projections conscious is a necessary step in improving not only intergroup relations but also intragroup relations. Group members need to discover that projection is normal, something everyone does, and that it is not in and of itself right or wrong, or something to deny or avoid. Rather, the issue is one of becoming aware of projections in a way that makes them useful for learning and fostering reparation within and between groups. In intergroup relations, one sign that reparation between groups is occurring is when groups begin to describe themselves and each other in *both* positive and negative terms. Using the group mirrors method, a consultant or manager can assess whether group reparation and learning have occurred. As you can see in Figure 3, there is sharp splitting in Time Period 1 and reparation of that splitting in Time Period 2.

We hope that we have provided a theoretical foundation—a beginning—in our analysis of the psychodynamics of intergroup relations that can serve to encourage and guide much needed future research on within-group dynamics and its connection to between-group dynamics. Group intervention designed to bring to awareness and make discussable mutually disowned projections, as well as those designed to foster reparation, need to be more precisely developed and tested in the crucible of actual intergroup relations.

REFERENCES

- Alderfer, C. (1977). Group and intergroup relations. In J. Hackman & L. Suttle (Eds.), *Improving life at work* (pp. 227-296). Santa Monica, CA: Goodyear.
- Blake, R., & Mouton, J. (1961). Reactions to intergroup competition under win-lose conditions. *Management Science* 7,420-455.
- Brewer, M. (1986). The role of ethnocentrism in intergroup conflict. In S. Worchel and W. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (2nd ed., pp. 88-102). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Coser, L. A. (1956). *The functions of social conflict*. Glencoe, IL:Free Press.
- Frank, J. D. (1980). The nuclear arms race—Sociopsychological aspects. *American Journal of Public Health*, 70(9), 950-952.
- Gemmill, G. (1986). The dynamics of the group shadow in intergroup relations. *Small Group Behavior*, 17(2), 229-240.
- Gemmill, G., & Costello, M. (1990). Group mirroring as a means for exploring the group shadow: A perspective for organizational consultation. *Consultation*, 9(4), 277-291.
- Gemmill, G., & Wynkoop, C. (1990). The psychodynamics of the client-consultant nexus in organizational process consulting. *Consultation: An International Journal*, 9(2), 129-140.
- Gilmore, T., & Krantz, J. (1985). Projective identification in the consulting relationship:

- Exploring the unconscious dimension of a client system. *Human Relations*, 38(12), 200-212.
- Group for the Advancement of Psychiatry. (1987). *Us and them: The psychology of ethnonationalism*. New York: Brunner/Mazel.
- Hinkle, S., & Schopler, J. (1986). Bias in the evaluation of in-group and out-group performance. In S. Worchel & W. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (2nd ed., pp. 196-212). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Hirschhorn, L. A. (1988). *The workplace within: Psychodynamics of organizational life*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Jacobi, J. (Ed.). (1970). *C. G. Jung: Psychological reflections*. Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Jung, C. G. (1958). Flying saucers: A modern myth of things seen in the sky. In G. Adler, M. Fordham, W. McGuire, & H. Read (Eds.), *The collected works of C.G.C. Jung* (Vol. 10). Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Keen, S. (1986). *Faces of the enemy: Reflections of the hostile imagination*. San Francisco: Harper & Row.
- Klein, M. (1946). Notes on some schizoid mechanisms. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 27, 99-110.
- Klein, M., & Riviere, J. (1964). *Love, hate, and reparation*. New York: Norton.
- Levine, R. A., & Campbell, D. T. (1972). *Ethnocentrism and theories of conflict, ethnic attitudes, and group behavior*. New York: Wiley.
- McClure, B. A. (1990). The group mind: Generative and regressive groups. *Journal for Specialists in Group Work*, 15, 159-170.
- Quattrone, G. A. (1986). On the perception of a group's variability. In S. Worchel & W. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (2nd ed., pp. 25-48). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Smith, K. K., & Berg, D. N. (1987). *Paradoxes of group life*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Stein, H. F. (1982). Adversary symbiosis and complementary group dissociations. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 6, 55-83.
- Volkan, V. D. (1988). *The need to have enemies: Theories of conflict, ethnic attitudes, and group behavior*. New York: Wiley.