

外研社高等英语教育学术论丛

主 编：孙有中 冯 源

副主编：翟 峥

跨文化研究新视野

Intercultural Studies:
New Horizon

外语教学与研究出版社
FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING AND RESEARCH PRESS



外研社高等英语教育学术论丛

本书得到 中国文化走出去协同创新中心 资助
外语教学与研究出版社

跨文化研究新视野

Intercultural Studies:
New Horizon

主 编: 孙有中 冯 源

副 主 编: 翟 峥

编 委: 郭石磊 王 强 修 晨

学术顾问: 胡文仲 贾玉新 许力生
林大津 宋 莉 戴晓东

外语教学与研究出版社

FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING AND RESEARCH PRESS

北京 BEIJING

HORIZON

NEW

Int
stu
New
Horiz

图书在版编目 (CIP) 数据

跨文化研究新视野：汉、英 / 孙有中，冯源主编；郭石磊等编. — 北京：外语教学与研究出版社，2015.6 (2016.3 重印)

(外研社高等英语教育学术论丛)

ISBN 978-7-5135-6215-7

I. ①跨… II. ①孙… ②冯… ③郭… III. ①文化交流—文集—汉、英 IV. ①G115-53

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字 (2015) 第 149871 号

出版人 蔡剑峰
责任编辑 毕争 金玲 董一书
封面设计 覃一彪
出版发行 外语教学与研究出版社
社址 北京市西三环北路 19 号 (100089)
网址 <http://www.fltrp.com>
印刷 北京京华虎彩印刷有限公司
开本 787 × 1092 1/16
印张 20
版次 2015 年 7 月第 1 版 2016 年 3 月第 2 次印刷
书号 ISBN 978-7-5135-6215-7
定价 72.90 元

购书咨询：(010) 88819926 电子邮箱：club@fltrp.com

外研书店：<https://waiyants.tmall.com>

凡印刷、装订质量问题，请联系我社印制部

联系电话：(010) 61207896 电子邮箱：zhijian@fltrp.com

凡侵权、盗版书籍线索，请联系我社法律事务部

举报电话：(010) 88817519 电子邮箱：banquan@fltrp.com

法律顾问：立方律师事务所 刘旭东律师

中咨律师事务所 殷斌律师

物料号：262150001

目 录

Foreword

Beyond the Crooked Timber of Humanity: Empathy in the Global World.....	Dr. Carolyn Calloway-Thomas	1
序	孙有中	14

跨文化语用研究

Conversational Dominance and Cultural Dominance—A Number's Game?.....	Stefanie Stadler	16
Gender and Complimentary Discourse	Alla Sheveleva & Viktoriia Timchenko	30
英汉人际关系隐喻的跨文化对比	岳喜华	48
跨文化交际中的“文化语法”——《理解跨文化交际：文化语法的协商》评介	王景云	59

国际关系/国家形象的跨文化研究

跨文化传播中的德国受众心理和应对策略研究.....	陈 正	66
跨文化沟通研究新走向——跨文化公共外交	庄恩平 虞怡达	73
外国留学生对中国文化认知情况调查	王 强	80

跨文化能力研究

孔子学院中方人员跨文化适应能力理论模式建构	安 然	94
跨文化适应能力理论的构建	张卫东	105

跨文化商务沟通研究

- 诉他型冲突风格 赵 倩 116
- Adapting to the Local Culture: A Case Study on the Management Communication
in a Subsidiary of an MNC in Chengdu Yiheng Deng & Sha Hu 130
- Glocalizing Voice and Style of *Cosmopolitan* in China
..... Doreen D. WU & Agatha Man-kwan CHUNG 153
- 华文广告中传统文化的再现: 比较内地、香港和台湾广告影片中的创意表现
元素 陈燕玲 168

跨文化教学研究

- The Anthropocosmic Perspective on Foreign Language Education for Global
Citizenship—Learning to Be Global Citizens as Learning to Be Human
..... Jia Yuxin & Jia Xuelai 179
- International Transitions: Facilitating Intercultural Learning and Global Citizenship ...
..... Jane Jackson 207
- Investigation Into the Assessment of Intercultural Communication Competence
in China's College English Test Band Four Yanhong Hu & Weiwei Fan 225
- Uncovering Learning Performance in Higher Education: A Cross-cultural Study
..... Yaolung J. Hsieh 252
- 从框架语义学视角探究大学生批判性文化自我意识的产生 和媛媛 264

跨文化比较研究

- Intercultural Understanding of "the Chinese *Five Elements*": A Cross-cultural
and Cognitive Case Study Zonglin Chang 274
- 汽车旅行: 两篇郁达夫游记的跨文化书写 张一玮 290
- 中美电视脱口秀节目主持人话语风格的文化差异研究 刘君红 297

Beyond the Crooked Timber of Humanity: Empathy in the Global World

Dr. Carolyn Calloway-Thomas
Indiana University

On August 21, 2013, 1,429 people were gassed in Syria in the midst of a brutal civil war. On August 8, 2012, in the town of Manolada in western Greece, two men jammed a 22-year old Egyptian man into a car and dragged him through town. In 2013, more than 120 Christians in Nigeria were killed by a radical group named Boko Haram.

On September 12, 2012, the US Embassy in Libya was attacked and Ambassador Christopher Stevens was killed along with three other Americans. The attack on the US Embassy in Libya occurred because an obscure 14-minute film trailer surfaced, which allegedly mocked Islam's Prophet Muhammad. Although facts are still murky regarding who killed the ambassador and why, it is the case that over the past several years, much civil unrest has occurred in over 11 nations. As fires raged, and as individuals in the Middle East and Africa demonstrated fiercely, I pondered what could have generated such violence and outrage. Televisual footage was dramatic and compelling. Subsequently, when I gazed upon an international map that was trotted out by a North American television network and saw the large number of contested geopolitical spots around the world, my heart stood still. And I wondered aloud how much goodwill needs be injected into this troubled, messy globalized world in order for human beings to live well and address the myriad of problems that confront us.

In my way of thinking, this is the quintessential question of the moment. We need to recognize the very centrality of discourses of empathy in this fractious, tottering world. But we can talk more about this later, because I want to start with a story that provides a glimpse into what happens when empathy enters the world beautifully, and remains alive in it.

In his remarkable book, *Bury the Chains*, Adam Hochschild (2005) tells a riveting story of how and why slavery commanded Thomas Clarkson's attention. According to Hochschild, in 1784, Clarkson competed for an essay prize at Cambridge University,

and chose the papers of a slave merchant for his research investigation. While sorting through the papers, young Clarkson “found himself overwhelmed with horror” (p. 88). Of the essay competition, Clarkson said, “I had no motive but that which other young men in the University had on such occasions; namely, the wish of...obtaining literary honor” (p. 88). But unexpectedly, as he prepared his essay, and as he marshaled evidence, he was overcome with pain. “In the day-time I was uneasy, in the night I had little rest. I sometime never closed my eyelids for grief,” wrote Clarkson. What caused the turmoil in young Clarkson’s soul? The compelling answer? The contents of the essay! You see he had written an essay on the topic, “Is it lawful to make slaves of others against their will? And what his research uncovered was most disturbing” (Hochschild, 2005, pp. 88-89).

Clarkson’s essay won first prize, but his life would never be the same again because the evils of slavery had gained his attention. And according to Hochschild (2005), “Clarkson read it aloud in Latin to an audience at the university’s majestic Senate House, where such ceremonies are still held today” (p. 88). By that time, Clarkson was already a deacon in the Church of England. However, en route back to London, after he mounted his horse, he had an epiphany.

Over six feet tall, Clarkson had thick red hair and large, intense blue eyes that looked whomever he spoke to directly in the face. Riding to the capital in the black garb of a clergyman-to-be, he found himself, to his surprise, thinking neither of his prospects in the church nor of the pleasure of winning the prize. It was slavery itself that “wholly engrossed my thoughts. I became at times very seriously affected while upon the road. I stopped my horse occasionally, and dismounted and walked. I frequently tried to persuade myself in these intervals that the contents of my Essay could not be true. The more however I reflected upon them or rather upon the authorities on which they were founded, the more I gave them credit.” These feelings grew more intense at the midpoint of his journey, as he was riding down a long hill towards a coach station where the road crossed the River Lea. “Coming in sight of Wades Mill in Hertfordshire, I sat down disconsolate on the turf by the roadside and held my horse. Here a thought came into my mind, that if the contents of the Essay were true, it was time some person should see these calamities to their end” (Hochschild, p. 88).

“It was time some person should see these calamities to their end.” I recite the story of Thomas Clarkson because his role in the abolition movement is one of the most inspiring examples of what can happen when one uses empathy as the bedrock of human

relations. Hochschild identifies empathy as the key reason why white abolitionists such as Thomas Clarkson, John Newton, William Wilberforce, and others succeeded in ending slavery in the British Empire. And I am talking about ending British slavery, not North American slavery. Said Hochschild (2005), “abolitionists mastered one challenge that still faces anyone who cares about social and economic justice, drawing connections between the near and the distant” (pp. 5-6). At the time, in the 19th century, this was a new, enterprising force in history!

The words, “Because the abolitionists were able to make Britons understand what lay behind the sugar they ate, the tobacco they smoked, and the coffee they drank, they changed the world in dynamic and elegant ways” (Hochschild, 2005, p. 6) are extraordinarily insightful. They remind us that huge economic things were at stake, and yet a small knot of individuals changed the thinking and behavior of an empire! Rarely has there been a more compelling movement in history than “the fight to free an empire’s slaves.” The words that Clarkson and other abolitionists used, the arguments they employed brilliantly to stir human’s souls, surely contain a lesson for us today as we focus on empathy in the world.

For my speech today, I have chosen the title “Beyond the Crooked Timber of Humanity: Empathy in the Global World,” which is taken from 18th century philosopher Immanuel Kant, who employed the powerfully explicit statement, “Out of timber so crooked as that from which man is made nothing entirely straight can be built.” If one thinks of a world in conflict in Syria, in Egypt, and other places; if one thinks of the 85 people who were killed at an island youth camp in Norway in 2011, most of them young future leaders, because the killer’s world view differed significantly from the world view of those who died; if one thinks of the extreme vitriol that exists between Tea Partiers, conservatives and Progressives and Democrats in the United States, one has to conclude that something is out of kilter. One has to conclude that things are other than what they should or need be and that something is powerfully askew, globally. One also has to conclude that we need to insert empathy—a global imperative into the world of human affairs. At a time of crucial cultural, economic, and social change, it is imperative for me to argue that the practice of empathy can influence human affairs and help straighten Kant’s crooked timber of humanity, but it will not be an easy thing for us to do in some places. Empathy is one of the greatest challenges of our time. To make my point, along the way, I will define empathy, discuss Hume’s notion of concentric circles,

and use mini-case studies as synecdoches (tropes which put the name of the whole for a part or the name of a part for the whole) to juxtapose old models of behaving against empathetic models of human relations, while simultaneously challenging us to argue another form of humanity into existence (one based on inclusivity, peace, respect, and universal human values) as opposed to arguing another kind of community into existence (one based on turmoil, meanness, wretchedness, genocide, and heaps of trouble). And now for a definition of empathy, something basic, but very complex and difficult; otherwise, why is there so much grief and conflict in the world?

Empathy is a difficult concept to grasp. That is the great historical and philosophical fact that we must face at the outset. The term we call empathy was coined in the 19th century by Vischer (1994) who aligned it with the psychological theory of art, which I need not go into today. By empathy, I mean the ability, “imaginatively,” to enter into and participate in the world of the cultural other cognitively, affectively, and behaviorally. The phrase “imagining the feelings of others,” means that we understand the behavior of others better when we are able to enter their world and “see it” through their eyes. If we accept the proposition that people’s behavior and words can be interpreted as intelligible responses to the natural conditions in which they find themselves and seek to understand, we are better equipped to deal with discourses of empathy in human relations. Of course, attempting to “see through the eyes of others” does not mean that we can duplicate others’ actual feelings but rather that we can suspend judgment and seek to enter their minds and feelings through “imaginative participation.” Imaginative participation is critical. One must be able to “see” through the eyes of others, creating both a subject and an object-oriented focus that can shift, depending on whether the lens of cultural empathies are a reflection of one as subject or object.

One of my arguments is that virtuous empathy is a global imperative—a necessary condition for highly desirable human outcomes. Underlying my argument about “desirable human outcomes” is an assumption that Kant advances in his book, *The Metaphysics of Morals*. Rather than using whose “ought” is worthier than someone else’s “oughts,” I agree with Kant that in the moral realm of things, respect for dignity is owed all humans regardless of their standing in the community.

In *the Metaphysics of Morals*, Kant wrote,

Humanity itself is a dignity, for a man cannot be used merely as a means by any man...but must always be used at the same time as an end. It is just in

this that his dignity (personality) consists...so neither can he act contrary to the equally necessary self-esteem of others...he is under obligation to acknowledge, in a practical way, the dignity of humanity in every other man (Kant, 1991, p. 55).

Further, in his moving book, *Humanity: A Moral History of the Twentieth Century*, Glover (2000) argues that “our inclination to show respect and our disgust at someone’s humiliation, is a powerful restraint on barbarism” (p. 23). And he tells the following story to illustrate what happens when a weakening of a restraint against barbarism occurred in the Amritsar massacre. In 1919, in India, British troops under the command of General Dyer fired for 10 minutes into a peaceful Indian political meeting. Dyer’s men killed between 500 and 1,000 people and wounded scores of others. But the question that all of us should ask, according to Glover, is how could General Dyer have ordered such an atrocity? In explaining the serious matter, Glover offered some keen insights for our consideration as we ponder the importance of empathy, a global imperative. Glover notes that the reason why Dyer’s men fired on a group of unarmed Indians may be linked to the way British authorities in that part of India humiliated Indians. Indians had to “salaam,” when a European approached; Indians who failed to salaam was made to “kiss the boots of the officer” he ignored. For the same offence, as Glover notes, others were made to “lie down, rub their noses in the dust and grovel” (Glover, 2000, p. 23).

So, in answer to this keen question of why Dyer’s men fired on innocent Indians, Glover (2000) says compellingly, “To order the massacre might have been harder if the Indians’ protective dignity had not already been violated” (p. 23). This is a chilling explanation! And it tells us a great deal about why an empathetic impulse is needed—one of following Kant’s principle of respect for the dignity of everyone. Again, using Glover’s voice, **SHOWING RESPECT IS A POWERFUL RESTRAINT ON BARBARISM**. By implication, this also means that we must be very attentive to usual, everyday, ordinary, business-as-usual ways of treating our fellow human beings—a point that I will address in more detail later. But for now, we should heed Glover’s and Kant’s admonitions and not humiliate folks regardless of their standing in community, because all human beings are owed dignity.

What then does the respect for the dignity of others call upon empathetic humans to be or do? Part of empathy’s work is to knit together human and cultural elements of

both the near and the distant, so that we will care about other people even if they are an ocean away. But how do we do this? Why, after centuries, do human beings persist in messy, ugly and wretched ways, promoting evil upon the seashore? Why are there so many ugly stories of conflict and turmoil? On September 11, 2001, nineteen members of Al-Qaeda destroyed the World Trade Center in New York City, killing 3,000 people. On October 27, 2005, in towns and cities, French-Arab and French-African youths rioted, burning cars, businesses and public buildings (Carreyrou, 2005). Today, insurgents in Afghanistan continue their battle against American occupation of that country. When I talk about empathy as a global imperative, I exclude from consideration of psychopaths and mentally ill people for obvious reasons.

I could go on and on with this recitation, ever mindful, as Glover notes in his book, *Humanity*, that more ghastly and cruel things occurred in the 20th century than in all of humanity combined. Why have things gone so horribly wrong? I argue it is because we do not practice empathy. And today, I must emphasize, underline, stress, reiterate and insist upon compassionate discourse at all levels of human engagement from the elite level where so many decisions are made that affect human beings globally to quotidian, everyday, ordinary conversations.

To make my point about why empathy, the social glue that holds human society together, is so difficult to accomplish and why empathy's mission is so daunting, let us examine philosopher David Hume's concentric circles of reducing loyalty for what they reveal about a need for empathetic behavior in the 21st century. The concept of concentric circles of empathy is that human beings love and are loyal to their families first, and then their loyalty diminishes as they move from the center to the periphery. Each of us feels diminishing empathy as we go from our nuclear family to the extended family, to our local community, to our province or country (say, Hainan or China, to geographical regions (say, Asia and the Americas), and then to the world.

Thinkers as far back as the Stoics have posited a doctrine of the relationship between the near and the distant. Stoics called this mode of thinking and behaving *oikeiosis*, that is, the notion that we prefer those closest to ourselves than those farthest away. For some time now, humans have wittingly and unwittingly used this model as a prototype for how we engage with the world. And our slavish followership has, by extension, been accompanied by the "macho origin myth" that posits the notion that our true human nature is to wage war and that the world often is nasty, brutish and short. Bhagwati (2004) in his book, *In Defense of Globalization*, claims that "what the

Internet and CNN have done is to take Hume's outermost circle and turn it into the inner most. No longer can we snore while the other half of humanity suffers plague and pestilence and the continuing misery of extreme poverty" (p. 19). But have they? Have human beings finally turned Hume's and Stoic's outermost concentric circles into the innermost? If yes, then this certainly would be a beautiful triumph for humankind and should be met with jubilee by all.

But Hume's concentric circles raise questions of huge significance for empathetic discourse. Interculturally, can we generate doctrines of tolerance and universal love such to maintain powerful inversions of loyalty? And if yes, what will such conversion look like? Having grown up in the United States, in Bernice in Louisiana, a one-traffic light blink and it's gone kind of southern town, where people say hello and good morning, where religious training was all around me—in the Baptist tradition—and where the bonds of community were tightly woven, and where we functioned like coral—in an interrelated fashion instead of like a one-celled amebae, I am convinced that we need to imagine and talk into existence a different kind of human relations model worldwide. Surely, the challenge of a global economy and the challenge of our degrading biosphere, climate change and other serious ills, place upon us a demand as colossal as the one that confronted young Thomas Clarkson as he and his band of dedicated leaders faced the mighty British empire. Can the crooked timber of humanity be made straight? Can empathy, a global imperative, be talked into existence? This is our challenge, and it is one that we must confront fully in order to turn things right side up again globally.

Recall that Clarkson as well as other men and women from "the age of wigs, swords and stagecoaches," not only helped end one of the worst of human injustices in the most powerful empire of its time; they also revealed some crucial characteristics that are central for empathetic discourse. "Never doubt," said anthropologist Margaret Mead, "that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world. Indeed, it is the only thing that ever has." Mead's notion of smallness and what it implies is one of the reasons why I underline a need for global empathetic discourse in human relations. All we need are dedicated global citizens acting humanely as things spin around—and "get out of kilter," to quote North American abolitionist Sojourner Truth, who was one of a small band of people dedicated to the proposition that new and exciting things can happen in the service of humankind, if empathy is privileged.

Another beautiful example of helping talk empathy into existence concerns the

compelling story of Malala Yousafza¹, the 14 year-old Pakistani schoolgirl who was shot in the head by the Taliban because of her courageous attempts to help young people in Afghanistan learn how to read. She was shot for advocating education for girls. But empathy entered her world and the world of others. Malala made a miraculous recovery after being flown to the United Kingdom for treatment. And now Malala's story is a galvanizing one that is fostering empathy for young girls all around the world who are denied opportunities to develop the life of the mind, so that they can think well. She is an extraordinary, walking symbol of an empathetic imperative. In her presentation before the United Nations, to a chorus of positive responses, 16-year old Malala said powerfully, "They (referring to the Taliban) thought that the bullets would silence us, but they failed...The terrorists thought they would change my aims and stop our ambitions but nothing changed in my life," said Malala, "except this: Weakness, fear and hopelessness died. Strength, power and courage were born. I am the same Malala" (p. 2). I am sure many of us know her beautiful story.

So, transformations can and do occur and they have caused humanity to undergo a sea change of values, attitudes, beliefs and behaviors. And the empathetic leadership of abolitionists also reveals some crucial things that we sorely need.

First, there must be a fierce sense of urgency borne of attentiveness to others. How we get this precious quality is, of course, the subject of much debate and discussion. Recall Thomas Clarkson's moment of attentiveness. As Hochschild (2005) points out, the poignant moment of awakening held echoes of Saul's conversion on the road to Damascus. Like Saul's radical conversion to Paul, Clarkson's attentiveness energized his soul, and he began to "see" the world from the perspective of the slave. Now several features of empathic attentiveness are relevant here. As Alessandra² observes, "Attentiveness means that one is open to outside stimuli, your perception, or, if the stimuli, are subtler, entering your intuition" (p. 1). Because we select, organize, and interpret the stimuli we receive through our senses into a meaningful picture of the world around us, the perception process is the basis of our communication with others. In terms of empathetic literacy, the key is that humans who feel for others are able to interpret reality or incoming data from the perspective of the other.

Let us return to the 14-minute film trailer that has stirred such turmoil recently

1 see more at <http://ibnlive.in.com/news/full-text-of-malala-yousafzais-speech-at-united-nations/406812>.

2 quoted from <http://www.Alessandrfa.com>.

and ask what type of rhetoric should have been inserted at the moment of crisis? Then recall that the American Embassy in Egypt issued a statement before Ambassador Christopher Stevens was killed, which said that the US condemns, “the continuing efforts by misguided individuals to hurt the religious feelings of Muslims”¹. Recall as well that the discourse uttered by the American ambassador focused on Egyptians. Using context-dependent rhetoric, searchingly, the official tried to be attentive to the needs of Egyptians by contextually injecting the employment of wise, cool-headed, calm language that identified with Egyptians, keeping in mind Kenneth Burke’s notion of consubstantiality, that we can persuade a person only insofar as “we speak his language, identifying his ways with ours.” Most crucially, the language of attachment that the American diplomat employed was other-directed and spoke volumes about closeness and proximity, sameness and difference, and caring and not caring.

Both implicitly and explicitly, the language of the diplomat said respectfully to Egyptians “your soul needs attending,” and the language also said, “I want prevent the possibility of rhetoric ossifying.” Like the Stoics of old, the American diplomat tried to “radically cut back the passions” in Egypt and heal souls by using therapeutic arguments. The DNA of therapeutic argument is a commitment of compassion with an identification with the other. Somewhere and in some place Kenneth Burke said, “To call a man or a woman a friend or an enemy is to recommend a course of action with regard to him or her.”

To the American official in Egypt, the matter at that point, was about being attentive to Egyptians’ dignity. I cannot tell you how often on BBC world service radio, I’ve heard speakers from the Middle East commenting on the West’s lack of respect for Muslims. We should never ever undervalue the role that showing proper respect plays in human affairs. And as you know, honor is a big thing in the Middle East. Once upon a time, honor mattered in the United States. If you doubt it, simply go to Savannah Georgia and you will find there an old dueling spot of ground that used to be pretty robust. Appiah (2010) in *The Honor Code: How Moral Revolutions Happen*, argues forcefully how change occurs not from imposing edicts from above but from harnessing the power of honor from within cultures.

During the Iraq war, Lt. Colonel Tim Collins, commander of the Royal Irish battle

1 quoted from <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/special/world/cairo-libya-attacks-timeline>, p. 1

group in Iraq, addressed his troops in Kuwait before they were deployed to Iraq, and his story serves as a nice, compelling lead-in to the second condition for empathetic discourse: empathetic discourse employs the language of trust and goodwill. Lt. Colonel Collins's talk is one of the most emotionally moving, extemporaneous speeches that I have read recently. He said to his troops, "You will be shunned unless your conduct is of the highest, for your deeds will follow you down history. Iraq is steeped in history. It is the site of the Garden of Eden, of the Great Flood, and the birth of Abraham. Tread lightly there. You will have to go a long way to find a more decent, generous and upright people than the Iraqis. You will be embarrassed by their hospitality, even though they have nothing."¹ Of course, one could contest Colonel Collins's assertion that the Iraqis "have nothing," but let us save this point for another day.

The highest recommendation for employing a language of goodwill resides within the interplay between the past and the present. If past intercultural environments have been suffused with heaps of distrust, they can forestall the possibility of people seeing eye to eye and facilitating modes of empathy. Some years ago, Harry Triandis (1976) reported that black Americans had (and this is no longer as true today) what he termed "eco-system distrust," that is a general distrust of white institutions such as governments, churches and schools, because to African Americans' way of thinking, since slavery blacks' dealings with whites had revealed that whites could not be trusted.

Now imagine the most serious empathetic individuals starting from the gate with such history in their cultural background. This point argues piercingly why a language of goodwill is an imperative in today's globalized world. Despite utilizing the better angels of our nature, communication does not always start at the beginning of an encounter or an exchange. Rather, a huge overarching embedding process has occurred long before two individuals commence a conversation or meet and greet each other. And quite frankly, the embedding process is a huge deterrent to crafting empathy. Indeed, it is daunting and so suffused with complexity. As philosopher Taylor (1992) argues, all the days of our lives, we have a conversation with our ancestors—conversations so deeply internalized that they are hidden from view. For empathetic humans, the question is how does one insert the proper mix of rhetoric, feelings and language into an intercultural environment required to reduce or diminish the embedded unconscious

1 quoted from <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/3562917/Colonel-Tim-collins-Iraq-war-speech-in-fu>, p.1

conversations that flutter about in our heads, ones we have had and still have with our ancestors and that lie interred within the very marrow of our bones, to borrow loosely from Shakespeare? This is what the American diplomat in Egypt tried to do. He tried to diminish some embedded unconscious conversations that were likely to strike havoc—and they did!

Too often such internalized conversations loom and loom and intrude because of the power of repetition—a repetition of ideas, cultural warrants, beliefs, values, and common sayings that are bandied around, a wink and a nod from a grandmother or a grandfather; in a word, countless ideas and incidents that work like an invisible hand massaging messages and sometimes disturbing “meanings, messages, and people” greatly. In my way of thinking, this is one of the most compelling reasons why things can go so horribly wrong when individuals interact interculturally. In light of this, it behooves an empathetic person to amputate or deemphasize old musty, stale conversations that no longer apply to the human condition, for maximum compassionate benefit. This is where the role of how to talk about vexing matters enters the picture. This is where linguistic and cognitive deterretorialization enters the room. I have in mind here creating an environment that should discourage rhetorical excess. Consciously removing extraneous, intrusive attitudes and behaviors that poison agendas, relationships, and so on, should help empathetic individuals draw upon complex, rich sources of language such as elevating reason, argument, the presentation of evidence, and other things that lead to civility, as opposed to diminishing humankind.

Empathetic individuals are usually aware of framing, finding appropriate language with which to argue differing perspectives. Given competing and heightened “moral visions” of what people should be or do, it bears repeating—assuming goodwill—that each culture is motivated by its own “sources of moral authority”, that is, each group’s views are firmly grounded in its own ideas of what is right or wrong, good or bad, appropriate or inappropriate, relevant or irrelevant and important or unimportant. While I do not have enough time to amplify the significance of employing everyday techniques, I will provide one such autobiographical example from rule 3 of my 10 basic rules of intercultural communication, and that is, “In potentially confrontational or hostile encounters, treat the question or comment from another ‘as if’ the person is seeking information or knowledge” (Calloway-Thomas, 2010, p. 216).

In 2006, one of my colleagues and I traveled to Riga Latvia and Vilnius, Lithuania to participate in a conference on democracy and civic engagement, and to give lectures,

respectively. In beautiful Riga, while my colleague and I were shopping for trinkets for family members, we were greeted by two young, enthusiastic Latvian high school women, who, judging from their youth clearly should have been in school and not on the streets of gorgeous Riga—however engaging and fetching.

As my colleague and I approached the young women, we greeted them, only to be met with the following question: “Why is your skin black?” In a nanosecond, I replied, “Our skin is black because we have more melanin in our skin than you have.” And then I said, “But if you stay out in the sun long enough, you might get as dark as we are.” My friend and I finished our obligatory familial shopping, and upon leaving the product-laden vendor stalls, we encountered the same young women en route back to our hotel. The young women who had put a question to us that might have been viewed by some as hostile, mean-spirited, and confrontational said, “Hello, we are out in the sun trying to get dark like you.” A beautiful story! If we are to turn the world toward a more humane bent and away from global unrest and cruelty, we must foster more goodwill and sidle up to difference in coherent ways. But, again, I warn you that it will not be easy, although from my perspective, it is an easy thing to do.

For another truncated, but packed intercultural sense of how the language of goodwill functions, let us focus on former President Nelson Mandela’s historic inaugural speech, which was given at a time when both the malleability of nationalist sentiment and some of the enduring tensions around its radical constitution were evident. Appealing to the land—common ground—beneath the feet of his diverse, unified, and mutually suspicious audience, Mandela spoke of the soil and what it meant to all South Africans. He referred to the natural beauty of the country as symbols of a new beginning. He said,

To my compatriots, I have no hesitation in saying that each one of us is as intimately attached to the soil of this beautiful country as are the famous jacaranda trees of Pretoria and the Mimosa trees of the bushveld.

Each time one of us touches the soil of this land, we feel a sense of personal renewal...That spiritual and physical oneness we all share with this common homeland explains the depth of pain we all carried in our hearts as we saw our country tear itself apart in a terrible conflict (*The Independent*, May 11, 1995, p. 12).

It is this kind of rhetorical and intercultural power that will in ordinary interactive situations foster new and more compelling ways to promote harmony, tranquility