

PEACE PSYCHOLOGISTS—DETERMINING THE CRITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

A dissertation submitted

by

HENRIETTE VAN ECK

to

PACIFICA GRADUATE INSTITUTE

in partial fulfillment of  
the requirements for the  
degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY  
in  
CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGY

This dissertation has been  
accepted for the faculty of  
Pacifica Graduate Institute by:

Dr. Michael Sipiora, Chair

Dr. Azarm Ghareman, Reader

Dr. Julie Meranze Levitt, External Reader

ProQuest Number: 3722716

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 3722716

Published by ProQuest LLC (2015). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code  
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.  
789 East Eisenhower Parkway  
P.O. Box 1346  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

JUNE 22, 2015

Copyright by  
HENRIETTE VAN ECK  
2015

## ABSTRACT

Peace Psychologists—Determining the Critical Contributions

by

Henriette van Eck

Peace psychology was recognized by the American Psychological Association (APA) as a specialty area of psychology in 1990. This research study analyses the past 25 years of peace psychologists' efforts as the Society of Peace, Conflict, and Violence: Peace Psychology Division 48 of the APA (Division 48). Today the field has grown to include an international network of educators, researchers, practitioners, and advocates. The core mission of peace psychology is the transformation of conflict resolution away from violence and toward peacebuilding through psychologically informed interventions that operate at all levels of human relationships.

This research study focuses on both the theory and practice of peace psychology. The psychology informing peace building interventions is reviewed from the inception of psychology to the present, with specific emphasis on contributions from clinical and depth psychology. The research demonstrates how the organized psychological relationships among conflict, peace, and violence form a central axis which governs human relationships. Clinical and depth psychology contribute significantly to understanding the psychological processes of conflict, aggression, and interventions that promote mental health and wellbeing within both individuals and relationships. While

these theories illuminate key operations within the mental framework, they also govern processes addressed directly by peace psychology's interventions.

The three areas reported in the findings include the professional functions performed by peace psychologists, the essential characteristics that are at the center of the practice, and lessons from the lived experiences of the participants. The various roles represented by peace psychologists' contributions are described because they illustrate specific, identifiable contexts within which participants engaged professionally, and help illuminate how and where peace psychology is practiced. The researcher interviewed seven past presidents of the Division following oral history methodology. The interviews were analyzed using grounded theory. Advice from the leaders informs present and future challenges for the field of peace psychology.

Key words: Peace psychology, peace, conflict, conflict resolution, activism, depth psychology, clinical psychology, nonviolence, peace education

## Dedication

This research is dedicated to two very special people—my son, Britton, whose courage, integrity, and service as a Marine inspired my pursuit of this specific topic, and my sister-in-law, Jackie, who continues to set the highest standard for resilience, patience, perseverance, gratitude, and kindness in the face of extreme violence. Britton’s patriotism and desire to be of help to his peers who were in the military caused him to enlist in the United States Marine Corps Infantry. He served one tour in Afghanistan and two tours in Iraq. My experience of being a mother to a soldier on the front lines awakened me to another reality—my own complacency around accepting war as an unquestioned part of our civilization and culture. The repercussions from his experiences did not end with his service. He continues to hear of suicides of those he knew as well as manage his own invisible wounds. I deeply respect his courage both on the battlefield and in constructively building his future upon his return. His compassion, desire for excellence, humor, and exemplary character remain untouched by his experiences. His courage in reintegrating, and building a life aligned with his values is a constant source of inspiration.

My persistence to see this research through to the end has been inspired by Jackie. Unexpectedly, on the morning of January 2, 2014, she was viscously attacked by an intruder who was attempting to steal her car. He entered her home, saw her, and cut her face and eyes with a knife, smashed her skull on the floor, and left her for dead. She is alive today because of my brother’s luck in finding her quickly and his tenacity to endure the secondary victimization of being immediately treated as a prime suspect by the police. This brief but brutal event has left Jackie’s life forever altered as she is now

blind, confined to a wheelchair, and paralyzed on her left side. I have never seen Jackie's courage, optimism, and gratitude waver through every step of her rehabilitative process. I am humbled by her example. Britton and Jackie are living proof of the generativity and goodness of human nature's responses to violence in its most cruel forms. I hope that peace psychology may add one more drop to the ocean of efforts to increase peace building in human relationships.

A quick note about my name change that occurred during this research. My given surname of "Warfield" became more unsettling as I realized that the violence I had endured from my father had taken its toll in my own life's choices and path. Along with this path to a PhD in clinical psychology, I have been able to transform many of those dark places. Today, a name that is synonymous with a battle field no longer fits, and I have chosen to change to simply using my middle name "van Eck" which aligns with a special Dutch lineage especially of four prior "Henriette van Eck's"—my mother, great aunt, great grandmother, and great-great grandmother. My great aunt was a pediatrician, and my great grandmother established the first outdoor educational setting for disabled children. Since my goal is also to work with children, van Eck better aligns with my path going forward and honors the best parts of my past.

I want to express my sincerest gratitude to the many clients, fellow interns, supervisors, teachers, trainers, and advisors who have contributed to my knowledge and insights during my journey through this phase of my professional and personal growth. Special thanks to Julie Levitt, who has opened up my engagement with the Society for Conflict, Violence, and Peace when I first met with her as President in 2011. Julie has been a mentor and teacher; she is also an inspiring pioneer of peace psychology as was

her aunt, Clara Rabinowitz, who inspired her. To all the peace psychologists with whom I have spoken, especially those who permitted the interviews: you each added important perspectives from a life aligned with peacebuilding, and I thank you for your generosity of time, insight, and encouragement. Special gratitude to my husband and partner, Marty Poretsky, for his enduring support, his forbearance during the countless hours I disappeared in this undertaking, his many refills to my coffee cup, and the wonderful happiness he brought living life in the in-betweens.



## Table of Contents

Chapter 1. Introduction .....	1
Purpose Statement.....	1
Relevance of the Topic for Clinical Psychology .....	5
The role of war and peace in the development of psychology. ....	5
Violence: A leading global public health issue.....	10
Clinical psychology's contributions to a reduction of violence.....	14
Justification for continued clinical research. ....	20
The self-definition of clinicians as peacebuilders.....	22
Autobiographical Origins of the Researcher's Interest in the Topic .....	26
The Researcher's Predisposition to the Topic .....	28
Chapter 2. Literature Review .....	31
Psychology's Founders and Their Views of Peace and War .....	33
Depth Psychology Contributions .....	49
Historical roots.....	49
Freud's theory of the unconscious.....	50
Jung's theory of the unconscious.....	55
Expansion of depth psychology's theory.....	58
Unconscious dynamics in crowds and groups.....	59
Unconscious dynamics in nations.....	63
Psychology of war.....	65
War neurosis and depth psychology .....	66

Development of Freudian-based theories of war, conflict, and peace. ....	67
Development of Jungian-based theories of war, conflict, and peace .....	74
War's impact on the growth of psychology. ....	78
Contributions of Psychology's Professional Associations towards Peacebuilding.....	83
American Psychological Association. ....	83
The American Psychological Association and national defense ..	84
The American Psychological Association, the CIA, and the Cold War.....	90
War's impact on the American Psychological Association.....	99
Board of Social and Ethical Responsibility for Psychology (BSERP).....	100
Board of Advancement of Psychology in the Public Interest (BAPPI).....	101
Society for Psychological Study of Social Issues (SPSSI). ....	115
Other national and international psychology association's contributions to peace. ....	122
Development of Peace Psychology as a Field of Psychology .....	126
Pioneers in peace psychology. ....	128
Dorothy Ciarlo (1933– ).....	130
Ethel Tobach (1921– ) .....	130

Morton Deutsch (1933– ).....	132
Herbert Kelman (1920– ).....	133
Doris Miller (1922– ).....	136
Milton Schwebel (1914– ) .....	139
Brewster Smith (1919–2012).....	142
Ralph White (1908–2008).....	144
Other contributions by the authors of the Pioneers Series.....	146
Peace Psychology Research: 1900–1990.....	148
Peace Psychology Research: 1991–Present .....	153
Defining the field. ....	153
Peace Psychology Journal.....	156
Peace Psychology Book Series. ....	157
Summary.....	158
Chapter 3. Methodology .....	159
Research Approach.....	159
Research purpose. ....	159
Research rationale.....	161
Research method rationale.....	162
Interview versus survey .....	164
Personal investment in the topic .....	165
Prior research in this area.....	168
Research Methodology .....	169
Research design .....	169

Interview methodology.....	170
Participants.....	173
Questions.....	175
Analysis and coding.....	176
Ethical Considerations .....	178
Benefits to the participants.....	178
Confidentiality.....	179
Consent to be interviewed.....	179
Chapter 4. Findings.....	181
Interviews.....	181
Michael G. Wessells (1948– ).....	181
Daniel J. Christie (1949– ).....	186
Marc Pilisuk (1934– ).....	187
Eduardo Diaz (1951– ).....	188
Gilbert Reyes (1953– ).....	189
Rachel MacNair (1958– ).....	190
Brad Olson (1970– ).....	191
Chapter 5. Discussion .....	223
The Psychology of Conflict .....	225
Conflict is a both a conscious and unconscious process.....	225
Conflict creates an imbalance in a system designed to be in balance.....	228
Conflict engages defense mechanisms which mask root causes .....	229
Conflict involves the coexistence of opposites.....	230

Conflict is resolved either with violent or peacebuilding strategies .....	232
The Psychology of Violence .....	236
Violence is both overt and subtle .....	232
Violence destroys relationships and health .....	233
The Psychology of Peace/Peacebuilding .....	236
Peace psychology redefines peace. ....	236
Peacebuilding in peace psychology .....	237
Peacebuilding and personal peacefulness .....	238
Peacebuilding's essential tools .....	240
Psychologically informed peacebuilding is effective .....	242
Chapter 6. Conclusions and Implications for Future Research.....	245
Conclusions.....	245
Implications for Future Research.....	248
References.....	250
Appendix A. Peace Psychology Book Series .....	289
Appendix B. New York Times Article .....	291
Appendix C. Human Nature and Peace: Statement by Psychologists .....	292
Appendix D. Psychological Literature Listed in SPSSI's 1962 Newsletter, "Psychologists and Peace" .....	295
Appendix E. Sample Informed Consent Form.....	299
Appendix F. Sample Instructions to Participants.....	300
Appendix G. Recollections of Engagement with Peace Psychology Division's Development .....	301

Appendix H. Reflections on the Applicability of Depth Psychology to Peace Psychology .....	308
Appendix I. Participant Thoughts on Personal Peacefulness.....	314
Appendix J. Today's Priorities for Peace Psychology.....	317
Appendix K. Verbatim Responses to a Portion of Question 3 .....	324

The style used throughout this dissertation is in accordance with the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (6th ed., 2009), and *Pacifica Graduate Institute's Dissertation Handbook* (2014–2015).

## List of Tables

Table 1.	Breakdown of Psychological Research, 1900–1990.....	151
Table 2.	Nuclear Psychology Bibliography: Breakdown of Psychological Research by Theme and Number of Articles.....	152

## Chapter 1

### Introduction

When I despair, I remember that all through history the ways of truth and love have always won. There have been tyrants, and murderers, and for a time they can seem invincible, but in the end they always fall. Think of it—always.

—Mahatma Gandhi

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of this study is to understand the specific contributions to the field of psychology made by peace psychology as studied through the lives of peace psychologists who have served as presidents of the Society for the Study of Peace, Conflict, and Violence: Peace Psychology Division 48. This specialty area was officially made a division of the American Psychological Association (APA) in 1990. Division 48 includes self-selected psychologists, students, and affiliates from diverse disciplines. Membership in APA is not a prerequisite for membership in Division 48. This vision statement for Division 48 was accepted in 1995:

As peace psychologists, our vision is the development of sustainable societies through the prevention of destructive conflict and violence, the amelioration of its consequences, the empowerment of individuals, and the building of cultures of peace and global community. (Society for the Study of Peace, Conflict & Violence, 2012)

Although peace psychology has its roots in philosophy and is evident in the individual work of psychologists since its inception as a field of study, peace psychology did not gain momentum until the mid-1900s with the onset of the Cold War and the threat of nuclear annihilation (Christie, 2012). From a time preceding even the Cold War, it can



be said that the field of peace psychology has had, and continues to have, a tremendous impact on scholarship, practice, and public policy. Some of the key research studies addressed: (a) sources and consequences of conflict and violence, (b) interventions during conflict and cycles of violence, (c) post-violence peacebuilding, (d) sources and methods to decrease structural and cultural violence, (e) systems analyses and interventions for the whole system, and (f) methods to sustain and build on peaceful relations (Diaz, 2009). Scholarly contributions also include impacting education through academic curriculums used to teach peace psychology. Practicing peace psychology is undertaken through work in government and foundations, as well as independent practices. Peace psychology's social activism is represented in another association known as Psychologists for Social Responsibility (PsySR), as well as practiced by peace psychologists in international, national, community, corporate, non-profit, and individual work. Division 48 publishes a quarterly peer-reviewed journal, "Peace and Conflict: The Journal of Peace Psychology," and a biannual online newsletter, "The Peace Psychologist." The society also acts as a catalyst for members to leverage their interests in specific topics such as ethnicity and peace, immigration, spirituality and humanitarian practices, and personal peacefulness. At the APA's annual conventions, Division 48 presents peace psychology topics that align with Division 48's scholarship-activism model of psychologists concerned about peace and social justice (Christie, 2012). A Peace Psychology Book Series established by Christie, Series Editor, and an Advisory Board of internationally prominent peace psychologists is published through Spring Publishing and now contains 25 titles (see Appendix A). In 2012 the first *Encyclopedia of Peace Psychology* (Christie, 2012) was published.

The project is relevant not only because wars and violence are still prevalent, but also because the field has developed as a subspecialty of psychology and questions have arisen about where the field is headed. I am writing on this topic for three reasons: (a) to understand the contributions of psychology in general, and clinical and depth psychology in particular, to peacebuilding; (b) to understand why psychologists continue to find meaning in this work, including what sustains them; and (c) to document the insights of leaders regarding the challenges and opportunities ahead for the American arm of the peace psychology movement.

Psychology, as a field of science, is 123 years old and its intersection with war and peacebuilding is a central issue in the field today. During more than 100 years psychology has been actively researched and applied by the military as an offensive strategy to maintain military superiority. The researching of psychology's application toward peacebuilding has been a constant theme in the field, but only became a recognized specialty in the past 25 years.

The use of psychology by the military in World War I legitimized psychology as a field of science. During World War II the applications of psychology expanded within the Department of Defense (DOD) and the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) for propaganda, torture, mass communication, training men and women to kill, selecting optimal soldiers and support staff, and massaging public relations messages (Summers, 2008). Additionally, a large part of the growth of the clinical psychology field was spearheaded by the Veterans Administration in response to the mental health needs of returning veterans in World War II (Humphreys, 1996). The management of the responses to war's stressors, such as (a) treating post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD)

and traumatic brain injuries (TBI), (b) addressing high suicide rates, (c) providing grief counseling, and (d) adjusting to permanent psychological injuries (e.g., loss of limbs, blindness, paralysis) caused by conflict has created a large strain on limited mental health resources (Pols & Oak, 2007). Members of the American Psychological Association have expressed concerns about the role of psychology in the current reformed health care system (Health Service Psychology Education Collaborative, 2013). The financial and professional rewards from working as a psychologist at the DOD, CIA, or VA system, performing research in institutions receiving DOD and CIA funding, or contracting individually or through non-profits to these agencies is reflected in the large emphasis the military is given by the APA (Summers, 2008). Peace psychologists, however, do not have DOD, CIA, or the VA funding their work.

Let us remember an important historical lesson from the last time this question was before us: When money, jobs, and prestige are at stake, it is easy for us to follow those influences more than our vision of how psychology can best contribute to human welfare. (Humphreys, 1996, p. 193)

This research study will seek to understand 21st century thinking about psychology's application to peace from the perspective of those who have built the American arm of the movement, Division 48.

Peace psychology convenes psychologists from many specialty areas of psychology such as community, clinical, social, political, developmental, experimental, and neuroscience as well as academics, policy professionals, and researchers. The research focuses on the individuals and activities of Division 48 in order to study the growth of the field, its current successes and challenges, and future development.

Members of Division 48 define peace psychology as a discipline “seek[ing] to develop theories and practices aimed at the prevention and mitigation of direct and structural violence . . . [and] promot[ing] the nonviolent management of conflict and the pursuit of social justice” (Christie, Wagner, & Winter, 2001, p. 7). Peace psychology includes “a wide range of topics such as ethnic conflict, family violence, hate crimes, militarism, conflict management, social justice, nonviolent approaches to peace, and peace education” (p. iv). MacNair (2003) defined peace psychology as “the study of mental processes that lead to violence, that prevent violence, and that facilitate nonviolence as well as promoting fairness, respect, and dignity for all, for the purpose of making violence a less likely occurrence and helping to heal its psychological effects” (p. x). The research design of the line of inquiry in this dissertation extends the line of investigation begun with a 1990 survey of the membership of Division 48.

### **Relevance of the Topic for Clinical Psychology**

#### **The role of war and peace in the development of psychology.**

War and peace have been essential considerations from the first written texts by philosophers to the current writings of modern-day psychologists. Writings on war go back to the most ancient of world texts: India’s *Mahabharata* (Valmiki, trans. 1973) and the *Ramayana* (Valmiki, trans. 1970), China’s *The Art of War* (Sun Tzu, trans. 2008), Judaism’s *Torah*, and Greece’s *History of the Peloponnesian War* (Thucydides, trans. 1954). The philosophical writings of Socrates’ student, Plato (427–347 BCE), also focused on this topic. In *Laws, Book 1*, Plato explored the argument that war, and not peace, is the natural state of nature (Plato, 2006). The traditional argument that the state must always prepare for war is attributed to the philosopher Heraclitus (Kurtz & Turpin,

1999). Plato disputed Heraclitus, citing the view of Hesiod (c. 800 BCE), who wrote, “That other road is better which leads toward just dealing; for justice conquers violence, and triumphs in the end” (Robinson, 1968, p. 20). Plato concluded that the “something” which is superior to war is peace (Plato, 2006).

Psychological concepts blended with philosophy prior to the emergence of psychology as a separate field of science. Philosophy explored fundamental problems such as existence, knowledge, values, reason, mind, and language. The word *philosophy* comes from the ancient Greek φιλοσοφία [philosophia], which is loosely translated as “love of knowledge . . . the study of mortality, existence, and the universe” (Webster, 1828/1967). *Psychology* is literally translated as “study of the mind,” from the Greek: ψυχή psukhē “breath, spirit, soul”; and -λογία, -logia “study of” (Webster, 1828/1967). Webster (1828/1967) defined psychology as

the scientific study of the nature, functioning, and development of the human mind, including the faculties of reason, emotion, perception, communication, etc.;

the branch of science that deals with the (human or animal) mind as an entity and in its relationship to the body and to the environmental or social context, based on observation of the behaviour of individuals or groups of individuals in particular (ordinary or experimentally controlled) circumstances.

Three early contributors to the separation of psychology from philosophy were Wolff (1679–1754), Kant (1724–1804), and Herbart (1776–1841). Wolff separated empirical and rational psychology. Kant emphasized the distinction between empirical psychology and a philosophical theory of knowledge. Herbart added a distinction that psychology could be both mathematical and empirical as well as metaphysical (R. I.

Watson, 1968). As German Idealism underwent a crisis, marked symbolically by the death of Kant in the early 19th century, the academic pursuit of philosophy shifted to favor psychology. In academia, chairs of psychology replaced chairs of philosophy in departments and programs (Albertazzi, Libardi, & Poli, 1996). Against this backdrop, Wundt became the first person called a *psychologist*. Wundt labeled psychology as “a new domain of science” (Wundt, 1904/1984, p. i).

It is notable that the separation of psychology and philosophy did not happen without debate and serious consideration. For example, the American Philosophical Association and the APA held joint meetings annually in the early 1900s to discuss the issue. At the December 27, 1905, meeting, Munsterberg chaired a discussion that included Professors Hall, Angell, Taylor, and Thilly (American Philosophical Association, 1906). At this meeting the comments of the four panelists indicated the differing positions of psychology’s development as a separate field of science. Hall argued that

Psychology is a branch of natural science, and can be fruitfully studied only in connection with the phenomena of the material world. Its business is to examine the physical and psychological conditions of mental states, and this it can do only by employing the methods of the natural scientist. (American Philosophical Association, 1906, p. 173)

Angell argued for letting psychology evolve naturally:

For my own part, I refuse to recognize either the necessity or the wisdom of taking any overt measures looking toward the one step or the other . . . [f]or psychology is just beginning to gain the respect of scientists, and she has not as

yet wholly lost that of the philosophers. . . . Everyone knows that psychology has for the most part a philosophical lineage and that certain highly important foundations of psychology, even when it is regarded as a natural science, must always be of a philosophical character. (American Philosophical Association, 1906, p. 174)

Taylor stood on the side of science by stating that “[t]he affiliation of psychology appears to be with the natural rather than with the philosophical sciences” (p. 175). Thilly further argued that

The view that psychology is a natural science because it employs the methods of science is also untenable. The psychologist uses the objective method, but introspection is everywhere his basis and guide. Experiment facilitates, corrects, and controls introspections. Measurement forms but a small and unimportant part of the problem. . . . the brain psychologist cannot take a step in the construction of his hypotheses without psychology. . . . In conclusion, affiliation with philosophy is in the interests of both fields. (American Philosophical Association, 1906, p. 176)

Munsterberg argued that psychology belonged to both fields, yet had a specific purpose.

Indeed, it does not seem too much to claim that psychology has a peculiar mission at this precise juncture in the bringing together of the interests of philosophy and natural science. Certainly no other science is in so strategic a position for the accomplishment of this purpose. (American Philosophical Association, 1906, p. 175)

As can be seen in these excerpts, the views of the participants at the December 27, 1905, joint meeting were not unified. Clinical psychology grew out of the 19th century's struggle between rationalism, in which truth was obtained by abstract reasoning, and empiricism, in which truth was gained through sensory observations and experimentation (Reisman, 1966, p. 8). Early events at this time that were considered of outstanding importance specifically to clinical psychology included James's book, *The Principles of Psychology*, Freud's groundbreaking work into the causes and treatment of neuroses, the founding of the American Psychological Association, the opening of the first psychological clinic at the University of Pennsylvania, and the development of mental tests (Reisman, 1966, p. 3).

Despite the debate about the differences between psychology and philosophy, four psychologists, German Franz Brentano (1838–1917), American William James (1842–1910), Swiss Auguste Henri Forel (1848–1931), and Austrian Sigmund Freud (1856–1939) were at the forefront of establishing psychology as a science in Europe and America, and were also socially active as pacifists promoting anti-war efforts. The earliest publication on the subject was Larsen and Fischer-Benzon's *Krieg und Menschen: Psychologische Bilder aus einem Modernen Kriege* [War and People: Psychological Images of a Modern War], published in 1905. Freud, Jung, and other founders of psychology “were motivated in their research by a profound abhorrence of warfare and violence and the inner conflicts or drives and forces within the individual psyche that cause mental anguish and suffering” (Daffern, 1999, p. 756).



**Violence: A leading global public health issue.**

Violence has been elevated to a leading public health issue, in part because collective action can prevent it, but also because it causes the largest numbers of injuries, disabilities, and deaths (Powell, Mercy, Crosby, Dahlberg, & Simon, 1999). In 1996 the World Health Organization (WHO) adopted resolution WHA49.25 (World Health Organization, 1996). This resolution declared violence a leading and growing worldwide public health problem. The WHO also ordered a comprehensive study to investigate and compile basic knowledge about violence, as well as its causes, preventions, and interventions. Six years later publication of the *World Report on Violence and Health* set the stage for a comprehensive view of the problem and an invitation to expand efforts (Krug, Dahlberg, Mercy, Zwi, & Lozano, 2002). The report addressed a wide audience, such as researchers, those addressing violence in their work, and those who develop and implement programs and services.

In 1990 interpersonal and self-directed violence accounted for 2.7% of the disabilities suffered worldwide, and this number is expected to reach 4.2% in 2020 (Powell et al., 1999). Among the statistics compiled by WHO are the following: 1.6 million people lost their lives to violence in 2000; of these deaths 50% were suicide, 30% homicide, and 20% were war-related. Worldwide, among people aged 15–44 years of age, violence is the leading cause of death. Homicide rates in the United States are more than 10 times those of other leading industrial nations, on par with the rates in developing countries and those experiencing rapid social and economic changes (Krug et al., 2002). The WHO report also created the stage for recognizing violence not just as a criminal justice issue, but also as a critical public health issue. This set the stage for solutions

approached from an interdisciplinary perspective, which included public sectors such as mental health, physical health, education, social services, justice, and public policy. The forward and preface of the study included comments by Nelson Mandela:

The twentieth century will be remembered as a century marked by violence. It burdens us with its legacy of mass destruction, of violence inflicted on a scale never seen and never possible before in human history. . . . Many who live with violence day in and day out assume it is an intrinsic part of the human condition. But this is not so. Violence can be prevented. Violent cultures can be turned around. (as quoted in Krug et al., 2002, p. xi)

Also included were remarks by WHO Director-General Dr. Gro Harlem Brundtland:

Saving our children from (childhood) diseases only to let them fall victim to violence or lose them later to acts of violence between intimate partners, to the savagery of war and conflict, or to self-inflicted injuries or suicide, would be a failure of public health. (as quoted in Krug et al., 2002, p. xiii)

J. F. A. Murphy (2002), editor of the peer-reviewed *Irish Medical Journal*, commented:

The content of this [WHO] Report is harrowing. It deals with one of the greatest problems in society. It casts a new light on the genesis of violence. We are persuaded that violence on its present scale is not inevitable and that targeted public health measures can reap positive dividends. (p. 1)

Research released in 2010 by the Uppsala Conflict Data Program (UCDP) at the Department of Peace and Conflict Research at Uppsala University, Oslo, Sweden, has provided a more granular look at where conflicts are occurring, and how and when armed conflicts end (Kreutz, 2010). This dataset focused not only on international conflicts, but

also on civil wars. It provided a precise snapshot of outbreaks of violence and the duration and quantity of four types of peace structures: victory, peace agreements, ceasefire, and “other” outcomes (Kreutz, 2010). The definition of conflict in previous studies set the battle-death threshold at 1,000 deaths per year; if a subsequent year of the same conflict produced less than 1,000 deaths it was considered concluded. The UCDP used 25 deaths per year as the threshold in order to improve accuracy (Kreutz, 2010). The UCDP also included interstate conflicts never before measured by using the criteria of the conflict as the basic unit of measure rather than the country. Previous studies (Quinn, Mason, & Gurses, 2007; Walter, 2004) only reported conflict by country, thereby overlooking multiple, co-occurring interstate conflicts. For the period 1946–2005, 231 armed conflicts were identified by UCDP in 151 locations worldwide. In another study, UCDP researched peace agreements to understand their duration, and the threats to enforcing them. From 1997 to 2011, 216 peace agreements were achieved in areas where conflict had been ongoing (Högbladh, 2011). Two of the key findings resulting from studying peace agreements were that outside support for the establishment of peace was influential in intrastate conflicts, and the probability of continued peace increased in the presence of peacekeepers at the end of civil wars (Kreutz, 2010).

In 2014 the Institute of Economics and Peace (IEP) released the eighth Global Peace Index (GPI). The GPI, covering 99.6 per cent of the world’s population, is composed of 22 qualitative and quantitative indicators to gauge three themes: “the level of safety and security in society; the extent of domestic or international conflict; and the degree of militarization” (Institute for Economics and Peace [IEP], 2014, p. 1). The 2014 GPI reported that over the previous 7 years, 4 of the 22 indicators had increased in peace

and 18 had deteriorated, leading to the conclusion that overall peace in the world had deteriorated each year over the past 7 years (p. 43). The top four areas of deterioration were “the level of terrorist activity, per capita weapons imports and exports, and number of homicides” (p. 2). The top three areas of improvement are “nuclear and heavy weapons capability, per capita number of police, and number of armed service personnel” (p. 2). Furthermore, while the report indicated varying degrees of peace, violence and conflict were very present concerns in terms the welfare of the human population.

In March 2013, for the first time, the United Nations included peace as one of the five key transformational principles essential to meeting its eight Millennium Development Goals. The committee addressed structural violence as described in peace psychology. The panel stated, “Freedom from conflict and violence is the most fundamental human entitlement, and the essential foundation for building peaceful and prosperous societies” (United Nations, 2013, p. 9). This placement in the UN’s development agenda will shape policy through 2030. Against this backdrop of organizations’ statistics and research verifying an escalation of violence, there exists another body of research demonstrating that violence has declined over the millennia. Daly and Wilson (1988), in their book *Homicide*, argued that violence in non-state societies has declined since the Middle Ages. A German sociologist, Elias, analyzed history from 800 AD to 1900 AD and found a correlation of civilizations’ growth in functional complexity to a sublimation of man’s baser instincts (1939/2000). Political scientist Mueller (1989) traced how developed nations reduced their consideration of war as a policy option by studying the Korean, Cuban, and Vietnamese Cold War crises. In 2005, a Peace and Conflict Studies research group provided evidence that wars,

genocides, and international crises had declined since the end of the Cold War (Human Security Centre, 2006). Evolutionary psychologist Pinker (2011), in his theory of the civilizing process, made the case that psychology and history have cooperated in violence's decline. He linked changes in both the physical realm (such as commerce and feminization) and the intellectual realm (such as breakthrough ideas, the escalation of reason, moral sense, empathy, and self-control) as causal forces for reducing violence. An archeological and historical research study by Keeley (1996) provided a comparison of the frequency and brutality of warfare conducted by civilized versus prehistoric societies. He concluded that warfare today is less frequent or deadly than in prehistoric times.

#### **Clinical psychology's contributions to a reduction of violence.**

Psychology, sociology, group dynamics, and peace research in most languages refer to peacebuilding as a reduction in violence, conflict, and disagreement, as well as the development of peace, trust, confidence, and mutual accord between individuals, groups, and nations (Daffern, 1999). Within the many branches of psychology, clinical psychology specifically addresses these issues at the individual and group levels. A brief review of the founding and trajectory of clinical psychology will highlight more specifically the framework for peacebuilding contributions that clinical psychology has to offer.

Clinical psychology credits its founding to Witmer (1867–1956), an American psychologist who received his doctoral degree in 1893 under the tutelage of Wundt in Leipzig (McReynold, 1997). One of the original founders of the APA, Witmer argued for the separation of psychology from philosophy and the development of more science-

based criteria for selecting members of the APA (McReynold, 1997). It is worth noting that when Witmer originally presented his concept of clinical psychology at the APA's 1896 meeting, it elicited no other response than "slight elevations of the eyebrows on the part of a few of the older members" (Collins, 1931, p. 5). Witmer persisted and established the first laboratory of psychology at the University of Pennsylvania. In an article titled "Clinical Psychology," Witmer defined clinical psychology:

Although clinical psychology is clearly related to medicine, it is quite as closely related to sociology and pedagogy. . . . An abundance of material for scientific study fails to be utilized, because the interest of psychologists is elsewhere engaged, and those in constant touch with the actual phenomena do not possess the training necessary to make the experience and observation of scientific value . . . . I have borrowed the word "clinical" from medicine, because it is the term I can find to indicate the character of the method which I deem necessary for this work. The term "clinical" implies a method, and not a locality. (Witmer, 1931, pp. 348–349)

Witmer's work centered on children with learning and behavioral differences, and he used this population to describe the goals of clinical psychology.

Pedagogy is primarily devoted to mass instruction which teaches subjects of the curriculum to classes of children without reference to the individual differences presented by members of a class. The clinical psychologist is interested primarily in the individual child. As the physician examines his patient and proposes treatment with a definite purpose in view, namely the patient's cure, so the clinical psychologist examines a child with a single definite object in view—the

next step in the child's mental and physical development. It is here that the relation between science and practice becomes worthy of discrimination. . . . the purpose of the clinical psychologist, as a contributor to science, is to discover the relation between cause and effect in applying the various pedagogical remedies. . . . Whether the subject be a child or an adult, the examination and treatment may be conducted and their results expressed in the terms of the clinical method.

(Witmer, 1931, p. 351)

Witmer, in viewing psychology as a science, also framed its purpose as contributing to the advancement of humankind. "But in the final analysis the progress of psychology, as of every other science, will be determined by the value and amount of its contributions to the advancement of the human race" (p. 347). Although Witmer was aware of Freud's work, he mirrored Wundt's attitude by not paying much attention to Freud. Nevertheless, it is notable that Freud was the founder of psychotherapy, which is an important component of modern clinical psychology (Routh, 1996, p. 245).

Modern day clinical psychology, a field that operates on a scientist-practitioner model, has been credited to the conceptualization of Shakow (1901–1981), who published his collected papers in 1969 titled *Clinical Psychology as Science and Profession: A 40-year Odyssey* (Shakow, 1969). Shakow noted the "phenomenal" growth in clinical psychology, and cited membership in the APA's Clinical Psychology Division, which grew from 787 members in 1948 to 2,883 in 1964, and the increase in the number of schools having clinical psychology programs from 30 in 1948 to 55 in 1963 (Shakow, 1969, p. 41). A major contributor to the growth of clinical psychology was the lack of psychiatrists available during World War II to treat the 49% (550,000,

Summers, 2008) of discharged veterans diagnosed as neuropsychiatric (Menninger, 1948; Summers, 2008). Millions of other soldiers and veterans suffered from mental breakdowns of various types and severity (Menninger, 1948). “Due to the severe shortage of psychiatric personnel, psychologists were thrust into psychotherapeutic roles for the first time” (Summers, 2008, p. 617). The need for non-psychiatric clinicians was so great that the military embarked on landmark funding for training programs beginning with the program at Brooke General Hospital (Menninger, 1948). The Veterans Administration also began funding academic institutions for the express purpose of establishing clinical psychology programs, and thus graduates (Routh, 1996). This effectively increased the number of clinicians available to treat the overwhelming number of World War II veterans. These funds, combined with funds from the National Institute of Mental Health, provided the “origin of the American Psychological Association’s system for accrediting doctoral training and internships in clinical psychology” (Routh, 1996, p. 246). More effective mental health interventions and diagnostic tools have continually been the focus of research and practice in this field of clinical psychology. This effort to understand the inner causes of violence and aggression and establish parameters of inner psychological peace is at the core of clinical psychology. It has offered another dimension to those who thought of peacebuilding as only an outer political process of constructing relationships. There was growing agreement that outer peace is an impossible dream without first achieving inner psychological peace (Daffern, 1999, p. 762). Thus, the findings of clinical psychology are applicable to the main research areas in peacebuilding and peacemaking. These include (a) educational strategies; (b) psychological, scientific, religious, and artistic approaches; (c) the role of



the media, mass communications, and information technology; (d) peacemaking through justice, law, and human rights; (e) mediation, restorative peace, and conflict resolution; (f) nature and environmental peacebuilding; (g) politics, political science, and peacebuilding; and (h) social and economic thought and peacebuilding efforts (Daffern, 1999). The goals of these peacebuilding efforts parallel those of clinical psychologists working therapeutically with individuals and groups. Peacebuilding efforts include (a) transforming negative conflict situations into win-win (not win-lose) resolutions, (b) creating long-term strategies for deeper and more lasting interventions in areas of protracted conflict, (c) establishing processes for active reconciliation and genuine transformation of negative energy when disputes emerge, and (d) involving greater and more effective use of neutral third parties to aid in the reevaluation of the perspectives of both disputing parties while achieving more sustainable reconciliation (Daffern, 1999). As each of these goals involves attitudes and behaviors, they work within a shared framework of psychological premises. A rationale for expanding and improving psychological research in all of these areas correlates directly to improved methodologies to meet the goals of peacemaking as outlined. Thus, the study of the psychological underpinnings of conflict and violence, as well as peacemaking and peacebuilding, are applicable to individuals, families, communities, and nations (Daffern, 1999).

The abhorrence of war and violence partially motivated the earliest research done by founders of the field of psychology such as Freud, Jung, James, and others. They were also motivated by their recognition of the inner conflict of forces within the psyche that caused mental anguish and suffering, which in turn led to mental illness and psychotic states (Daffern, 1999, p. 762). Daffern (1999) wrote, “Many psychologists,

including William James, have made a direct connection between the mental illness exhibited by unstable individuals and the collective madness that seems to overcome large social and political groups in time of war and group violence” (p. 726). Another prominent psychologist, Alfred Adler, believed that social responsibility was “fundamental to the practice of psychology” (as quoted in Rudmin & Ansbacher, 1989, p. 8). Efforts by specific psychological groups, such as the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues (SPSSI) and the American Psychological Association’s Division 48, used knowledge gained from aspects of clinical psychology such as psychoanalysis; analytical, archetypal, and forensic psychology; cognitive behavioral therapy; and neuroscience. Clinical centers such as the Tavistock Clinic in London, the Veterans Administration’s mental health services, and numerous research centers have devoted efforts to addressing the effects of mental instability caused by violence, war, and conflict. All of these clinical efforts contribute directly to peacebuilding within the individual, family, and group domains. “A number of peace psychologists have approached the problem of collective violence with clinical tools” (Christie, 2006).

Universities worldwide today offer graduate and undergraduate peace studies courses to explore and teach the psychological contributions to peacebuilding at the social, political, cultural, and policy levels. For example, specific gender relation studies have focused on peacebuilding (Cole & Norander, 2011; Purkarthofer, 2006). Men’s studies engage scholars in analyzing the dynamics of male behaviors that contribute to violent behaviors in gangs, dysfunctional family roles, military groups, and criminal organizations. Feminist scholars argue that gender imbalance and patriarchal social relations are primary causes for organized violence. Psychologists, archeologists,

historians, and sociologists study gender roles across cultures with an eye to highlighting the victimization of women and children who suffer the consequences of rape, torture, death, dehumanization, and adverse conditions. Related to gender concerns is a growing focus on family peacebuilding in which stressors and tensions in family systems that often lead to violence and abuse are studied. Peacebuilding concerns also include a strong focus on children, because early instances of violence, sexual abuse, and conscription into the military can be major motivating factors for not only treatment but also policy concerns. Thus, from its inception clinical psychology has continued to be an important contributor with other disciplines focusing their expertise on peacebuilding and a reduction of conflict and violence.

#### **Justification for continued clinical research.**

At the 2013 Annual Conference of the Alliance for Peacebuilding, Col. Chris Holshek, former U. S. Army Civil Affairs officer and currently on the Editorial Board of *Building Peace: A Forum for Peace and Security in the 21st Century*, remarked,

When a couple of hundred guys with a few million dollars drive some airplanes into some building and . . . our response has been about two trillion dollars. . . we can't keep going on like this. . . . Only 0.5% of the entire defense budget goes to war-to-peace transition . . . the rest is for war fighting. (Holshek, 2013)

According to Witmer's (1931) standard for clinical psychology to measure its value by its contributions to the human race, the 21st century is calling for not only clinical psychology, but all disciplines to sharpen their focus on addressing conflict and violence. In addition to anecdotal quotes, statistics have verified the growth of global conflicts, violence, and wars. Three research data bases: the World Health Organization (WHO),

the United Nation's public health arm; the Uppsala Conflict Data Program (UCDP), which provides one of the most accurate data sources on global conflicts; and the Institute for Economics and Peace's Global Peace Index (GPI), which uses qualitative and quantitative measures to measure the relative position of nations' and regions' peacefulness all report an increase in violence and conflict (IEP, 2013; Kreutz, 2010; UNESCO, 2013b).

The coordination of efforts to promote peace includes many partners at world, country, county, community, and individual levels. At the global level, the United Nations Education, Science, and Culture Organization (UNESCO) was conceived with the view that education, science, social science, culture, and communication are the means for nations to collaborate in contributing to peace and security for all peoples of the world, without distinction of race, sex, language, or religion (UNESCO, 2004). Many disciplines, including some in the life science and medical science fields, as well as psychology, have embraced this goal. For example, biologists and neuroscientists are making new breakthroughs in understanding the physiological dynamics contributing to mental health. Pharmaceutical solutions for treatment of mental illnesses resulting from experiencing or witnessing violence are constantly undergoing research and refinement as part of a multi-phased effort to address trauma's mental aftermath. Clinical psychologists' focus on (a) restoring mental health for those impacted by violence, trauma, and conflict; and (b) optimizing and maintaining mental health, makes them critical contributors to the long-term growth and maintenance of peace in societies, groups, and among individuals.

Thus, more research and collaboration, not less, is needed, according to the host organization for UNESCO, the United Nations, which was founded in response to the atrocities of World War II and whose preamble proclaims a determination “to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war” (United Nations [UN], 2011, p. 4). For 60 years, UNESCO has taken up the implementation of this goal with a constitution that asserts that, “since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be constructed” (UNESCO, 2013b). UNESCO has recently established an overarching goal for all sciences to work together to build a culture of peace and non-violence.

In its essence, the culture of peace and non-violence is a commitment to peacebuilding, mediation, conflict prevention and resolution, peace education, education for non-violence, tolerance, acceptance, mutual respect, intercultural and interfaith dialogue and reconciliation. It is a conceptual as well as a normative framework envisaged to inspire thoughts and actions of everyone.

Therefore, it requires cognitive as well as the emotional abilities to grapple with our own situation in a rapidly changing world as well as with the emerging world society. This aim entails not just more factual knowledge, but also the broadening of our consciousness and the willingness to develop a new awareness, a new way of being in this world, a new “mental mapping.” (UNESCO, 2013b)

### **The self-definition of clinicians as peacebuilders.**

Psychologists have been engaged in peacebuilding since the field’s inception. The annual meeting of the APA in 1990 highlighted key peacebuilding contributions those psychologists pioneered (Pilisuk, 1992). These included (a) nonviolent conflict

resolution through mediation and negotiation (Fisher & Ury, 1981), (b) the understanding of trust (Deutsch, 1973), and (c) the numbing effects of the contemplation of nuclear war upon clients (Mack, 1988) and psychologists' own thoughts and behaviors (Lifton & Falk, 1982). Psychologists had also treated and documented the effects of war on both children (Beardslee, 1983; Schwebel, 1982) and soldiers (Lifton, 1975). The book *Psychoanalysis and the Threat: Clinical and Theoretical Studies* (Levine, Jacobs, & Rubin, 1988) was groundbreaking in exploring new psychological terrain. For example, the book included discussions on various forms of denial due to *psychic numbing*, a term introduced by psychiatrist Lifton (1968) that came out of his work in Hiroshima after World War II and applied to a state of thought he discovered that transcended the individual and applied to a group. The developmental consequences of the nuclear threat in childhood, adolescence, and adulthood also were explored. Further data on psychic numbing came from psychoanalysts' explorations of this issue as it occurred in sessions with patients. Additional chapters contained introductions to clinical perspectives on issues such as the impact of a nuclear threat on grief and loss, paranoid processes, gender, apocalyptic fantasies, love, work, and survival. Some of this early work has never lost its relevance. Frank's (1961) analysis of disarmament's impact on emotional and motivational states was in a "Peace Psychology Bulletin" reprinted 23 years later specifically because of its applicability to the ongoing sophistication of weapons that threatened humanity. Frank described how the maladaptive response of ignoring, denying, or habituating to threats can escalate and result in clinically relevant issues such as elevated anxiety, paranoia, and other strong emotions.

In 1996, an informal session of members of Division 48 and Psychologists for Social Responsibility (PsySR) occurred at the APA's headquarters to discuss clinical and applied practice in peace psychology. Issues discussed included the relationship between clinical work and peacebuilding, the unique contributions clinicians could offer, and ways to make more active contributions to the work of peace organizations and their communities (Division of Peace Psychology, 1996). Collaborations among members of Division 48 were underway at that time in order to provide more specialized focus on issues such as children, families, war, ethnicity, conflict resolution, militarism, disarmament, and conversion. These activities in 1996 echoed the need for clinical psychology to step beyond the focus of individual psychotherapy and have a more expansive impact on society.

Contrary to an attitude of despair, we should be optimistic that our contributions to human welfare will become more diverse and more effective if we place relatively less emphasis on psychotherapy and relatively more on other modes of intervention that we have developed and will continue to develop. (Humphreys, 1996, p. 195)

After the formal recognition of the Peace Psychology Division 48 by the American Psychology Association in 1990, a clinical psychologist performed the first survey of the peace psychologist membership (Brown, 1990). As the Division of Peace Psychology started to become formally organized, several members felt it was important to honor particular individuals upon whose work the field had been built. Nine individuals were selected as "Pioneers in Peace Psychology." Five of the distinguished

individuals identified themselves specifically as clinical psychologists and four of those also had another field of expertise. The specialties of the Pioneers were as follows:

- Dorothy Ciarlo: clinical psychology;
- Morton Deutsch: social psychology and clinical psychology;
- Herbert Kelman: clinical and social psychology, and international relations;
- Doris Miller: clinical psychology and labor-management relations;
- Milton Schwebel: developmental, clinical, and educational psychology;
- Brewster Smith: social psychology and psychological ethics;
- Ethel Tobach: biological psychology and feminist psychology; [and]
- Ralph White: social psychology, history, and political science. (Wessells, McKay, & Roe, 2010, pp. 336–337)

Clearly, no single disciplinary lens or orientation unlocks all the insights that peace psychology has to offer. In fact, the collective contribution by the pioneers seems to embody the Gestalt principle that “the whole is greater than the sum of its parts,” for it is through the diversity of approaches and the synergy between them that peace psychology achieves its full potential. (Wessells et al., 2010, p. 337)

The variation in the specialties of these Pioneers underscores the breadth of perspectives contributing to the establishment of peace psychology as a field, and its ongoing mission to serve as a neutral meeting place where ideas and research, as well as international and multicultural perspectives, joined.



### **Autobiographical Origins of the Researcher's Interest in the Topic**

My interest in this topic came from the convergence of starting a third career (clinical psychology) at the same time my son was enlisting in the Marine Corps Infantry in 2005. My previous exposure to military service consisted of very few memories. No one in my immediate family had served in the military. However, one event in ninth grade still bears haunting memories for me today. I was attending an all-girls boarding school in Baltimore. One day I heard my roommate scream in anguish, and as I ran to her side she told me the tragic news that her only sibling, Charlie, had just been killed in Vietnam. I knew that she and her parents had been planning his welcome home because his service was to end a week later. Her personal suffering stood in stark contrast to the peace marches in Washington, DC, in which soldiers were devalued and the cause for which Charlie lost his life was reviled. Almost 40 years after this, very unexpectedly, my son (and my only child) announced to me that he was enlisting in the Marines. Fear became a constant companion. While I could honor my son's sincere motivation to serve his country and help bring others back alive, I also recognized another reality—that uniforms, ribbons, parades, and air shows aside, our armed forces exist to recruit our sons and daughters to become part of a killing machine, which is the antithesis of how we raised them: to expand individual talents and live within a moral societal code which included “thou shalt not kill” (*Bible*, King James ver., Ex 20:13). I began wrestling with the dilemma of how we justify the incredible stripping of individuality from our children and the subsequent training that teaches them to kill. My son returned with psychological scars that he bears silently. Not until 5 years after his honorable discharge, did he begin to discuss his experiences with violence, killing, and death. Mine is one story among

millions of parents who have experienced their sons or daughters going into the theatre of battle and returning with mental and physical scars—if they are lucky enough to have their children return. Beyond learning about the management of the aftermath of trauma and post-traumatic stress disorder, I wanted to take a step back and know why we, as highly evolved technologically as we are, still had to engage in barbaric killing as a means of resolving conflict, and I wondered what psychology might have to offer.

My prior academic training was in political science and my first career in politics included running the research and polling arm of a successful gubernatorial campaign, declaring my own candidacy for elective office, and subsequently running a political party for 4 years. Very frustrated with the political system's resistance to change, and saddened by how little effort is given to actually solving problems, I left politics for a career in business which was 100% focused on change—marketing. I enjoyed the interplay of research, multiple tools, and creative execution—the cliché of thinking-outside-of-the box that results in establishing new markets and services and growing core lines of business. As a marketing executive it was second nature to think in terms of integrating different market sectors by creating solutions that benefited all sides. Acting in accordance with the status quo was simply not an option for meeting constantly evolving changes in technology, trends, and needs.

Thus, when I looked at the fact that war, conflict, and violence is our world's accepted status quo, knew the limitations of political structures to effect change, and felt the impossible chasm soldiers are asked to enter and return from and that families are co-opted to support, I just naturally began to question why psychology might not be an avenue for shifting this status quo—especially in light of psychology entering only its

second century as compared to the thousands of years that political, legal, and military institutions have tried to bring about permanent peace. Certainly everything learned in the past century about the mind, emotions, and brain via the new sciences of psychology, psychiatry, and neuroscience ought to offer some brighter solutions. I found I was not alone in this quest.

When I became acquainted with the national association representing my new professional endeavor, the American Psychological Association, I found a division within this association that seemed to bring together responses addressing my dual journey as a mother of a soldier and my new career path in psychology. This division was the Study of Peace, Conflict, and Violence: Peace Psychology Division 48 (Division 48). I was eager to learn about psychology's contributions to reducing violence, war, and killing. Thus, I chose this topic for my dissertation.

### **The Researcher's Predisposition to the Topic**

Self-reflection of my own biases as this research is undertaken will remain a vital part of this project. Gadamer assumed that the researcher will always have certain predispositions, but he advocated "an awareness of our own foreknowledge" so that it is easier for the other to "present itself in all its otherness and thus assert its own truth against one's own fore-meanings" (as quoted in Froese, 2006, p. 7). At the forefront of my biases is the new role I have as the mother of a Marine who did not return from his three tours unscathed. Occasionally he lets me know the impact on him of the deaths of soldiers with whom he served, post-discharge suicides among those he knew, and a best friend's continued enlistment and service in Iraq and Afghanistan. This is a prime motivator in my choice to undertake research in this area and has fueled my passion to

continue this research through the several years it has taken to complete it. However, this bias also precludes dispassionately undertaking this study. There is no relief from the topic as wars, conflict, and violence are the daily diet of the media. Thus, to be able to separate from my topic on a regular basis is the only way I can complete this project. Gratefully, I live surrounded by nature. The process of being able to feel the dark emotions and then turn to nature for grounding again is a process that has helped communities and indigenous cultures throughout civilization. It has been my support for years, and has helped ground this research with as much objectivity as is possible under these circumstances.

Another bias is my naiveté in assuming psychology was a field that is researching and practicing from a humane perspective. My discovery, 2 years into my research, that psychology has also been used as a weapon of war truly unsettled me. I have attempted to present the facts as they have been reported, but know that I bear a significant disgust for the manipulation of any skill for the perpetuation of suffering. It is my hope that the reader will have the facts as they have been reported and draw independent conclusions. It has been very challenging to stay neutral on this topic especially as it began to claim front page news in the last year of my work.

My belief that change is possible may also make me unwilling to accept, irrespective of the results of this research, that moving toward a culture of peace is impossible. My career in marketing taught me that overcoming what seemed like impenetrable barriers to attain growth of products and services in declining markets is, in fact, possible. Similarly, election of candidates to public office when they represented the minority political party also proved attainable. These successes predispose me to

believe change is always an option and barriers can be overcome. My optimism will be an asset because it will fuel my ongoing questioning of the status quo and sustain my interest in exploring information from a variety of sources, rejecting the oft-repeated excuse, “because it has always been that way.” However, my optimism may prevent my acceptance of the idea that the status quo may be the only possible option. In embarking on this study, I will be tracking those areas in which I find myself too invested in outcomes.

The research process of open-ended interviews also has time and resource limitations. I also recognize that by selecting the Peace Psychology Division as my research sample, many psychologists who might be doing the work of peace psychologists, but are not members of the division will not be heard. Lastly, I confess that the sheer amount of material written in various fields about violence, peace, conflict, and killing is too voluminous to study exhaustively. Many fields have made contributions with respect to peace; psychology is just one. Given these factors, I realize that my ability to understand various aspects of psychology and its relationships with other disciplines studying peace will be modest.

However, because psychology links to other fields dealing with human behavior, I can envision that my study here, while focusing on one sub-discipline (peace psychology), may have applicability within other psychology subspecialties and disciplines. My job will be to stay on task, focusing on how one group within psychology furthers the development of theory and applications that lead to sustainable, positive, and peaceful communities without war and internal fractionalizing of conflict.

## Chapter 2

### Literature Review

The best, however, is neither war nor civil war—the necessity for these things is to be regretted—but rather peace and at the same time goodwill towards one another.

—Plato: *Laws. Book I.* (628c).

The purpose of this chapter is to show the interweaving of co-occurring yet different elements that influenced the development of the field of peace psychology. The bedrock underlying all these components was both a deep passion for peace and a commitment to use scientific research methodologies to understand causes and offer solutions and interventions. This review will be used to look at the contributions from psychologists, psychological associations, researchers, and applications specifically concerned with reducing conflict, violence, and war and treating its effects. Also considered are the development of scientific discoveries and the subsequent growth of subspecialty fields that have contributed expertise regarding behavior, conflict, violence, trauma, and peace among individuals and groups. The use of psychology in war is reviewed because it offers a perspective of psychology's early outreach to, and acceptance by, the military to the development of the military as psychology's largest consumer.

The literature review begins with an exploration of connections that linked founders of psychology with their individual, yet shared, quest to alleviate war and increase peace efforts. Next, the subspecialty of depth psychology, known for its research into unconscious as well as conscious psychological factors, is reviewed for its contributions. This subspecialty is also important to cover for two reasons: the

researcher's training has been informed by this field, and the research methodology selected allows for this lens to be applied.

Next, a review of the relationship between psychology and the military offers insights into the growth of psychology, especially clinical psychology. It also illustrates psychology's areas of expertise specific to conflict and its aftermath. Psychologists can be found working in the Defense Department, Veterans Administration, State Department, Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), the National Security Agency (NSA), and in many non-governmental entities contracted to deliver services to the military.

Professional associations serve as a means of expanding a field by setting professional standards, offering education, publishing research, serving as a catalyst for professional exchange and outreach, and lobbying for the field when challenged publically or legislatively. How national and international psychology associations have demonstrated concern and made efforts to reduce conflict, violence, and wars provides helpful insights to understanding how group dynamics played a factor in launching peace psychology within APA in the United States. Contributions from national and international associations are reviewed to understand how psychologists worldwide are using their group structure to leverage changes toward peace. To understand the breadth of socioeconomic, cultural, and professional diversity among individuals who had the greatest impact on the development of the field of peace psychology, a section is dedicated to a review of nine individuals who have been given the distinction by Division 48 as Pioneers in Peace Psychology. Next, a section is devoted to psychology research from 1900 to 1990 that impacted the development of a division specifically dedicated to

expanding the research and application of psychological principles to peace. This is followed with a review of research published by Division 48, Peace Psychology.

### **Psychology's Founders and Their Views of Peace and War**

The concern with expanding peace and minimizing violence has been recorded in the works of philosophers as far back as Pythagoras, who lived from 570 BC to 490 BC (Rudmin, 1991). While engaged in discoveries that built the new field, early founders of psychology found avenues to speak about psychology and war. Franz Brentano (1838–1917) was one of the first psychologists to advocate for peace and include it as a goal of psychology (Corsini, 2002). Brentano founded his psychological principles on Aristotle's writings, and, in so doing, revived Aristotelian studies. Although Brentano believed psychology and philosophy presented little difference, he used psychology to resurrect philosophy and established the Act School of Psychology (C. E. Watson, 2005), which approached the acts of psychology (i.e., what a person does, including his or her emotions, judgments, ideations) as distinct from Wundt's structural approach of describing the contents of a person's consciousness (Corsini, 2002). Among Brentano's leading contributions to psychology was authoring *Psychology from an Empirical Standpoint* (1874). He later published *The Classification of Mental Phenomena* (1911), and parts of a third book, *Sensory and Noetic Consciousness*, published posthumously by Oskar Kraus in 1928. Brentano believed psychology should focus on social issues (Rudmin, 1991).

We may, therefore, confidently hope that psychology will not always lack both inner development and useful application. Indeed the needs which it must satisfy have already become pressing. Social disorders cry out more urgently for redress



than do the imperfections in navigation and railway commerce, agriculture and hygiene. (Brentano, 1911/1978, p. 24)

Brentano reflected on the contrast of Aristotle's teachings to his star pupil, Alexander the Great, who chose the life of a warrior with much celebrated violence and killing.

Aristotle resolved this conflict by satisfying himself that he had given his student his best teaching. Aristotle stated that it is an "empirical fact . . . that man is moved more to love the gifts he has bestowed than those he has received" (Brentano, 1911/1978, p. 2).

Nevertheless, Brentano commented, "Bent on conquest, Alexander pursued nothing but war and ever greater expansion of his empire. But Aristotle declares that all states whose institutions are designed mainly with a view to war are ill-conceived in principle" (p. 2).

At the outbreak of World War I Brentano's deeply personal convictions against war caused him to move from his retirement home in Italy to the more neutral grounds of Zurich (Rudmin, 1991). Rudmin (1991) noted that Brentano's students continued to expand on his teachings and impacted the fields of psychology (e.g., Stumpf, Ehrenfels, Freud, Meinong), philosophy (e.g., Husserl, Meinong), logic (e.g., Twadowsky), and literature (e.g., Kafka, Musil).

In the United States, some have called James the "first true American psychologist" (Wertheimer, 2000, p. 81). He widely travelled in Europe and used the work of Wundt and Brentano to develop his own concepts. After receiving his medical degree from Harvard in 1869, he stayed on and taught both psychology and philosophy. His students, who made significant and pioneering contributions to psychology, included Sidis (psychopathology, hypnoid/hypnotic states, group psychology), Hall (childhood development, evolutionary theory), Thorndike (comparative and educational

psychology), and Calkins (paired-associate task and self-psychology). Calkins was also the first woman president of the American Psychological Association. Other students of James made significant contributions in a variety of fields. Stein, who was supervised by James at Harvard's Psychological Laboratory, opened up an understanding of normal motor automatism, a phenomenon hypothesized to occur in people when their attention is divided between two simultaneous intelligent activities such as writing and speaking (C. E. Watson, 2005). Stein's experiments yielded examples of writing that appeared to represent "stream of consciousness," a psychological theory often attributed to James that became a term used to describe the style of modernist authors Virginia Woolf and James Joyce. Other students included Theodore Roosevelt, George Santayana, W. E. B. Du Bois (Du Bois was a noted sociologist, historian, civil rights activist, Pan-Africanist, author, and one of the co-founders of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People in 1909), Ralph Barton Perry (a philosopher who led the new realism movement and was a biographer of William James), Horace Kallen (a philosopher who articulated the danger in oversimplification of philosophical concepts because without examination of complexities, difficulties multiply), Walter Lippmann, Alain Locke, and C. I. Lewis (G. E. Myers, 2001). James is best known for his two-volume publication, *Principles of Psychology* (1890), which was condensed into a single volume popular in psychology courses throughout the first half of the 20th century.

James's ideas impacted many psychological and philosophical topics and are still pertinent including his ideas on peace (Rudmin, 1991). After the Spanish American War (1898) and during the Philippine-American War (1899–1902) James joined peace conferences and served as Vice President of the Anti-Imperialist League (Rudmin, 1991).

The Anti-Imperialist League formed to oppose the American-Philippine War and joined together diverse individuals such as Andrew Carnegie and Samuel Clemens with William James. As part of their efforts, they published letters written by soldiers serving in the Philippines. The letters described service members' orders to use torture, as well as explicit orders to kill everyone age 10 or older (Hamson, 2013).

James believed that the drive to kill was a part of who we are as a species. He addressed this bluntly at the Universal Peace Conference in 1904 by noting that man is unique from a biological perspective insofar as humankind is the only species that “preys systematically on his own species” (James, 1904/2008, p. 122). A month before his death in August of 1910, James's (1911/2008) essay, “The Moral Equivalent of War,” was read at Stanford University. He outlined the grip that war has had throughout the history of civilization, while at the same time acknowledging that the unrestrained plundering of Alexander the Great has served somewhat as a check on aggression in modern warfare. Keep in mind that James died in 1910, thereby not experiencing the magnitude of aggression in wars that came after his death. “History is a bath of blood,” James (1911/2008, p. 110) stated, and he proposed a practical counter-balance to the force of the military in society. “It would seem that common sense and reason ought to find a way to reach agreement in every conflict of honest interest. . . . But, as things stand, I see how desperately hard it is to bring the peace-party and the war-party together” (p. 110). When the military use the word peace, it is just another form of war. As James (1911/2008) noted,

Every up-to-date dictionary should say that “peace” and “war” mean the same thing. . . . it might be said that the intensely sharp preparation for war by the

nations is the real war, permanent, unceasing; and that the battles are only a sort of public verification of the mastery gained during the “peace” interval. (p. 110)

Also while noting that patriotism is used to justify militarism, James pointed out that the psychological underpinnings (or the soul) of patriotism are “inordinate ambitions” (p. 111).

James (1911/2008) faulted pacifists of his time for being “too weak or too tame” (p. 114), and for failing to offer alternatives that matched the discipline of the military. “We do ill, I fancy, to talk much of universal peace or of a general disarmament. We must go in for preventive medicine not for radical cure” (James, 1904/2008). Somewhat echoing today’s call for universal national service, James called for the creation of a “moral equivalent of war” that would involve, instead of military service, “a conscription of the whole youthful population to form for a certain number of years as part of the army enlisted against *Nature*, the injustice [of man’s relations to the globe he lives on] would tend to be evened out” (p. 117). With this civilian endeavor, James argued that the qualities of discipline, hard work, and achievement that were central to military training were applicable to needed social projects.

A contemporary of James who also made contributions to the peace movement was Auguste Forel (1848–1931). Forel impacted many fields beyond psychology, such as entomology and neuroanatomy. His contributions to psychology included comparative psychology, hypnosis, and social psychology. He was equally diverse in the social activism in which he promoted pacifism, socialism, feminism, sex education, and eugenics (Rudmin, 1991). Forel was still a medical student when the Franco-Prussian War broke out. Although Switzerland did not engage in this war, Forel’s teacher

organized a field hospital at the Swiss border to care for the wounded, and Forel chose to go there. The scene deeply impacted him. “The utter wretchedness of war (and we had passed by way of bombarded Belfort) made an ineradicable impression on me” (Forel, 1937, p. 72). It was only in his retirement years, which coincided with the beginning strains of World War I, that in his memoirs he asked himself the question, “What can I, an old cripple do?” (Forel, 1937, p. 300). He answered, “very soon the war was to show me what I could do” (p. 300). He began using his considerable reputation and contacts to advocate publically for international peace. During this time a number of peace organizations either formed or deepened ongoing efforts to either stop the war or establish permanent peace (American Peace Society, 1915). In early 1914 the Hamburg newspaper asked Forel to write an article about the formation of a United States of Europe. Although he wrote under that headline in order to stimulate consideration of this view, his real desire was to include the whole world, a view the editor declined to adopt for that article. Forel subsequently published his own pamphlet titled “United States of the World,” and was among the first to advocate for a focus on world order and human rights, instead of nationalistic interests, as the reason for peace. At the outbreak of World War I, the Dutch Anti-War Council, formed in 1914, embraced Forel’s call for minority equality before the law, religious liberty, and the free use of minority language. This council then had these concepts repeated in the International Peace Conference in Berne (Rudmin, 1991). During the war years, Forel actually organized two drawers in his desk with the intention that future generations would use them to understand those turbulent times. One drawer contained the pro-war articles and letters, and the other contained the writings of those advocating peace. “When they do not attempt in cold blood to delude

the masses, such writings are evidence of the subconscious affective complexes of wartime, and afford a rich source of material for the psychoanalyst of the future” (Forel, 1937, p. 305).

Forel (1937) continued to advocate for a United States of the World and in 1917 gathered together the peace societies in Switzerland for a Congress. The preponderance of those joining him in this advocacy exceeded the support he received at a 1915 peace meeting in The Hague. With this momentum, a Congress called at the end of 1917 met to discuss the formation of a League of Nations. Forel was further gratified that a colleague put forward a plan for this meeting, which exceeded his United States of the World and called for a World League of Peoples based on democratic and social principles (Forel, 1937). Forel strongly pushed this agenda and in March of 1919 the first Peace Congress for the World League of Peoples met in Berne. Three months later the signing of World War I’s peace agreement greatly disappointed Forel, who called it:

A bitterly ironical peace . . . a limping peace, with the motto: “Vae victis!” behind which lurked the other motto: “Vae victoribus!” Woe to the conquered—woe to the conquerors! And all this thanks to the weakness of five bonzes who even today determine the destiny of the human race! (p. 326)

Forel summed up his efforts for peace by comparing himself to the Greek philosopher Diogenes of Sinope (c. 404–323 B.C.E.) by stating, “in vain I lit my Diogenes-lantern” (p. 314). Diogenes reportedly carried a lantern in daylight to symbolize his efforts to find an honest man and to fight against corrupt societies (Dudley, 1974).

Although the contributions of James and Forel to the field of psychology are notable, Sigmund Freud (1856–1939) is generally credited with being the founder of

modern psychology. Freud considered himself a neurologist who made his lasting contributions to the field via clinical observations (Watson, 1968). While developing the field of psychoanalysis, Freud lived during multiple wars: the Franco-Prussian War (1870–1871), the Russian Revolutions (1905 & 1917), World War I (1914–1918), and the buildup and start of World War II. His experiences also bore the imprint of being Jewish, which impacted his family, colleagues, and patients, and ultimately resulted in his move to London in 1938 as Nazi persecutions escalated. From an early age Freud responded to the evidences of war with compassion. When he was 10 years old, his father took him to see the returning soldiers from the Franco-Prussian War at the train station. This so deeply affected Freud that he “begged his mother to give him her linen so he could make what was called *charpie*, the predecessor to medicated cotton” (Jones, 1953, p. 21). He even asked his teacher if the students could organize to produce charpie (Jones, 1953).

As the landscape of wars took shape, Russia maintained a special significance to Freud. Although Freud moved to Austria from Monrovia (now Czechoslovakia) at age 4, his ancestral homeland was Russia, in an area recognized today as Lithuania (Gay, 1989). Freud’s mother and many relatives lived in the town of Odessa. Freud’s father and uncle travelled frequently to Odessa on business. Freud’s patients, before the turn of the century, came to him from Odessa and other parts of Russia. Freud’s chosen mentor, Jean-Martin Charcot (1825–1893), the founder of modern neurology, served intermittently as physician to the czar. To Freud, Russia was not only of personal and familial interest, but also of political concern. Freud’s first exposure to the Russian intelligentsia took place when he studied in Paris with two colleagues and Jean-Martin

Charcot, the founder of modern neurology (Lamberty, 2008). In contrast with these colleagues who were sophisticated, progressive, and pro-West, the official political stance of Russia was tyrannical and anti-West. Freud spoke out about the events of his times using the same lens that he employed when working with patients. According to Freud's official biography, he had been uneasy about the prospect of war with Russia for many years, at least since 1886. When Czar Nicholas II issued a peace manifesto on August 24, 1898, calling for an international conference, the media reacted negatively and diplomats interpreted this offer as a way for other countries to slow their military expansion so Russia could catch up (Santi, 1991). Freud commented in a personal communication that rhetoric of peace from Russia was paradoxical, almost "revolutionary" (Rice, 1993, pp. 39).

In more public venues Freud brought the discussion of the Russian psyche to the Analytic Society he helped form in Vienna (Rice, 1993). In his article, "Thoughts for the Times on War and Death," Freud emphasized that those instincts that are foundational to understanding individuals in psychoanalysis can collapse to their most primitive state by the pressures of war and yet emerge restored in peace (S. Freud, 1915/1953). He expressed shock at the descent of leaders' ethics and morality into narrow-mindedness, "their obduracy, their inaccessibility to the most forcible arguments, and their uncritical credulity for the most disputable assertions" (p. 13). His explanation echoed that of a lineage of philosophers who noted that intelligence is not independent of emotions (Rice, 1993). Thus, Freud explained that while one might expect that leaders would support the "extensive community of interests established by commerce and production . . . nations still obey their immediate passions" (S. Freud, 1915/1953, p. 14). His antidote for the



future was a common theme among people advocating on the side of peace, “a little more truthfulness and upright dealing on all sides, both in personal relations . . . between them and those who govern them, should do something toward smoothing the way for this transformation” (p. 14). S. Freud (1915/1953) also noted that war completely removes the abstraction with which people view death because of its randomness and the volume of deaths impacting families. This experience creates both “bewilderment and the paralysis of energies . . . so felt by us we cannot maintain our former attitude toward death, and have not yet discovered a new one” (pp. 17–18). War reduces individuals to their most primitive state. He asked, “Would it not be better to give death the place in actuality and in our thoughts which properly belongs to it, and to yield a little more prominence to that unconscious attitude toward death which we have hitherto so carefully suppressed?” (p. 24). By so doing, he reasoned, life might become more tolerable.

While Freud viewed war as unavoidable, he joined Albert Forel, Albert Einstein, Rabindranath Tagore, Romain Rolland, Jane Addams, John Dewey, Upton Sinclair, Thomas Mann, Stefan Zweig, Selma Lagerlof, H. G. Wells, Bertrand Russell, and other global dignitaries and peace advocates in signing the 1930 Second Manifesto against Conscription and the Training of Youth (Melicharova, n.d.). This manifesto was sponsored by the Joint Peace Council, a loose confederation or advisory committee embracing the Quakers, the Fellowship of Reconciliation, War Resisters’ International, the Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom, and several other pacifist groups. The manifesto stated that governments should acknowledge that people were entitled to peace, that compulsory military training and conscription of youth should be abolished, and that the peoples of all countries should adopt the mantra of “No more

militarization! No more conscription! Education for humanity and peace!” (Einstein, 1960, p. 114).

Freud and Einstein engaged more directly 2 years later over the subject of war. Einstein, a tireless crusader for peace, was forthright about his thoughts on the military.

This brings me to the worst outgrowth of life, the military system which I abhor. I feel only contempt for those who can take pleasure marching in rank and file to the strains of a band. Surely, such men were given their great brain by mistake; the spinal cord would have amply sufficed. (Einstein, 1960, pp. 111–112)

Einstein also made several references to the psychology behind peace when he wrote that “the trouble with Europe is that her people have been educated on a wrong psychology. Our schoolbooks glorify war and conceal its horrors. They indoctrinate children with hatred. I would teach peace rather than war, love rather than hate” (p. 126). Einstein commented on the danger of war with Russia and Japan. “The danger of war is real, though capitalism is not the sole cause of it, as the Marxists claim. . . . the psychological factor is of even greater importance” (Einstein, 1960, p. 174).

Thus, it was Einstein who gave the world the opportunity to hear psychology’s perspectives on war through a unique invitation he extended to Freud in 1932 (Einstein, 1960). Einstein’s (1960) letter to Freud explained his position on peace by noting that the problem facing humankind was whether there was

any way of delivering mankind from the menace of war? It is common knowledge that, with the advance of modern science, this issue has come to mean a matter of life and death for civilization as we know it; nevertheless, for all the

zeal displayed, every attempt at its solution has ended in a lamentable breakdown. . . . I believe, moreover, that those whose duty it is to tackle the problem professionally and practically are growing only too aware of their impotence to deal with it, and have now a very lively desire to learn the view of men who, absorbed in the pursuit of science, can see world-problems in the perspective distance lends. As for me, the normal objective of my thought affords no insight into the dark places of human will and feeling. Thus, in the enquiry now proposed, I can do little more than seek to clarify the question at issue and, clearing the ground of the more obvious solutions, enable you to bring the light of your far-reaching knowledge of man's instinctive life to bear upon the problem.

(p. 118)

S. Freud (1933/1964) responded, in a letter now titled "Why War," by first addressing the social and historical context of violence and then outlining how conflicts within an individual result from competing internal instincts—the instinct for life (Eros) and the instinct to die (the death instinct, later named Thanatos). Freud believed these instincts operating within each individual also act to deter universal peace. Freud began his letter by noting the evolutionary trajectory of violence that began with human beings using brute force to settle conflicts just as is mirrored in the animal kingdom. Humans depart from the animal kingdom in replacing brute force with the ongoing development of weapons and skills to deploy them. This leads to superior intellect coupled with weapons rather than just brute force deciding the outcome of wars. In victory, another act of violence, slavery or servitude in one form or another, could be a modification of the instinct to kill the enemy. For the defeated, this ignites "a craving for revenge" (p. 84).

More recently, Freud noted, the development of law became a way for an “alliance of many weaklings” (p. 84) to overcome brute force. Yet the use of law can also be violent by attacking those who are not in agreement. This is a marked departure from historical views of violence because it is a community acting rather than an individual. Johan Galtung (1930– ), a sociologist and mathematician credited with founding the discipline of peace and conflict studies, more eloquently developed the theory of structural violence in which the concept that institutions can be violent was explored (Bajaj, 2008, p. 159).

Although in *Civilization and its Discontents* S. Freud (1929/1958) posited that law and civilization served to restrict human’s violent instincts, Freud continued to state that this is only true in theory because the group being governed by law has people with access to varying levels of influence. This sphere of influence breeds another kind of violence, as those with more influence construct laws that grant them advantages over less influential members of the group. Legal instability then occurs as “first, the attempts by the members of the ruling class to set themselves above the law’s restrictions and, secondly, the constant struggle of the ruled to extend their rights and see each gain embodied in the code” (S. Freud, 1929/1958, p. 86). Thus, conflicting interests alone can become a breeding ground for violence. Freud echoed Einstein’s conclusion that to replace what exists with a higher ideal would be impossible because the view of what is right in modern times is “founded on brute force and even today [1929] needs violence to maintain it” (p. 90). He also echoed Einstein’s view that the League of Nations, without a legal arm, was ineffective as a peace-keeping institution. Einstein stated in his rejoinder to Freud, “I am rarely enthusiastic about what the League of Nations has

accomplished or has not accomplished, but I am always thankful that it exists” (Einstein, 1960, p. 111).

Departing from a socio-historical perspective on violence, S. Freud (1933/1964) explained how violence, based on the instincts of aggressiveness and death wishes, is promulgated. Drawing from clinical work, he reasoned that these instincts never operate in a pure form; otherwise they would be easier to detect. Instead, there is an admixture of the opposites that tends to either modify the prevailing instinct or enable its expansion. Also, these admixtures operate in tandem with other pairs of opposing instincts, a cluster theory that Freud highlighted, proposed by a colleague of Einstein’s, G. C. Lichtenberg, as a “compass-card of motives” (p. 203). For this discovery, Freud noted that Einstein’s colleague “was perhaps ever more eminent as a psychologist than as a physical scientist” (p. 91). Freud explained that while aggressiveness and death wishes are a part of the human being’s ability to respond to the call to war, these instincts are more “submerged in the unconscious” while “the ideal motive (e.g., serving one’s country) has served as the camouflage” (p. 92).

While outlining the reasons why Eros and Thanatos are individually and collectively a part of human nature, S. Freud (1933/1964) surmised that “there is no likelihood of our being able to suppress humanity’s aggressive tendencies” (p. 93). Despite this, however, he did offer a means of building toward the establishment of longer-lasting peace. Freud proposed that anything that promotes Eros (i.e., love directed toward self-actualization, a life force) can serve as an antidote. He also proposed a utopian solution that involved the conscious development of a more independent class of thinkers to challenge leaders, those who currently relied on a majority to follow them in

lockstep. Freud ended his letter to Einstein by acknowledging their shared hatred of war, and concluded that “perhaps our hope that . . . man’s cultural disposition and well-founded dread of the form that future wars will take—may serve to put an end to war in the near future” (S. Freud, 1933/1964, p. 97).

One of the important theories relevant to conflict is the theory of aggression and Freud’s further correspondence with Einstein shows where aggression fit in with warring. Freud, in his dialogue with Einstein, defended his belief that within us is an unconscious reservoir of aggressive energy, Thanatos, or the death instinct, that requires release and elevation into the conscious so that aggression is not ignited (S. Freud, 1920/1922). Five years after Freud’s response was published, Konrad Lorenz, the declared “father of ethology” (Tinbergen, 1963) lent credence to Freud’s theory by demonstrating the theory in his animal behavior research. In 1937, Lorenz demonstrated that all behavior patterns related to anatomical organs required catharses to prevent outbreaks of violent aggression (Lorenz, 1937). This gave an anatomical explanation for what Freud was describing as psychic catharses needed between competing instincts in humans. This concept of the release of energy leading to insight harkens back to Aristotle’s belief that there could be a “purging of the spirit of morbid and base ideas or emotions by witnessing the playing out of such emotions or ideas on stage” (Butcher, 1917, p. 59).

This theory was rejected by the international scientific community convened by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) in Seville, Spain in 1986. The question posed was: “Does modern biology and social science know of any biological factors, including those concerned with the biology of violent behavior of individuals that constitute an insurmountable or serious obstacle to

the goal of world peace?” (Seville Statement on Violence, 1986). The basis for the challenge was both new data from the scientific community and a shared commitment to conduct research that might reduce violence and foster peace. For example, an eminent researcher in behavioral genetics, Ginsburg (1958), established that all behavior was a result of genetics although not completely influenced by genetics. A renowned animal behaviorist, John Paul Scott, through behavior genetics studies with animals, determined that aggression was not innate but rather the interaction of complex genetic and environmental factors (1989). Berkowitz’s (1962) classic work, *Aggression: A Social Psychological Analysis*, in which he demonstrated that watching violent behavior only increased the level of violent response, was met with an interest by others to further research and challenge that premise. The unique feature of the Seville meeting was that 20 international specialists from diverse scientific fields attended: psychology, ethology, neurophysiology, biological anthropology, behavior genetics, animal behavior, social psychology, physical anthropology, psychiatry, political psychology, psychobiology, and sociology. The Seville Statement included the observation that it is scientifically incorrect to argue that the propensity to make war is genetic in nature, inherited from animal ancestors, a product of human evolution, or instinctual (Seville Statement on Violence, 1986).

The document concluded with the statement that “just as ‘wars begin in the minds of men,’ peace also begins in our minds. The same species who invented war is capable of inventing peace. The responsibility lies with each of us” (Seville Statement on Violence, 1986, p. 2). Since its publication, the Seville Statement has become “a normative instrument used by professional, educational and peace organizations around

the world” (Adams, 1996, p. 2) because it demonstrated that the tasks are not just institutional and collective, but rather, depend on individual consciousness in which pessimism and optimism play critical roles (Adams, 1996; Adams & Bosch, 1987).

## **Depth Psychology Contributions**

### **Historical roots.**

*Depth psychology* became a term used to identify those practices of psychology in which the unconscious is embraced. The writings of the Greek philosopher Heraclitus revealed early historical roots for depth psychology; he was the first to call the soul of a man *psyche* (Snell, 1960). Furthermore, Heraclitus “brought together *psyche*, *logos*, and *bathos* [depth]. . . . Depth was designed to throw light on the outstanding trait of the soul and its realm” (Mayer, 2007, p. 78). Heraclitus’s famous quote, “You could not find the ends of the soul, though you traveled every way, so deep is its *logos*” (Snell, 1960, p. 17) established a path which the *psyche* probed and which was represented by symbols and mythology.

Eugene Bleuler, a Swiss psychiatrist at the Burgholzli Clinic in Zurich in the early 20th century, first used depth as a psychological descriptor. He described Freud’s psychoanalysis as less of a scientific dissection but rather a process in which “the ideas which are derived from the greatest depth and which form the nucleus of the pathogenic organization are also those which are acknowledged as memories by the patient with greatest difficulty” (Breuer & Freud, 1895/2000, p. 300). While Nietzsche and others talked about the unconscious, it was Sigmund Freud who was highly influential in discussing the unconscious as an important part of psychology, a discussion that was continued by the Swiss psychiatrist, Carl Jung (Polka, 2001; Snell, 1960). Freud received



credit for establishing a psychology that included the unconscious within the individual, but Jung is credited with discovering a psychology that looked at the unconscious in terms of its operation, not just within an individual, but also as a shared belief of society or humanity as a whole.

***Freud's theory of the unconscious.***

Early signs of the existence of the unconscious in individuals were described first by Freud in 1889 with Hippolyte Bernheim (1840–1919), a French physician, neurologist, and leading investigator of hypnotism (Jones, 1953). Freud noted, “I was a spectator of Bernheim's astonishing experiments upon his hospital patients, and I received the profoundest impression of the possibility that there could be powerful mental processes which nevertheless remained hidden from the consciousness of man” (p. 211). He would later describe himself as a pupil of Bernheim, and it was out of this practice of Bernheim's suggestion/hypnosis that psychoanalysis would evolve.

Freud, in his paper, “The Unconscious,” stated that

Our right to assume the existence of something mental that is unconscious and to employ that assumption for the purposes of scientific work is disputed in many quarters. To this we can reply that our assumption of the unconscious is *necessary* and *legitimate*, and that we possess numerous proofs of its existence.

(Emphasis in original; quoted in Gay, 1989, p. 573)

This adamancy about the existence of an individual's unconscious separated Freud from philosophers and other scientists who equated the mind with only consciousness (Gay, 1989, p. 572–573). Freud described the unconscious as “the deepest strata of our minds, made up of instinctual impulses” (S. Freud, 1915/1953, pp. 21–22). He then developed a

model of mental functioning to address how the unconscious interacts with conscious mental activity. He defined a stage between the unconscious and conscious that he labeled *pre-conscious*. He stated that the borders between the unconscious, the preconscious, and the conscious are guarded by censors that can either hold back movement toward consciousness or allow instincts to slip into the next state. Freud argued that feelings and thoughts that an individual rejects lodge in the unconscious where they exert a strong influence on the individual's life.

As part of his exploration of these layers of consciousness, Freud discovered and described unconscious mechanisms that keep painful thoughts and affects away from conscious awareness (S. Freud (1989/1964), Cramer, 2000). His theory of defense mechanisms (1915/1957, 1926/1959) was further developed by Anna Freud (A. Freud, 1936/1946). They outlined five important properties of defense mechanisms as (a) unconscious, (b) separate and distinct, (c) reversible, (d) adaptive, and (e) pathological (Vaillant, 1994). Vaillant (1977) further suggested that dissociation allows an individual to detach from adverse emotional states (e.g., rage, fear, anger, sadness) so that “the pain of conflict seems irrelevant” (Bowins, 2004, p. 3). Psychological defense mechanisms occur in two overlapping spectrums of dissociation (e.g., emotional numbing, depersonalization, amnesia) and cognitive distortions (e.g., intellectualization, rationalization, denial; Bowins, 2004). Freud described how affect can be dislocated from ideas through dissociation (S. Freud, 1894/1964). Cognitive distortions serve to alter, modify, or transform painful, shaming, or disappointing events in order for the individual to maintain a positive and self-enhancing outlook (Bowins, 2004).

This concept was not embraced by the wider field of psychology, as evidenced by the refusal to include it in the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (3rd ed. [DSM-III], 1980), because “defense mechanisms implied unconscious etiology” (Vaillant, 1984, p. 544). This stance changed by the time the third edition was revised in 1987. Defense mechanisms have been included in the glossary of all subsequent editions. The DSM-V (2013) defines defense mechanisms as:

Mechanisms that mediate the individual’s reaction to emotional conflicts and to external stressors. Some defense mechanisms (e.g., projection, splitting, acting out) are almost invariably maladaptive. Others (e.g., suppression, denial) may be either maladaptive or adaptive, depending on their severity, their inflexibility, and the context in which they occur. (p. 819)

Empirical studies further demonstrated the interest in defense mechanisms and have now been embraced by cognitive, developmental, personality, and social psychologists (Cramer, 2000).

Both Freud and Jung believed that conflicting instincts, such as love and hate, or pleasure and pain, exist within the individual, and the clash between them creates conflicts that trigger unconscious defense mechanisms. These mechanisms keep internal conflicts denied and relegated to the unconscious to reappear at another time. However, left unattended, the instincts will always be governed by “the principle of constancy . . . [and move] toward stability” (S. Freud, 1922/1949, p. 5). Instincts then will ultimately control the ego’s need for self-preservation, which Freud named the “reality principle” (S. Freud 1920/1922, p. 226). To prevent chaos and destruction, the instincts must be brought into consciousness and tamed. This need to mediate instincts to prevent chaos

and destruction was a central dynamic of Freud's psychoanalysis and Jung's conception of psychic life. Their psychologies explained this duality as a part of human nature and understood conflict as an integral part of the human species.

Instincts always have a dual and contrasting nature, such as love and hate, or pleasure and pain. In order for individuals to avoid pain, for example, they repress painful feelings that stay in the unconscious, or project them onto people and/or objects. Additionally, those elements held in the unconscious can appear in dreams and neuroses and in the therapeutic relationship between analyst and patient.

Freud applied his understanding of the contrasting instincts within the unconscious to frame his views on war and peace. In early writings, Freud posited that all behavior stemmed from a life force (which he named Eros) which is aimed toward creativity, love, and the enhancement and preservation of life and its conflict with its opposite, the death instinct. After viewing the atrocities of World War I, Freud framed war as a manifestation of aggression, but he saw this as a part of a larger motif (which he named Thanatos) impacting the individual, which included the drive of sadism, destruction, violence, and death. "All human behavior, he [Freud] held, stems from the complex interplay of this instinct with Eros and the constant tension between them" (Baron & Richardson, 2004, p. 14).

Freud's reflections on this inner conflict of Eros and Thanatos, manifested outwardly in civilization by war and death, are found in "Thoughts for the Times on War & Death" (S. Freud, 1915/1953), "Civilization and its Discontents" (S. Freud, 1929/1958), and his open letter to Albert Einstein, "Why War?" (S. Freud, 1933/1964). Freud posed the quixotic dilemma that civilization faces regarding the impossibility of

achieving peace while people still have not managed the Eros/Thanatos conflicts within themselves. S. Freud (1929/1958) believed that the human instincts of aggression and self-destruction would lead to the “derangement of communal life” (p. 80) that would ultimately tip the balance between Eros and Thanatos toward the latter.

In a co-authored book, *Thomas Woodrow Wilson, the Twenty-Eighth President: A Psychological Analysis*, Freud’s application of his theory to actions of political leaders and their impact on peace were presented (S. Freud & Bullitt, 1939/1999). Bullitt (a friend and U.S. Ambassador to Paris) approached Freud to explore collaborating on what began as a chapter on Wilson in a book Bullitt was writing about the Treaty of Versailles. The chapter soon grew into its own book, becoming a 10-year project that included Wilson’s public and private records and correspondences, which were never published. Freud made every effort to approach the book project as strictly scientific research in spite of his growing disgust with Wilson (S. Freud & Bullitt, 1939/1999).

In his youth, Freud remarked that he had an “overpowering need to understand something of the riddles of the world in which we live and perhaps even to contribute something to their solution” (S. Freud, 1926/1990, p. 253). He compared knowledge gained from the rigorous scientific application of psychoanalysis as a breakthrough similar to the advances made in the physical sciences. Knowledge from the physical sciences had, for example, reversed the belief that the earth was the center of the universe—thereby revising the understanding of mankind’s place in the universe. Similarly, Freud’s discovery of the workings of the inner psyche expanded and changed the understanding of mankind’s actions and behaviors (S. Freud & Billet, 1939/1999).

*Jung's theory of the unconscious.*

Jung found that beyond an individual's psyche, which included conscious and unconscious elements, there was a collective consciousness that could impact the individual at an unconscious level. In the early 1900s, Jung and Freud corresponded. Freud, quite taken with Jung, considered Jung his heir apparent. However, by 1913 Jung's developing views of the psyche diverged so greatly from Freud's that even their friendship was intolerable. Jung's view of the unconscious as including a collective unconscious was at the center of this break. Freud strongly disputed the existence of a collective unconscious and remained focused on developing his thesis of an individual unconscious driven primarily by the libido, the energy of the death or aggressive drive. Jung's personal and clinical experience tapped into dimensions not explained by Freud. For example, Jung understood the images emerging in clients' dreams as part of something universal and shared by humans throughout history and cultures (Jung, 1963/1989).

Jung believed that deep, mythic patterns also shape the world and determine policies and strategies. An example Jung wrote about is a particularly disturbing dream he had in 1913 that involved the archetypal figure of Siegfried. Jung reasoned the collective German psyche was being held captive by Siegfried, who used his strength and fierce will to take what he wanted. "The dream showed that the attitude embodied by Siegfried, the hero, no longer suited me . . . and my heroic idealism had to be abandoned, for there are higher things than the ego's will, and to these one must bow" (Jung, 1963/1989, pp. 180–181). Ego here is defined as the mediator between person and

reality. Jung is saying that the perception of reality keeps changing and there is a larger totality influencing our actions; we act, based on many states, including the unconscious.

Jung later addressed this difference with Freud in a radio interview broadcast by Radio Berlin on June 26, 1933. When asked about the difference between his psychology and the psychology of Freud and Adler, Jung responded that Freud, like Adler, tended to focus almost exclusively on the individual to the point where the “whole is distorted into nonsense, and the beauty that is proper only to the whole is reduced to absurdity” (as quoted in McGuire & Hull, 1977, p. 65). Jung further remarked in his later book on analytical psychology:

To Freud the unconscious is chiefly a receptacle for things repressed. He looks at it from the corner of the nursery. To me it is a vast historical storehouse. I acknowledge that I have a nursery too, but it is small in comparison with the vast spaces of history which were more interesting to me from childhood than the nursery. (Jung, 1935/1970, p. 143)

Jung expanded the understanding of the unconscious established by Freud to include psychological factors operating in groups and individuals, and explained the role of rationality and irrationality of the conscious and unconscious in both (N. A. Lewin, 2009). This also gave a new lens through which to consider psychology’s view of the issue of war and peace both internally and externally.

Yet, it was Jung’s unrelenting study of the wars of the psyche that informed his comments on the subject of war and peace in the external world, where he also viewed social and individual events through a psychological lens (N. A. Lewin, 2009). He studied the conscious and unconscious factors involved in war and peace that caused

rational or irrational behaviors and outcomes (N. A. Lewin, 2009). When explaining evil, violence, and psychopathology, Jung used the metaphor of the shadow to explain their existence within the personal, cultural, or collective psyche as an unconscious part. The shadow holds such negative feelings as hatred, jealousy, greed, and rage, which fuel violence. In an attempt to avoid acknowledging those negative parts as one's own, they are projected onto an outside object that assumes the role of the enemy or scapegoat. As a natural consequence, eliminating the enemy becomes justified. "The tendency to see one's shadow 'out there' . . . is the most dangerous aspect of the modern psyche. . . World War II gave us endless examples of shadow projection...Germany fell into the idiocy of projecting its virulent shadow on the Jewish people" (Ford & Ford, 2003, p. 39). Jung's comments regarding the blind optimism of peacebuilding by the League of Nations are another example of a denial of unconscious, or shadow elements:

Before the Great War all intelligent people said: "We shall not have any more war, we are far too reasonable to let it happen, and our commerce and finance are so interlaced internationally that war is absolutely out of the question." And then we produced the most gorgeous war ever seen. And now they begin to talk that foolish kind of talk about reason and peace plans and such thing; they blindfold themselves by clinging to a childish optimism—and now look at reality! Sure enough, the archetypal images decide the fate of man. Man's unconscious psychology decides, and not what we think and talk in the brain-chamber up in the attic. (Jung, 1935/1970, p. 183)

He offered the following as a way for humankind to step in a direction toward peace:



Inner transformation . . . is infinitely more important than political and social reforms which are all valueless in the hands of people who are not at one with themselves. This is a truth which we are forever forgetting, because our eyes are fascinated by the conditions around us and riveted on them instead of examining our own heart and conscious. Every demagogue exploits this human weakness when he points with the greatest possible outcry to all things that are wrong in the outside world. But the principle and indeed the only thing that is wrong with the world is man. (Jung, 1922/1970, para. 441)

In particular, Jung focused his efforts, not on the “systemic instability of the balance of power leading to war, but rather on the irrationality of its leaders” (N. A. Lewin, 2009, p. 73). Jung captured this when he wrote, “Do high explosives make themselves? Do they declare war and march to war? Do they bring the men with them? It is the psyche of man that makes wars” (as quoted in McGuire & Hull, 1977, pp. 73–74).

### **Expansion of depth psychology’s theory.**

A number of important depth psychology contributions to understanding the workings of the unconscious and its impact on groups, conflict, and violence grew from the foundations laid by Sigmund Freud and Carl Jung. Otto Rank (1884–1939) reframed Freud’s concept of repression, which he felt kept patients captive to the past, and instead introduced the concept of denial, which emphasizes the here and now and empowers patients to separate from outworn thoughts (Rank, 1936/1978). Rank was the first to conceptualize that human development is a lifelong interplay between the desire to connect with others and the need to individuate. He also extended psychoanalytic theory into the territory that Jung had embraced—the study of myth, creativity, and legends

(Rank, 1932/1989). He was the first to introduce the theory of object relations in a 1926 lecture; a theory reintroduced in the 1940s and 1950s by British psychologists Ronald Fairbairn, Melanie Klein, Donald Winnicott, Harry Guntrip, Scott Stuart, and others (Hartman, 1999). The scope of object relations theory is defined by how it seeks to explain the mental representations of an individual's self and significant others that are formed in the early developmental stage and shape adolescent and adult behavior in social and interpersonal relationships and interactions. Rank's break with Freud occurred over minimizing the importance of the Oedipal complex in favor of an important phase of development he named *pre-oedipal* (Rank, 1924/2010). Rank has been credited with shaping major schools of psychoanalytic theory by these well-known and respected authorities: Rollo May (1909–1994), who pioneered existential psychotherapy; Carl Rogers (1902–1997), who introduced client-centered therapy; and Paul Goodman (1911–1972) and Fritz Perls (1893–1970), who together founded the practice of Gestalt therapy (Hartman, 1999).

***Unconscious dynamics in crowds and groups.***

Both Jung and Freud were aware of the work of the French social psychologist Gustave Le Bon, who introduced the concept of the unconscious to social psychology—in particular, the functioning of a crowd. His book, *La Psychologie de Foules [The Psychology of Crowds]*, was published in 1895. Le Bon described how a group transforms individuals into a collective in which they behave differently than they would individually. “The substitution of the unconscious action of crowds for the conscious activity of individuals is one of the principal characteristics of the present age” (Le Bon, 1895/2001, p. iii). Le Bon outlined how the actions of crowds originated in the

unconscious. He noted that half a dozen people drawn together could become a crowd, while a larger number of people brought together by chance might not form a crowd. Le Bon also acknowledged that nations, under certain conditions, may come under the influence of crowd behavior. Defining the general psychological characteristics of crowds, Le Bon described the “psychological law of the mental unity of crowds” (p. 5). First among these characteristics is the observation that individuals behave differently in crowds than they do individually—taking on a “collective mind” (p. 5). He compared this to elements in chemistry which, when combined, form a new chemical compound in which the properties of the base elements are superseded. Next, he emphasized the importance of the unconscious’ impact on the operation of people’s intelligence, which is of primary importance. While he noted that intelligence may create separate societal strata, at a more basic level all people share the same “instincts, passions and feelings” (p. 8), which makes all people more similar than different. It is also this commonality at a more basic level that makes crowds incapable of high intellectual functioning. “In crowds it is stupidity and not mother-wit that is accumulated” (p. 9). Other general psychological characteristics of crowds are that individuals take on an air of invincibility and, because of the anonymous nature of a crowd, they drop their sense of personal responsibility and can behave in ways that would not be conceivable as individuals. There is also a sense of contagion that may intersect with a kind of hypnosis, and by participation in a crowd, “man descends several rungs in the ladder of civilization. . . . he is a barbarian—that is, a creature acting by instinct” (p. 12). Wilfred Trotter (1872–1939), a surgeon and pioneer in neurosurgery at the University College Hospital in London, popularized Le Bon’s theory. Trotter was a student of social psychology, and thus of Le

Bon's work. Trotter published papers in 1908 and 1909 that later became a bound document titled *Instincts of the Herd in Peace and War* (1916). He described sociology as "another name for psychology in the widest sense" (p. 11) because it included "all the phenomena of the mind without the exception even of the most complex" (p. 11).

Trotter noted that throughout the history of human societies, constructive and destructive forces have been active, but the destructive is always stronger (Jones, 2004). He advocated for the creation of either a more coherent class, which can provide more intelligent direction, or the evolution of more intelligent consciousness in the overall population. Either of these occurrences, Trotter posited, would increase peace and reduce war. Trotter also introduced his associate in the hospital, Wilfred Bion, to the concepts of S. Freud's (1922/1949) work, *Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego*, and they both associated with Freud after he fled Austria in 1938 due to the German annexation of Austria. Bion later developed the field of psychology called group psychology with Freud's official biographer, Ernest Jones (Jones, 2004).

S. Freud (1922/1949) minimized the work of Le Bon by pointing to others who had made similar points regarding groups' heightened emotionalism correlating to a diminished intellectual capacity. Freud did concede that Le Bon's description of the operation of the unconscious was compatible with his view, as was Le Bon's comparison of the actions of a group mimicking that of primitive peoples. Freud commented that a group is "impulsive, changeable and irritable. . . . It is led almost exclusively by the unconscious" (p. 4). He also noted that the group's feelings are "greatly exaggerated" and "inclined to extremes" (p. 5), which thereby causes them to assume an air of omnipotence and invincibility. Freud critiqued Le Bon's views and believed they were

limited to transient groups and that his views failed to consider more permanent groups like the army and church. Trotter's definition of the group as a primary formation, thus irreducible, was also challenged by Freud, who stated that the instinct for self-preservation and the sexual instinct can trump group actions. Also, herds, as defined by Trotter, do not account for a leader since all members of the herd are equal. Yet, in the example of the church, all members consider themselves equal, as determined by the leader who is not an equal since he or she leads. Freud drew a parallel between the natural tendency of a group to devolve to a lower common denominator and an individual's regression to a primitive state. Therefore, just as primitive instincts arise in an individual, so, too, does the "primitive horde" arise in a crowd (p. 24). S. Freud (1922/1949) concluded that while group psychology may appear the original psychology, in fact, "from the first there were two kinds of psychologies, that of the individual members of the group, and that of the father, chief, or leader" (p. 25).

Bion (1897–1979) contributed a breakthrough concept when he framed the unconscious elements at work in groups. The genesis of Bion's interest resides in his and other psychiatrists' experiences treating groups of soldiers during World War II. They began to find the intrapsychic dynamics of the individual, as established by Freud, were limited when treating groups of soldiers, and instead found the existence of emotional dynamics unique to the group. Bion devoted his career to furthering research into the social nature of psychic life, and pioneered understanding collective mental characteristics as they varied from individual life (Bion, 1961; Poster, 1978).

During the Cold War, depth psychology research of group processes was applied by a few psychoanalysts (e.g., Levine, 1986) who worked with other professionals to understand and reduce psychological barriers in groups.

People's lives are shaped by unconscious, destructive, and self-destructive forces. Despite the evolution of our capacity for reason, our very natures are bound to the primitive, irrational substrates from which we developed. If psychoanalysis has a claim on social sciences, it is that any attempt to formulate a political or social psychology must take into account this unconscious dimension of human behavior and the irrational forces it contains. (Levine, 1986)

The field of group psychology has grown to embrace many specialties: family psychology; social psychology; political psychology; industrial and organizational psychology; media psychology; military psychology; community psychology; environmental, population, and conservation psychology; and the psychology of ethnicity and culture. Many models have developed as a result of the groundwork of Freud and Jung, and a multiplicity of theories both exclusive and inclusive of depth psychology have been developed in these fields. All contributed to an expanding body of research in the field of psychology and are relevant to peace psychology.

***Unconscious dynamics in nations.***

Jung took his understanding of Le Bon's depiction of the psychological component of crowds and linked it to commonalities he had seen in individuals' psychological states (N. A. Lewin, 2009). In 1917, Jung first proposed the concept of a "psychology of the nation" in his book, *Two Essays on Analytical Psychology*. Jung (1917/1977) wrote in the preface that the psychological concomitants of war are

“uniquely fitted to force upon the attention of every thinking person the problem of the chaotic unconscious which slumbers uneasily beneath the ordered world of consciousness” (p. 4). Jung went on to note that the only way to change the attitude of a nation is to change the attitude of the individual. Throughout his career Jung continued to link clinical insights to international politics. He wrote in 1939, “The man at peace with himself, who accepts himself, contributes an infinitesimal amount to the good of the universe. Attend to your private and personal conflicts and you will be reducing by one millionth the world conflict” (as quoted in McGuire & Hull, 1977, p. 145).

Embedded in Jung’s (1911/1916) understanding of the collective was his view of the psychological dynamics of change. From his clinical work Jung had adopted Heraclitus’ idea of *enantiodromia* to explain how emotional energy in individuals can switch unexpectedly into its opposite state.

Old Heraclitus, who indeed was a very great sage, discovered the most marvelous of all psychological laws: the regulative function of opposites. He called it *enantiodromia*, a running contrariwise, by which he meant that sooner or later everything runs into its opposite. . . . Thus the rational attitude of culture necessarily runs into its opposite, namely the irrational devastation of culture. (Jung, 1911/1916, p. 72).

Jung commented in 1925 and 1942 that this last sentence, which was written during the First World War, “contains a truth which has been confirmed more than once in the course of history. . . . Who wants this blind destruction? But we all help the daemon to our last gasp” (Jung, 1911/1916, p. 72). Jung reasoned that this tension, which is between opposite behavioral patterns, not only fuels change and creativity, but also

ignites conflict and instability. Thus, our instinctive heritage contains all these dynamics and makes the concept of permanent psychological peace inconceivable. By expanding to consider a psychology of nations, Jung maintained his focus on the instability engendered among nations by the psychological dangers of idealism, materialism, religious fanaticism, and unconscious drives (N. A. Lewin, 2009, pp. 89–95). Jung could never define the psychology of nations as a separate entity and distinct from political, social, economic, and historical factors (p. 84).

### *Psychology of war.*

Freud’s theoretical contribution to understanding war was centered on his psychology of aggression, which focused on:

- the potential for social instability caused by the repression of the instincts,
- the emotions involved with aggression and death,
- the psychology of hate, and
- the suggestibility of crowds and their need for leaders. (N. A. Lewin, 2009, p. 22)

World War I, for no stated reason, changed Freud’s focus from “the problems of the individual to the problems of the culture” (Menand, 2005, pp. 9–10). Just as Freud found the individual psyche, with the constant pull from opposite instincts, rarely maintaining stability for very long (N. A. Lewin, 2009, p. 27), the instability brought on by war caused society to react by imposing restrictions on individual freedoms. This was an indicator to him that the individual is “living psychologically . . . beyond his means. . . . We are certainly misled by our optimism into grossly exaggerating the number of human beings who have been transformed in a civilized sense” (S. Freud, 1915/1953, p. 299).



Further writings by Freud that reflected this cultural concern included, *Totem and Taboo* (1913), *Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego* (S. Freud, 1922/1949), *The Future of an Illusion* (1927/1989), *Moses and Monotheism* (S. Freud, 1939/1959), and *Civilization and its Discontents* (S. Freud, 1929/1958). Later, Klein continued to advocate for the acceptance of Freud's theory of aggression (Klein, 1958).

Alternatively, Jung said very little about Freud's theory of instincts, preferring to cast war as a "participation mystique (an unconscious identity with something) in which the energy of the myth flows irresistibly through the force-fields of the nation's psyche" (as quoted in N. A. Lewin, 2009, p. 87). Yet, Jung aligned with Freud's view of war being caused by a conflict of instinctual drives against the restraints placed on instincts by civilizations when he hypothesized that one of the explanations for the Germans' attraction to Nazism was the rift between civilized societies and a much less socialized world (N. A. Lewin, 2009).

#### ***War neurosis and depth psychology.***

As early as the Civil War neurologists recorded certain psychiatric symptoms, such as "nostalgia, malingering, return of the psychotic soldiers to their homes, and the problems arising from the teen-age-draft" (Menninger, 1948, p. 3). Yet during the subsequent 50 years, very few physicians took an interest in learning "how and why the minds of people became sick" (p. 3). Demands for treatment escalated during World War I. War neurosis and psychic trauma, today known as post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), were identified and studied during World War I and its aftermath (Ferenczi, Abraham, Simmel, Jones, & Freud, 1921). Psychoanalysis grew dramatically between 1918 and 1941 (Menninger, 1948). "Its discoveries are probably the most important

contributions to our technical knowledge in the history of psychiatry” (p. 6). In 1920, Freud noted that after a severe shock to the system, individuals tended to develop symptoms referred to at the time as “traumatic neurosis” or “war neurosis.” Individuals who were participants in war were uniquely susceptible to this form of psychological injury (S. Freud, 1920/1922).

Freud and Breuer also noted that an oft-reported feature of war neurosis and psychic trauma was the recycling of traumatic memories, which they had reported in *Studies in Hysteria* in 1893 (S. Freud, 1920/1922, p. 9). In *An Outline of Psycho-Analysis*, S. Freud (1940/1969) continued to trace connections from civilization’s compounding influence on neurosis. Published during World War II, a literature review of the research specific to the psychology of neuroses in war became available (E. Miller & Crichton-Miller, 1940), showing the central place these issues had in the depth psychology field. Psychic trauma was identified as impacting personality development and pathology (Dane, 1949; Simmel, 1941). During and after World War II a number of studies were conducted on the effects of war on survivors, Holocaust survivors, women, and children. Anna Freud’s work in 1976 in London with children and orphaned war victims opened up the study of the complex role that trauma plays in survivors and the impact on personality development and pathology of children. The focus on early childhood intervention for trauma has been a result of her research (Hartman, 1999).

***Development of Freudian-based theories of war, conflict, and peace.***

In 1949 Oskar Pfister, an early associate of Freud’s, addressed the Psycho-Analytical Congress in Zurich on the subject of “War and Peace as a Psycho-Analytical Problem” (Pfister, 1950). He deplored the lack of psycho-analytic research on the topic

of war and peace beyond Freud's preliminary investigation (p. 151). "As a means of solving the problem of war he has put depth psychology at the disposal of that science of which he was creator and master" (p. 151). Pfister emphasized the importance of "investigating and influencing the underlying crucial psychic motives, viz. those that are unconscious" (p. 151). The Cold War, fueling the threat of global annihilation from nuclear weapons, spurred many depth psychology contributions. The Boston Psychoanalytic Society and Institute held a 5-day Symposium in 1986 titled "Psychoanalytic Explorations of the Nuclear Threat: Aggression, Projection and Identity" (Levine, 1987, p. 19). A bibliography of psychological research of the nuclear threat was prepared for this symposium. The categories that were used to organize the literature in the bibliography indicated the wide scope of depth psychology's contributions:

- psychoanalytic study of war, peace and human aggression;
- the effects of the nuclear threat on adolescents and children;
- psychosocial studies of war and the nuclear threat;
- problems of leadership in the age of nuclear threat; and
- general introduction to the medical, social, and political dimensions of the nuclear threat (Levine, 1987).

During the Cold War, a few psychoanalysts applied depth psychology research to group processes (e.g., Levine, 1986) and worked with other professionals to understand and reduce psychological barriers.

People's lives are shaped by unconscious, destructive, and self-destructive forces. Despite the evolution of our capacity for reason, our very natures are bound to the primitive, irrational substrates from which we developed. If psychoanalysis has a

claim on social sciences, it is that any attempt to formulate a political or social psychology must take into account this unconscious dimension of human behavior and the irrational forces it contains. (Levine, 1986)

Although World War II displaced many psychoanalysts who fled to London and the United States, the field grew as both a practice area and an area for expanded research. Unlike other non-depth-oriented schools of psychology, depth psychology offered an understanding of soldiers in combat (Lifton, 2011). Psychoanalysts Erik Erikson (1902–1994), Franco Fornari (1921–1985), William Meissner (1931–2010), and Vamik Volkan (1932– ) made significant contributions to the understanding of war and conflict (Lifton, 2011). Avner Falk (1943– ), an Israeli clinical psychologist and scholar, studied Islamic terror from political, social, historical, cultural, and economic perspectives which were informed by his psychological training in both unconscious and conscious processes (Falk, 2004, 2008a, 2008b).

Erik Erikson, while not specifically addressing the causes of war, did make several important breakthroughs that expanded depth psychology's contributions to understanding social phenomena. Some of his views on identity change came specifically from his work with World War II veterans (Lifton, 2011, p. 190). Before Erikson's time, Freud addressed individual development in a psychosexual frame. Erickson expanded this by introducing a new view of development that required successful navigation of individual, social, cultural, and psychological milestones to achieve individuation. One stage particularly critical to adolescents, that of identity versus identity diffusion, "is perhaps [Erikson's] most influential single concept" (Hartman, 1999, p. 135). Erikson wrote about Luther, Hitler, Gandhi, Jefferson, and

others to illustrate how leaders' navigations of this stage of identity formation during adolescence crafted their leadership styles with respect to their followers and fit the particular social, historical, and cultural influences that allowed for a rise to power (Erikson, 1962, 1964, 1965, 1974). For example, Erickson analyzed the psychological role of hatred in Hitler's life and of nonviolence in Gandhi's, and explored the psychosocial aspects of culture and historical underpinnings to understand their rise to leadership. Erikson's work, which integrated the psychological and social factors, inspired others to look at history, culture, and interpersonal relations through a psychological lens (Hartman, 1999). Inspired by Erickson, Peter Loewenberg (1933– ) applied his training as a psychoanalyst, historian, and political psychologist to explore identity's impact on nationalism and the impact of "social forces on the generation of youth that became Hitler's *Freikorps*" (Kurtz & Turpin, 1999, p. 135). Loewenberg was one of the founders of the University of California Interdisciplinary Psychoanalytic Consortium, and authored numerous publications addressing the intersection of history, psychoanalysis, and political psychology (Kurtz & Turpin, 1999).

A key contributor to understanding psychological undercurrents in major areas of international conflict was psychiatrist Lifton (1926– ), who found psychiatry "a decade after World War II . . . reenergized by the influence of psychoanalysis" (Lifton, 2011, p. 4). He formed a group with Erikson and an MIT historian in the 1960s to explore the application of psychological principles to understand the motivations for war, terrorism, and genocide (Lifton & Olson, 1975). Lifton credited a convergence of circumstances in the spring of 1954 as sparking the initial foray into his life's work. After being discharged as an Air Force psychiatrist serving in the Korean War he lived in Hong

Kong. Rather than return to build a comfortable life in the United States, he made a radical decision to stay in Hong Kong and pursue a specific line of psychological work that had intrigued him. “Rather than focus on individual psychological health, I was wandering about the more obscure territory of shared and collective behavior, extending out to vast movements” (Lifton, 2011, p. 77).

I had been interviewing both Westerners and Chinese who had been subjected on the Mainland to a remarkable process called “thought reform.” The reformers employed considerable coercion, sometimes violence, but also powerful exhortation on behalf of a new Chinese dawn, seeking to bring the beliefs and worldviews of participants into accord with those of the triumphant Communist regime. I could observe that thought reform was by no means a casual undertaking but rather a systematic and widespread program that penetrated deeply into people’s psyches and raised larger questions about the mind’s vulnerability to manipulation and coerced change. (Lifton, 2011, p. 3)

Lifton is now an internationally recognized scholar on the topic of genocide and brainwashing, the effects of the Hiroshima bombing, the genocidal mentality and Nazi doctors, lessons from Vietnam veterans, and terrorist cults (Lifton, 1968, 1988, 2005; Moyers, 2002).

Fornari’s writings bridged the divide between psychology and psychoanalysis, as well as clinical and experimental psychology, by pioneering the use of psychoanalytic analysis to the psychology of war regarding both the formation of enemies and how barbaric killings occur as a result (Hartman, 1999). He challenged Freud’s view that war was the result of humankind’s aggressive instincts breaking through civilizations’

imposed restraints of law and other civilizing influences. Fornari proposed that war was a “paranoid elaboration of mourning” (Fornari, 1975, pp. xiv–xv), borrowing from the results of Klein’s (1932) research on how infants develop their relationship to emotions, objects, and people in the first 4 to 6 months of life. This early state (Klein named it the *paranoid-schizoid position*) refers to the anxiety and fear of annihilation that infants experience in birth and early months. With a good enough caregiver, infants develop into a more integrated stage (Klein’s *depressive position*) where anxiety is moderated with trust in good outcomes, consequently enabling adaptive mourning and metabolizing losses with their ensuing feelings of guilt. Klein proposed that both positions (paranoid-schizoid and depressive) exist in varying states of prominence throughout the lifetime.

Fornari viewed war as a type of infant-styled paranoid defense in which, instead of accepting and mourning losses, they were projected onto an enemy hoping that would expunge the pain individuals do not want to feel. Thus war, Fornari argued, served as an attempt to heal “archaic conflicts around loss and mourning” (as quoted in Hartman, 1999, p. 136). This theory again rebounded in the 1980s, drawing a parallel between mother and infant relations and individuals’ relations to the group (Hartman, 1999).

Meissner (1978), a Jesuit priest and psychoanalyst, expanded Fornari’s concept of a paranoid process to conceptualize how this creates the basis for hostility and violence both in and between groups. His formation of a group psychology on this basis explained the need for groups to have enemies and then engage in wars to kill them off, thereby relieving the group’s feelings of powerlessness. Meissner (1984) also applied this theory to explain the psychology of cults in which everything that is purportedly good is contained inside the group, and everything bad exists outside of the cult.

Volkan, a Turkish Cypriot-American psychoanalyst and a renowned international negotiator, has spent more than three decades in refugee camps, speaking with world political leaders, and conducting unofficial dialogues between enemy representatives. Growing up in Cyprus just after the civil riots against British rule and witnessing the violence induced by bitter ethnic conflicts between Greek and Turkish Cypriots greatly influenced his psychoanalytic work. Volkan built on Klein, Meissner, and Fornari's work to establish a more integrated view that explains the psychological motives underlying war and ethnic conflict, and the resultant intergenerational transmission (Hartman, 1999). Volkan (1996), Moses (1966), and others also studied the intergenerational transmission of trauma on ethnic groups and individuals. Volkan (1988) focused on how enemies and allies serve an important psychological function. He drew concepts from infant development theory, not Klein's immediate post-birth months, but a developmental milestone termed *stranger anxiety* (Deterding, Hay, Levin, & Sondheimer, 2006, p. 200). Stranger anxiety generally occurs around 6 to 12 months of age, when children experience distress when exposed to unfamiliar people. "The eight month anxiety is the proof that, to the child, everyone is a stranger, with the exception of the unique object" (Volkan, 1988, p. 18). Volkan applied this concept to explain the nature and quality of the relations between nations driven by the psychological need for enemies and allies, employing ethnicity, nationality, and global politics in varying proportions to serve this need. Ethnicity, by its very nature, has historical roots, but Volkan also revealed that conflicts experienced by specific ethnic groups have histories deeply engrained in the psyche of the culture. Although Staub (1989, 2011) and others



have also noted the universal tendency to have or create enemies, it was Volkan who traced its earliest origins to stranger anxiety, which is a universal occurrence in children.

Other psychoanalytic concepts applied to understanding war, violence, and peace at the group or national level included splitting, projection, apportioning roles, and scapegoating (Bion, 1961). These concepts were applied to a number of specific types of groups: large groups (E. J. Miller, 1976), boys' groups (Sherif, 1966), gangs (Thrasher, 1927), and ethnic and political groups (Fornari, 1975; Valent, 1982). Others built upon Fornari's (1975) conceptualization and developed psychological theories about the construction of enemies as a large-scale projection and externalization of a collective's unconscious bad feelings directed towards others based on the need for people to unify and reduce their own internal tensions by projecting them on an outside group (Boyer & Grolnick, 1988; Schwartz-Salant & Stein, 1987; Volkan, 1988). Lord Brian Alderice (1955– ) is one example of a public figure contributing to peace, stability, and reconciliation in Northern Ireland from a psychoanalytically informed perspective. He served as an elected member of the Belfast City Council (1989–1997), appointed Speaker of the Northern Ireland Assembly for Belfast East (1998–2004), and Member of the House of Lords since 1996. His trained to be a psychiatrist, then a psychoanalyst, and he was appointed Ireland's first Consultant Psychotherapist and served as Executive Medical Director of one of Northern Ireland's largest Health Care Trusts.

***Development of Jungian-based theories of war, conflict, and peace.***

In 1982 William Walcott, Editor of *Psychological Perspectives: A Quarterly Journal of Jungian Thought*, criticized Jungian analysts for acting like “an ostrich with its head in the sand” (p. 113) with regard to “society's sorry plight . . . that the world is

poised on the brink of annihilation” (p. 113). He wrote of searching all major Jungian periodicals from 1976–1981 and finding no topics relating to social issues. Three years later, Bernstein, guest editor of *Quadrant*, C. G. Jung Foundation of New York’s journal, reflected on the changes evident since Walcott’s article. He noted that Jungians were now addressing conflict resolution, nuclear threats, and deterrence theory with seminars, workshops, articles, and lecture series (Bernstein, 1985). In May, 1984 nuclear war was the subject of the first national meeting of Jungian analysts in New York City, and also became a theme in Jungian seminars and workshops around the United States. By fall of 1985, two major Jungian journals, *Psychological Perspectives* and *Quadrant*, had special issues devoted to the topic. Also that year the C. G. Jung Lectures sponsored by the Jung Foundation of New York City, which only occur every two to three years in order to allow for original work in analytical psychology, focused on *The Archetypes of War* (Stevens, 1985).

In his book, *The Roots of War & Terror*, Stevens (2004) explained why Jungian psychology has a place in the discussion of war and peace by arguing that previous studies on war have three shortcomings: “they ignore the *unconscious*, they rely too heavily on *rational* explanations of national conduct, and they attach too little importance to *human biology*” (emphasis in original, p. vii). Stevens then drew a map of the collective unconscious of war by describing the archetypes at play. He used Jung’s concept of archetypes as both transpersonal and biologically based “energetic motifs which control and mediate human behavior and comprise the functional units of the collective unconscious” (p. 220) to describe the forces at work in the unconscious. For example, Stevens described the warrior archetype as a part of masculine unconscious,

which lies dormant until activated through cultural rituals perpetuated by older males.

“What gives the warrior role its fatal attraction . . . is that it appears to offer young males the opportunity to achieve power and status as men—both in their own estimation and in that of the group” (p. 93). The documented brutality in prehistoric times shows that the warrior archetype predates civilization (Keeley, 1996). Stevens laid bare the hollowness of the rational explanations for the causes of war. For example, wars attributed to the abuse of monarchs championed a liberal democracy. Yet, liberal democracies have given rise to warfare, such as the French Revolution, that was more brutal than life under a monarch. In response to Marxist claims that wars resulted from capitalism—so capitalism should be overthrown—they proposed replacing it with an international brotherhood of proletariats. Yet, this fell apart when national ties prevailed during World War I and socialists showed their primary allegiance to their countries of origin. From this archetypal perspective Stevens (2004) outlined four actions comprising a solution:

- recognizing that the enemy’s behavior is partially caused by how we treat it [the enemy],
- understanding our defenses, which keep us unconscious and strive for consciousness,
- assuming a neutral position which can include the perspective of warring parties and can distinguish between the motives and the actual policies at stake, and
- differentiating archetypal forces drawing toward conflict from actual facts of the circumstances. (p. 236)

Jungian-based psychology has continued to develop new frameworks responding to other fields of science such as neurology and quantum physics, as well as Eastern wisdom traditions. Developmental and emergence theories expanded Jungian psychology and gained momentum, exploring the subjects of war, conflict, violence, and peace through these lenses (Hogenson, 2011). There is an open dialog in the Jungian community with many efforts both inside and outside of the Jungian community. In 2009, the leading Jungian journal, *Spring*, devoted its spring edition to articles on the topic of the psychology of violence. Topics presented included peace, fanaticism, war, warriors, cultural rupture, and the enemy. Hillman (2005), an internationally renowned lecturer, teacher, and Jungian psychologist, invited consideration of the love of war not for peace, but just for war's own sake in his book *A Terrible Love of War*. "The crucial opposition to be reconciled and transcended, if we are to be saved rather than destroyed, is not between Christendom and Islam, but between consciousness and the archetypal imperatives to war" (p. 242). Zoja and Williams (2002) published *Jungian Reflections on September 11* to address the complex issues of 9/11 with perspectives from psychoanalysts who looked to depth psychology to enlighten their perspectives.

An example of an integrative approach using Jungian psychology to address conflict is in the work of Arnold Mindell, a Jungian analyst with a graduate degree from MIT in applied physics and mechanical engineering, and a PhD in psychology. Since the 1970s he has been developing a psychology based on underlying relationships between ancient wisdom traditions and modern sciences including Taoism, physics, Jungian psychology, mathematics, and quantum theory which he called process-oriented psychology (Mindell, 2007, 2013). Process-oriented psychology's applications include

the self-therapy needs of the individual, as well as resolving conflicts in large public forums, and in political, organizational, cultural, community, and family settings (Mindell, 2000, 2002). In 2004, a master's program in Conflict Facilitation and Organizational Change was launched by Mindell's Process Work Institute (established in 1989) to continue to educate and train culturally competent facilitators in the areas of human and organizational growth using process-oriented psychology.

### **War's impact on the growth of psychology.**

Although the field of psychology would not be recognized until much later, the foundations of its involvement with war and the effects of war essentially started in the early 18th century. The earliest records of the diagnosis of combat stress breakdowns were in the early 1700s, when they were termed *nostalgia* (Zajtcuk & Bellamy, 1995). Anecdotally, this presentation was called "the Swiss disease" to describe a common ailment among young Swiss men who were uprooted from their villages and placed in mercenary armies (p. 6). Later it was recognized that this diagnosis applied more broadly to soldiers in all areas of combat. The treatment of nostalgia by Napoleon's Chief Surgeon, Barron Larrey, shows an almost modern-day awareness of the socialization benefits of handling psychiatric casualties:

[T]o prevent this sort of cerebral affection in soldiers who have lately joined their corps, it is necessary not to suffer those individuals who are predisposed to it more repose than is necessary to recruit their strength, exhausted during the day; to vary their occupations, and to turn their labours and recreations to their own advantage, as well as to that of society. Thus, after the accustomed military exercises, it is desirable that they should be subjected to regular hours, gymnastic

amusements, and some mode of useful instruction. It is in this manner, especially, that mutual instruction, established among the troops of the line, is beneficial to the soldier and the state. Warlike music, during their repasts, or at their hours of recreation, will contribute much to elevate the spirits of the soldier and to keep away those gloomy reflections which have been traced above. (as quoted in Rosen, 1975, p. 34)

During the U.S. Civil War several psychiatric diagnoses were added and a new specialty in medical training, neurology, was established. Neurology resulted from the recognition of the differences between organic and psychological causes of combat disorders and the need to develop more research on psychological causes (Zajtcuk & Bellamy, 1995, p. 8). The term *malingering* described presentations of “exaggerated trivial conditions or neurological symptoms” (p. 8). A secondary condition to anxiety was the medical diagnosis of “irritable and exhausted heart . . . [which] may have resembled neurocirculatory asthenia of World War I” (p. 8). Between 1861 and 1865, the Union Army diagnosed 2,600 cases of insanity and 5,200 cases of nostalgia requiring hospitalization (p. 8). The desertion of 200,000 Union Soldiers and 160,000 cases of constipation “reminiscent of the precombat syndrome” (p. 8) were also reported during this time.

Even with this early awareness of neurological causes to combat-related issues, it was not until World War I that U. S. soldiers were labeled as psychiatric casualties, generally identified as “war neurosis” or “shell shock” (Zajtcuk & Bellamy, 1995, p. 8). Although psychologists at this time were not viewed as strictly medical staff, their work supplemented the medical examiner by referring soldiers for psychiatric examination, and

also leveraging vocational, educational, and social services (Yerkes, 1918). Beyond treating psychiatric casualties, psychology was used to build vertical cohesion in officer training; promote small group cohesion; improve rotation schedules to ensure adequate rest, sleep, and nutrition; and reinforce the individual soldier's contribution to missions (p. 28). Recruitment, selection, and placement processes were also refined during this time through the use of performance metrics to measure cognitive ability, which is now a hallmark contribution of psychology (Matthews & Laurence, 2012). "Our profession has brought to the front the desirability and the possibility of dealing scientifically and effectively with the principal human factors in military organization and activity" (Yerkes, 1918, p. 114).

Psychology continued to refine and expand scientific contributions to improve the military's performance metrics and organizational challenges. The military is the largest employer in the United States, and its attendance to best practices in its own use and care of employees and soldiers has given military psychology a critical role in establishing preventive and palliative practices. This growing demand for psychological services by the military led to the creation of one of the first subdivisions within the American Psychological Association, the Division of Military Psychology (Division 19), which became the Society for Military Psychology in 2003 to reflect its expanded international composition (Matthews & Laurence, 2012, p. 1). Division 19 includes a cross-section of specialty areas of psychology which reflect the expansion of the profession's contributions to the military: clinical and health psychology, training and human factors, manpower and personnel, industrial-organizational, experimental, engineering, and social psychology (p. 1).

Psychology today contributes to “recruiting, training, socializing, assigning, employing, deploying, motivating, rewarding, maintaining, managing, integrating, retaining, transitioning, supporting, counseling, and healing military members” (Matthews & Laurence, 2012, p. 2). Thus the ongoing need to defend our country from war, or participate in it, and maintain the military organization in peak condition has given rise to psychology’s legitimacy and expansion as a profession.

The history of post-World War II psychology shows a clear pattern: areas of psychological research and clinical intervention that begin in the military tend to become institutionalized as specialties of psychological science. So, even when a field such as the practice of psychotherapy finds sources of support outside the military, it owes a historical debt to the DOD (Summers, 2008, p. 636). War and the military have contributed significantly to the growth of psychology as a legitimate field of science by using psychology to strengthen military effectiveness and treat combat stress. A separate field of psychological research aimed at peacebuilding and peacekeeping has emerged through the work of peace psychology. The statistics from the Uppsala Conflict Data Program (UCDP) at the Department of Peace and Conflict Research, Uppsala University, Sweden has been providing one of the most accurate data sources on global conflicts since 1970. UCDP documents the duration of peace agreements and make the case for more expertise in peacekeeping among all sectors to ensure longer-lasting peace within and among nations (Kreutz, 2010). The ongoing threat to humanity as a whole from nuclear and biological weapons also reinforces the need to expand building peace on more than military strength and tactics.



As evidence of psychology's response along these lines, peacebuilding skills have expanded to involve many dimensions: individual (psychological peace, aggression, violence, gender, developmental stages), social (education, research, science, religion, arts, family systems, gender relations, children, organizational management), and structural (political, diplomatic, communication channels, information technology, law, justice, human rights, natural resources, industry; Daffern, 1999). These various dimensions, whether directly or indirectly linked to war or avoidance of war, are inextricably interwoven. For example, economic pressures are considered perhaps the foremost individual, social, and structural stressor (Daffern, 1999, p. 768). Military spending in the United States is 39% of the world's total military expenditure (Stockholm International Peace Research Institute [SIPRI], 2013). According to the *SIPRI Yearbook 2013: Armaments, Disarmament and International Security*, in which military expenditures are summarized, the total worldwide military expenditures (US\$1.756 trillion) annually correspond to a cost of US\$249 to each person in the world (SIPRI, 2013).

Psychology's growth to become the largest discipline of the social sciences was built on the resources, support, and respect of the DOD and DIA (Summers, 2008, p. 628). As yet, there are no statistics detailing the percentage of the world's psychologists who work in areas that relate to peacekeeping. The organizations they have formed are the starting place to understanding the scope and growth of peacekeeping applications performed by psychologists, and, of course, the possibilities for growth are unlimited.

## **Contributions of Psychology's Professional Associations towards Peacebuilding**

Associations, generally chartered as nonprofit organizations, are important to understand because they control entry and standards of a profession, further the growth of the field, and protect the public interests of the profession. The Peace Psychology Division (48), founded in 1990, has been the primary organization to forward the field of peace psychology in the United States. It functions as one of 54 specialties of its host organization, the American Psychological Association. Therefore, some discussion of its host organization, APA, and other related affiliations will clarify how peace psychology emerged as a professional designation.

### **American Psychological Association.**

On July 8, 1892, a governing organization now known as the American Psychological Association established the field of psychology as a profession. This occurred as a result of an invitation sent by G. Stanley Hall at Clark University in Worcester, Massachusetts, to “a group of rugged pioneers” (Fernberger, 1932, p. 2). At the first meeting, William James and six other colleagues formed the first governing council and began to formulate procedures for operating the association and accepting members. Over the next several decades the association began addressing issues that practitioners were encountering in the field, and from its original 32 members, grew by an average of 19 members annually to a total of 925 members by the start of World War II (Summers, 2008, p. 615). Key accomplishments in the first decade included:

- The establishment of psychology as a science. “The object of the Association is the advancement of Psychology as a science” as stated in Article 1 of the Constitution of the American Psychological Association

(Cattell, 1895, p. 150). Having refused an earlier offer to merge its membership, the APA affiliated in 1902 with The American Academy for the Advancement of Science (AAAS). The affiliation gave the APA national recognition as a branch of science (Sokal, 1992).

- The separation of psychology from philosophy, and the identification of psychology as a field of scientific practice, left those with more philosophical leanings to join the American Philosophical Association, and psychology grew as a field marked by clinical and experimental roots (Sokal, 1992).
- The establishment of a procedure for special segments of psychology to organize under the APA's organizational structure as Divisions was established (Sokal, 1992).

As a portent of things to come, the annual speech by the President of the APA at the 1917 national convention during World War I was not about the psychology of peace, but the relevance of psychology to war. The President outlined numerous areas of the military that could be improved through the use of psychology and concluded: "As we look ahead and attempt to prophesy future needs in the light of occurrences of the past 6 months, it is clear that the demand for psychologists and psychological services promises, or threatens, to be overwhelmingly great" (Yerkes, 1918, p. 113).

***The American Psychological Association and national defense.***

The military's use of psychology has been the single most influential factor in expanding the field of psychology (Summers, 2008). The field began as a strong academic discipline and a committee established in 1895, named by its members The

Committee on Physical and Mental Tests, developed the first clinical applications. This committee drew up a series of tests for administration in college psychological laboratories, which were in their nascence. Psychology's first clinical application used by the military during World War I was testing (Fernberger, 1932). After World War I, the United States Department of War contracted with John Dollard of Yale University's Institute of Human Relations to study fear, morale in combat, and the psychological attributes of good soldiers. Three hundred American veterans who fought fascism as volunteers in the Spanish Civil War (1936–1939) and volunteered again in World War II became research subjects for this study. The study involved a 45-page survey that took 5 hours to administer. Dollard received the cooperation of the Communist party and the FBI for this study (Summers, 2008). The findings were summarized in a report titled *Fear in Battle* (Dollard, 1943), which became a self-help handbook for World War II military personnel. It contained outlines of various types of stress and fears in soldiers and recommended methods of controlling those stresses and fears (Summers, 2008). The Army's chief of morale urged his officers to use the findings in training soldiers and *Time* magazine gave it a favorable review (Carroll, Nash, & Small, 2006, pp. 41–44).

World War II put increased demands on the field of psychology for research, consulting, and clinical services. Both psychology and psychiatry grew concurrently (Summers, 2008). After the first year of the war, 40 PhD psychologists were employed by the military, and by the end of the war the number totaled 1,710, which is significant considering the APA had only 1,012 full members at the start of the war (Summers, 2008). These statistics do not take into account the number of psychologists working as consultants on defense contracts. After the war, the APA's growth exceeded every other

medical and academic association. The United States was the largest employer of psychologists per capita in the world (p. 615).

Psychology was employed by the military in the following ways:

- Studying how to control population growth and quell potential resistance in groups and individuals;
- Creating screening and classification protocols for prospective and active soldiers, which became known as the General Classification Tests;
- Establishing the first psychological assessment center under the Office of Strategic Services (OSS), which later became the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), and screening 5,000 candidates for the OSS within the first 18 months (Summers, 2008);
- Researching areas as diverse as night vision, perception, frustration and aggression, the design of gun sights, group morale, and leadership;
- Performing morale studies specifically designed to destroy enemy morale. Within the military these studies were undertaken in the Psychological War Division of the Supreme Headquarters, Allied Expeditionary Forces, dubbed the “Skyewarriors.” This involved analyzing Nazi broadcasts and documents, gathering data from prisoners of war (POWs), and analyzing Hitler’s speeches. Two Princeton projects funded by the Rockefeller Foundation and led by prestigious psychologists provided aid. The Princeton Office of Public Opinion Research, directed by Cantril, analyzed European broadcasts to understand Nazi psychology. The Princeton Listening Center, led by G. Watson, became part of the Federal

Communications Commission as the Foreign Broadcast Monitoring Services. The Skywarriors provided critical contributions to the defeat of the German army, the breaking of the German will, and the identification of five categories of German attitudes toward the Nazi movement that successfully predicted German responses to allied propaganda (Summers, 2008).

- Understanding the effects of combat using pioneering methods of interview and survey responses: a major finding was that bombings did not affect enemy moral to the extent expected. This led to new psychological strategies to break the enemy's will (Summers, 2008).
- Applying psychology to maintaining and improving domestic and military morale; a Committee of National Morale, including some of the well-regarded psychologists of the time, studied Nazi psychological warfare. The Emergency Committee in Psychology, chaired by Gordon Allport, sponsored a conference titled "On the Psychological Factors in Morale" in 1940 and had 22 seminars functioning 2 years later. The Emergency Committee performed extensive polling to recommend policy on explaining the U. S. entry into the war and to manage opinions in various sectors of society such as trade unions and ethnic communities.
- Conducting the largest study of a subcategory of the American population executed to date with an intensive psychological investigation of military morale through 300 studies comprising 60,000 interviews resulting in the four volume *The American Soldier* series, which was not only a landmark

scientific study, but also the first social psychological investigation conducted by American psychologists (Stouffer et al., 1949). They found the current preoccupations of American soldiers had less to do with democracy and aligned more with their German and Japanese counterparts: physical discomfort, moving up the chain of command, and staying out of combat. This generated a massive indoctrination effort (films, pamphlets, education) to explain the purpose of war. Psychologists such as Dollard wrote some of these materials.

- Assisting with large numbers of psychiatric casualties resulting from military service; millions of soldiers and veterans suffered from a variety of mental breakdowns (Menninger, 1948). Forty-nine percent of all discharges were neuropsychiatric. Shortages in psychiatric personnel thrust psychologists into psychotherapeutic roles for the first time. Very few had significant training (Herman, 1995). This led to the establishment by the military of a pioneering clinical psychology training program at Brooke General Hospital (Menninger, 1948).

The field of psychology as a whole had several landmark outcomes as a result of the military's use of psychological knowledge and theories. Summers (2008) noted several of these outcomes, which included the following:

- New fields of psychology were established and institutionalized;
- Clinical psychology became established as a field of psychology;
- Research domains were expanded;

- Social psychology, group dynamics, culture, and personality were created as new fields of psychology;
- The OSS, which became the CIA, recognized the huge contribution made by social scientists; and
- Psychological warfare became a legitimate branch of war (U.S. Congress, Senate, 1945).

The portion of the Department of Defense (DOD) budget allocated for the field of psychology grew exponentially from 1945 onward (Summers, 2008). The Office of Naval Research (ONR) was the first military research program to fund science and technology programs for the US Navy and Marine Corp at universities, government labs, and both non-profit and for-profit organizations. It provided the single largest funding source for psychological research until the establishment of the National Science Foundation in 1950 (p. 619). The ONR funded new areas of psychological research in “attitude measurement, leadership and small group theory, job and task analysis, and human factors in job performance” (p. 216).

The other branches of the armed services followed suit. In the 1950s, the Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences (ARI) researched human factors, and used the results successfully in the Gulf War as well as adapting them for commercial applications (Paddock, 1982; Summers, 2008). The Army employed over 100 psychologists at ARI’s Walter Reed Hospital to research military life stressors. In 2008, 94% of ARI’s workforce was composed of psychologists. The Air Force established three centers for human resources today collectively known as the Personnel Research Laboratory at Lackland Air Force Base (Taylor, 2006). From 1945 to 1968, the



DOD was the largest institutional sponsor of psychological research with “no close second” (Summers, 2008, p. 620). Today, psychological research funded by DOD has become institutionalized in university psychology programs, within the DOD, and in for-profit and non-profit companies receiving DOD contracts (Summers, 2008).

***The American Psychological Association, the CIA, and the Cold War.***

As post-World War II fears of communism rose in the United States, the CIA (formerly the Office of Special Services, or OSS) immediately began recruiting psychologists (Summers, 2008). The CIA knowingly capitalized on and perpetuated false public rumors that indicated communists in the Soviet Union and China had invented secret mind-control mechanisms (McCoy, 2006, p. 34). Prominent psychologists participated in endorsing these rumors, among them Janis (1968), a well-known Yale professor and later president of the APA. The public hysteria over alleged psychological methods the Communists used served to justify the allocation of billions of dollars to the CIA. From 1950 to 1962, the CIA used these funds to study psychological limits of pain with respect to torture, as well as the extent to which individuals can (and cannot) resist psychological torture, exposure to hallucinogenic drugs, sensory deprivation, and electric shock. As McCoy (2006) noted, it was a time that can be described as “a veritable Manhattan Project of the mind,” which resulted in a new approach to torture that could be best described as “no-touch torture” (p. 7).

The first phase of the research on mind control from 1950–1956 was led by Richard Helm, who later became head of the agency. It involved a total of 149 projects, 33 sub-projects, and 185 non-governmental researchers. The cost was \$25 million annually (\$200 million-equivalent value today; McCoy, 2006).

Their research demonstrated illegal disregard for professional ethics and human subjects. The LSD program, for example, used unsuspecting subjects in settings such as “cocktail parties, summer camps, and . . . prison camps” (Summers, 2008, p. 621). In another program on “depatterning,” psychiatrist Dr. Ewen Cameron used unsuspecting hospital patients to perform experiments. These patients were administered drugs, given electroshock, and subjected to sensory deprivation without their consent or knowledge. Donald Hebb (1949), a prominent psychologist and later president of the APA, received credit for creating a cognitive revolution by viewing psychology as a biological science. He received a CIA grant to study sensory deprivation under the guise of a research project designed to prevent “railway and highway accidents” (Summers, 2008, p. 621).

Hebb paid students double the going rate to sit for 4 hours in a cubicle with all sensory stimuli muted. All suffered hallucinations and many could not complete the project. Those completing the project had difficulty connecting thoughts (Bexton, Heron, & Scott, 1954), leading to the conclusion that even brief periods of sensory deprivation could lead to a complete breakdown of mental functioning (Summers, 2008). The lead researchers and team members published a series of articles on the critical need for sensory stimulation to maintain a delicate state of human equilibrium (Hebb, Heath, & Stuart, 1954; W. Heron, 1957). These findings (Hebb et al., 1954) were groundbreaking and immediately became a standard part of psychology textbooks, and also a foundation for the CIA’s “new psychological paradigm for torture” (Summers, 2008, p. 622). The Office of Navy Research (ONR) received CIA funds to create a fictitious “Department of Psychology” when LSD experiments were not yielding needed results. Newly employed psychologists then tried behavioral approaches. The ONR issued 117 contracts at 58

universities under its newly created Psychological Sciences research program (Page, 1954). This led to the discovery of psychological torture, and established the Navy as the second largest patron of the field of psychology. The extent of the covert research in academic institutions still remains unknown because Helms destroyed the files (McCoy, 2006).

The CIA and the ONR were the major funders of continuing investigations into key variables in isolation and sensory deprivation. A very close relationship evolved among experimental psychologists and these two agencies. The CIA routinely flew psychologists to international conferences and monitored APA annual meetings (Summers, 2008). CIA Chief Allen Dulles convinced a close personal friend, Cornell neuropsychiatrist Dr. Harold Wolff, to establish the Society for the Investigation of Ecology at Cornell's Medical Center. Later renamed the Human Ecology Fund (HEF), its purpose was to study mind control techniques with CIA funds. Wolff and his partner, Dr. Lawrence Hinkle, were given \$5 million (\$40 million-equivalent value today) to test drugs and study cultural differences. They reached out to Col. James Monroe, former head of the Psychological Warfare Research Division of the Air Force, and CIA psychologist John Gittinger, to perform a comprehensive study of Communist mind control techniques. They found sleep deprivation and forced standing as the primary methods used by Communists to force coercion of captives (Greenfield, 1977). Another future APA president, Harry Harlow, received funds to study monkeys' responses to isolation, which involved some monkeys being isolated without contact for 24 months (Summers, 2008, p. 623). Harlow, along with Dr. I. E. Farber, a psychologist, and Dr. Louis Jolyon West (Farber, Harlow, & West, 1957), were funded to undertake the

definitive study on Communist psychological tactics. They discovered three other key factors used in the mental breakdown of subjects: dread (anticipating with alarm, distaste, or reluctance), debility (being weak or feeble), and dependency (not confident, prone to mistakes, indecisive) thereafter known as DDD. The research also led to a discovery of how prisoners can view themselves as inflicting the harm and see the captors as providing a source of relief. Their research involved “producing a condition of excessive weariness, the occasional respite from deprivation, which makes the prisoner dependent on the captor for relief, and the induction of chronic fear” (p. 623). This provided a more precise understanding of how self-inflicted harm worked as part of the Communist strategy, and then became the CIA’s strategy for breaking down prisoners. The CIA, through the many investigations channeled through academic institutions and with the critical help of psychologists, established “a new strategy for breaking down prisoners: sensory deprivation and self-inflicted harm. The handbook for CIA interrogation, the Kubark Manual of 1963, was based on these two principles” (p. 623). In procedures developed from this and many other psychological research projects lay the foundation for practices used at Guantanamo Bay and other “black sites” (p. 623).

HEF disbursed other funds for various types of original psychological research.

As Summers (2008) noted, prominent psychologists receiving HEF funds included:

- Dr. Martin Orne, professor of psychology and psychiatry at the University of Pennsylvania, known for research into hypnosis and credited with discovering demand characteristics in human subject research that illustrated the flaws inherent in informing participants of the purpose of research and then expecting them to act normally.

- Dr. Carl Rogers, president of the APA in 1947 and later appointed to the board of the APA, one of the founders of humanistic psychology and psychotherapy research. The APA awarded Rogers the Award for Distinguished Scientific Contributions to Psychology in 1956 and the Award for Distinguished Contributions to Applied Psychology as a Professional Practice in 1972 (Rogers, 1980). In his later years he travelled worldwide to apply his theories to promote reconciliation in areas of political oppression and national social conflict, receiving a nomination for the Nobel Peace Prize 5 days after his death.
- Dr. Edgar Schein, an eminent MIT organizational psychologist, who published studies of civilians imprisoned in China in a book titled *Coercive Persuasion*, underwritten by CIA funds—although Schein claimed not to know the source of the funding (Greenfield, 1977).

In 1951 a group of psychologists with close ties to the APA received 100% funding by the Department of Defense (DOD) to establish a research organization focused on human factors and organizational research for the U.S. Army called the Human Resources Research Organization (HumRRO; Summers, 2008). While HumRRO has expanded into commercial markets, in 2008 55% of its \$21 million budget came from DOD funds. Recent ties to the APA included: former APA Senior Counsel, James McHugh, Jr., HumRRO chairman of the board; the APA's Chief Financial Officer, Charles McKay, HumRRO vice chairman; and the APA board member representing the Division of Military Psychology, and chief APA spokesman to Congress supporting defense money, HumRRO president Dr. William Strickland. In its early days it added to

the research done by Hebb to explore the “impact of ‘radical isolation’ on hallucinations, mood, and the measurement of affect and subjective stress (e.g., Myers, Murphy, Smith, & Goffard, 1966)” (Summers, 2008, p. 623).

Psychology during the Cold War was considered by U. S. foreign policy makers the key to persuading or dominating targeted groups in the United States and abroad and extending U.S. influence more widely and cost effectively (Simpson, 1994). The CIA added mass persuasion research as a critical component of its mind control program and created psychological warfare programs targeting the Philippines, Middle East, and Southeast Asia (Simpson, 1994). Government funding by the CIA, Pentagon, and other U. S. security agencies funded the academic studies that have, according to the results of Simpson’s research, formed the basis for mass communication studies today. He noted that six of the major communication studies programs that began after the war received 75% of their funding from DOD (Simpson, 1994).

Using the Army as an example to view the incorporation of psychology into fighting units of the military demonstrated how psychology has changed warrior training and culture. In 1941 General Eisenhower appointed a decorated warrior and brigadier general, Robert Alexis McClure, to serve as his chief of intelligence for the European theatre. This permanently changed McClure’s career trajectory (Paddock, 1999). His letters to his wife indicated the challenges and opportunities of this new warfare and one soldier’s personal experience in this change to embrace psychology. He wrote to his wife, Marjorie, “My new job—for which I was called by Ike—very hurriedly—is a continual headache—I have what I call the INC [Information and Censorship] Section—I am just creating it” (pp. 2–3); and then McClure indicated another feature of the job

which carried a “slop over into civil affairs” (p. 3). In another letter a year later, McClure outlined the scope of his responsibilities: INC operated 12 high-powered radio stations and had a staff of over 1,500 “in an organization never contemplated in the Army” (p. 3).

He then listed the breakdown of the office personnel:

My Psychological Warfare staff—radio, leaflet, signals, front line, occupation, domestic propaganda personnel, exceed 700. In censorship—troop, mail, and cables, civilian mail, radio, press, cables, telephone for all of North & West Africa, Sicily, etc., over 400 personnel & supervising 700 French. Public relations—press and correspondents—150 correspondents—250 personnel. (p. 3)

A year later he wrote to his wife that psychological warfare had become, for him, the “big job” where he was proud of his contributions. “Our propaganda did a lot to break the Wops—as their emissaries admit—now we have to turn it on the Germans” (as quoted in Paddock, 1999, p. 3).

In 1944, General Eisenhower authorized the establishment of the Psychological Warfare Division to support the campaign against Nazis and assigned McClure as its director. McClure defined psychological warfare as “The dissemination of propaganda designed to undermine the enemy’s will to resist, demoralize his forces and sustain the morale of our supporters” (p. 4). McClure was tapped by Eisenhower to participate in the occupation of Germany where he applied what he had learned about psychological warfare to peacebuilding. On May 8, 1945, McClure wrote to his wife:

The shooting war is over, here! Signed yesterday. Paris is wild with excitement. . . . With one phase over I am now up to my neck on the control phase. We will rigidly control all newspapers, films, theatre, radio music, etc., in Germany! My

division now publishes 8 newspapers in Germany, with 1,000,000 circulation and sends 2 million+ language papers each day by air for displaced persons and POWs. Biggest newspaper enterprise in the world. (as quoted in Paddock. 1999, p. 4)

The three phases of McClure's plan to cause individual Germans to renounce Nazism and militarism and take their place in a democratic society were: first, shutting down all media; second, establishing U. S. operation of information vehicles such as radio and newspapers; and third, strategically turning over the media instruments to carefully selected Germans (Paddock, 1999, p. 4). In addition to traditional media outlets, McClure created another function, called intelligence, which was responsible for public opinion research, German bureaucracies, youth, and the church (p. 4). His outline of the scope of the offices' reach is clearly broken down in a letter to his friend and vice-president of Time-Life, Inc., C. D. Jackson in July of 1946.

We now control 37 newspapers, 6 radio stations, 314 theatres, 642 movies, 101 magazines, 237 book publishers, 7,384 book dealers and printers, and conduct about 15 public opinion surveys a month, as well as publish one newspaper with 1,500,000 circulation, 3 magazines, run the Associated Press of Germany (DANA), and operate 20 library centers. . . . The job is tremendous. (as quoted in Paddock, 1999, p. 4)

In the first few years of the Cold War McClure noticed the Army's trend to move away from military use of psychology and he spent the next few years advocating the incorporation of psychological warfare into service schools. In a memo to Dwight Eisenhower, McClure urged, "psychological warfare must be a part of every future war



plan” (as quoted in Paddock, 1999, p. 4). These efforts and the outbreak of the Korean War prompted the army in 1951 to establish an Office of the Chief of Psychological Warfare (OCPW), the first of its kind in the Army, with McClure as its first chief. The Army Special Forces emerged under the leadership of McClure (Paddock, 1999). In honoring his contributions to special operations, the U.S. Army dedicated its headquarters building to Major General McClure on January 19, 2000.

Government-funded communication studies performed mostly by social psychologists consumed \$1 billion (\$8 billion in today’s dollars) annually in the 1950s (Summers, 2008). Buried in the funding were secret research studies of torture. One such study of POW torture was funded by the CIA through the Bureau of Social Science Research and disguised as a social psychology study of communication (Summers, 2008). In 1962 the Army held a symposium that brought together military personnel and psychological expertise to validate the role of psychology in the military and invite further development in exploiting “national vulnerabilities to prevent insurgencies or destroy such movements if they were initiated” (p. 624). At this meeting, the areas of psychological involvement outlined included: “the special forces section battery, psychological screening tests for use by friendly forces, accelerated language training techniques, training for military operations with indigenous personnel, handbook of psychological symbols, and special studies of guerrilla and unconventional warfare” (Karcher, 1962, p. 348). The response from psychologists reflected a sincere interest in being “included in the effort to win over populations in the underdeveloped world” (Summers, 2008, p. 624). The goals were realized in subsequent years with \$50 million (\$300 million in today’s dollars) allocated to understanding insurgency movements

worldwide by 1970, and psychologists were the most represented profession in this research. Warfare was clearly redefined as both psychological and technological by the time the Vietnam War was underway (Summers, 2008, p. 625). Military applications of psychology were the determining factor in growing the field of psychology because no other field of psychology research received amounts of money close to the funding from the Department of Defense.

“Psychological warfare is a war of the mind” (Dougherty, 2006). America’s use of psychology to wage war, referred to as *psychological warfare* (PsyWar), began in World War I. British military analyst and historian Fuller reportedly first coined the term *psychological warfare* in a 1920 scholarly analysis of lessons learned during World War I (Dougherty, 2006). He speculated that “purely psychological warfare” (Fuller, 1920, p. 320) would replace the tank warfare used in World War I. Psychological warfare, just like market research in business, entailed learning about target enemy’s beliefs, likes, dislikes, strengths, and weaknesses and strategically designing uses of communications to influence attitudes and behaviors. Understanding group and individual behavior, emotions, and attitudes supported the achievement of national objectives (Dougherty, 2006). The weapons were sight and sound and were not necessarily related to how verbal, auditory, or written communications were disseminated, but rather how the messages induced the desired changes in the receiver (Dougherty, 2006).

#### ***War’s impact on the American Psychological Association.***

Just as psychological operations became the second leg of the military, psychological services grew exponentially beginning with the treatment of World War II veterans. Over 50% of all military disabilities after World War II were psychiatric, and

psychiatric patients occupied 10% of the in-patient beds (Menninger, 1948). The Veterans Administration (VA) estimated it needed 4,700 clinical psychologists to meet the demand, which was larger than the entire psychology profession in the U.S. Before the war, there had only been 270 members of the APA participating in the clinical division. The VA undertook a massive funding of clinical psychology programs in universities, and within 3 years had 700 students in 41 universities studying to be clinical psychologists (Rainy, 1950). Accompanying this effort, Congress passed the Mental Health Act of 1946 (Mullner, 2009, p. 546), which established the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) to fund research on psychological disorders, training in mental health services, and supporting states' mental health treatment facilities. By 1964 the behavioral sciences received 60% of all NIMH funding, and psychology was the largest profession receiving funds. Remarking at the 10th Annual VA Leadership Conference in 2007, Sharon Brehm, president of the APA, reversed the paradigm of her presidential predecessor 90 years earlier, who expressed a vision of psychology's usefulness to the military. She remarked that it was now the military that was essential to psychology, and honored the VA as the birthplace of professional psychology training during World War II (Brehm, 2007).

***Board of Social and Ethical Responsibility for Psychology (BSERP).***

Questions about the legitimacy of applying psychological inquiry to social issues in the field of psychology remained unanswered when the APA created a Board of Social and Ethical Responsibility for Psychology (BSERP) to focus the application of psychology on issues of human welfare (White, 1986). Several highlights regarding issues of war, violence, and peace were included in a public statement issued in 1982 by

the APA supporting a bilateral nuclear freeze and other initiatives that would reduce nuclear conflict. In 1984 BSERP gathered a group of researchers well known for their work in areas of war, peace, and conflict resolution to consider how psychology and biological sciences could make more focused contributions. They consolidated the most current research on what psychologists understood about the prevention of nuclear war into a book published with the support of SPSSI titled *Psychology and the Prevention of Nuclear War* (White, 1986). Some of the most respected thinkers on this topic contributed articles including Lifton, Robert Jervis, Urie Bronfenbrenner, David Yankelovick, Janis, Fisher, Etzioni, Kelman, Richard Ned Lebow, Deutsch, Mack, Frank, Marshall Shulman, and Fromm. At BSERP's 1986 mini-convention on empowerment, one of the sessions was on the topic of peace: "Providing Psychological Tools for the Peace Movement" (Board of Social and Ethical Responsibility for Psychology [BSERP], 1986, p. 13).

***Board of Advancement of Psychology in the Public Interest (BAPPI).***

Twenty years after its creation, both BSERP and the Board of Ethnic Minority Affairs (BEMA) agreed to disband and reconstitute under the Board for the Advancement of Psychology in the Public Interest (BAPPI), which is still in existence. In its first year, BAPPI chose to focus on the theme "Violence in Society: Research, Prevention, and Treatment," which included violence in "all its forms such as violence against women and against lesbians and gay men" (Freiberg, 1961, p. 38). Commenting on the change that had taken place over the previous 20 years regarding the mainstreaming of public interest issues in psychology, Jack Plummer, Director of Psychology and Director of the Traumatic Brain-Injury Program at Gaylord Hospital in Wasingford, Connecticut, wrote:

Personally, I'm interested in guild issues as a practitioner . . . but I'm also very interested in non-guild issues, because I think that the whole purpose of APA has to do with the promotion of human welfare. . . . I take it very seriously, and I think this board will take it very seriously. (As quoted in Freiberg, 1961, p. 38)

The annual conventions of the APA in 1947, 1949, and 1958 included specific programs on “international understanding and roles of the psychologist in promoting a long and enduring peace” (Russell, 1958, p. 213). Psychologists at that time were concerned with looking at the motivations behind individuals’ actions, and how conflicts could be resolved at both group and individual levels when at each level there were incompatible motives. Practitioners believed psychology had the capacity to make contributions (Russell, 1958). In post-World War II years the expansion of nuclear arsenals fueled the Cold War and for the first time threatened the annihilation of civilization at a scale never before imagined. Psychologists expressed concern to their association that there had not been sufficient consideration of the contribution psychologists could make to those areas of national and international safety that involved significant components of human behavior. In 1958 the Board of Directors of the American Psychological Association responded and asked the Executive Secretary of the Association to assemble “a small group of experts to consider any appropriate program which should be recommended to the Board regarding the role of psychologists in the maintenance of peace” (Carter, 1958, p. 699). The talent assembled in this working group not only represented the breadth of expertise that had grown out of the basic tenets of psychology’s founders, but also signified a shared belief in applying psychology to more national and international arenas. The committee was comprised of seven psychologists: Bronfenbrenner, Deutsch,

Fred Edward Fiedler, Harold Guetzkow, Hollander, Weitz, and Osgood. These individuals experienced World War II and, as psychologists, led significant new research that impacted the growth of the field and could be applied to the subject of peace. The breadth of their contributions also illustrated the diversity of a field only newly established in their lifetimes. Although no information on Joseph P. Weitz emerged from the literature search, the literature regarding the contributions of the others members showed the variety of individual and professional backgrounds gathered to shape APA's focus on peace.

Urie Bronfenbrenner (1917–2005) was a Russian-born American psychologist generally regarded as one of the world's first scholars to focus on the interplay between research and policy on child development. He pioneered the ecological systems theory and co-founded the Head Start Program. His personal exposure to war occurred when he was drafted 24 hours after completing his PhD at the University of Michigan. He served as a psychologist in a variety of assignments for the Army Air Corps and the Office of Strategic Services. After completing officer training he served in the U.S. Army Medical Corps. Immediately after World War II, Bronfenbrenner worked as Assistant Chief Clinical Psychologist for Administration and Research for the Veterans' Administration, before beginning his work as Assistant Professor in Psychology at the University of Michigan (Ceci, 2006).

One of the world's most respected scholars of conflict resolution recognized today is Morton Deutsch (1920– ). He joined the U.S. Air Force as a psychologist after the start of World War II, and then served as a navigator in 30 bombing missions over Germany. He completed his services as a clinical psychologist in an Air Force hospital

and entered MIT to earn his PhD, studying at Kurt Lewin's Research Center for Group Dynamics. His dissertation research was a comparison of performance in cooperative and competitive groups, which was "sparked by his interest in how the United Nations could work together cooperatively for peace . . . [along with] a growing global concern with nuclear weapons" (Association for Psychological Science, 2006). Among Deutsch's many achievements was founding the International Center for Cooperation and Conflict Resolution in 1986 to (a) expand theory and research related to conflict, justice, cooperation, and systemic change; (b) educate future leaders with the goal of understanding and supporting sustainable peace; and (c) provide a bridge between theory and practice.

Fred Edward Fiedler (1922– ) was one of the leading researchers in organizational psychology and an expert on the study of leadership and performance (Wetzel, 2005). He grew up in post-World War I Vienna where the ideas of Freud, Adler, and Jung were part of the intellectual fabric. Having accessed his father's psychology books, Fiedler reportedly wanted to become a psychologist before he entered his teens. When Germany invaded Austria in 1938 Fiedler's family immigrated to the United States. Two years after his high school graduation in 1942, Fiedler joined the U.S. Army and served in a medical battalion, an infantry battalion, and in military civilian and governmental affairs during tours in both England and Germany. Upon his discharge in 1945 he re-entered the University of Chicago where he received a master's degree in organizational psychology and a PhD in clinical psychology. His early research was with the Veterans Administration, and then the Combat Crew Research Laboratory at Randolph Field. At the research laboratory, his lifelong interest in leadership was inspired by his work with

Donald Fiske (1917–2003), who undertook groundbreaking work on validity and personality assessment, and Lee Cronbach (1916–2001), who placed the concept of validity theory in the center of educational and psychological testing (Wetzel, 2005).

Harold Guetzkow (1915–2008) contributed to the science and art of simulation. For example, his inter-nation simulation was “viewed as a device for integrating diverse islands of theories in international relations and social psychology” (Druckman, 2011, p. 4). Guetzkow was a conscientious objector during World War II.

Hollander was an organizational social psychologist. He served as a neuropsychiatrist in an army hospital during World War II. After his service he left clinical practice to become a scholar, researcher, author, and teacher on leadership; he placed primary importance on the transactional nature of the leader-follower relationship (Hollander, Park, Boyd, Elman, & Ignagni, 2008). “Almost single-handedly, through the force of his impeccable and creative research, he has altered, indeed transformed, our view of leadership by insisting on the study of followership” (Sorenson, 2008).

Osgood (1916–1991) contributed to the field of intercultural research and communication and served as the APA’s president from 1960–1962. He developed a theoretical foundation in human behavioral and communication processes . . . semantic techniques . . . massive cross-cultural measurements of affective meanings of human conceptions . . . intercultural awareness . . . intra- and inter-cultural communications theories, analytic methodologies, and contemporary substantive social issues. (Tzeng, Landis, & Tzeng, 2012, p. 832)

During the Cold War he designed a new approach to international relations called graduated reciprocation in tension-reduction (GRIT), which focused efforts on a series of



carefully calibrated, reciprocal steps that would gradually foster trust between the two superpowers (Osgood, 1962a, p. 567). However, Osgood recognized that psychological more than technological answers would determine the outcome of a strategy of deterrence. Osgood spoke of deterrence as depending upon both “the ‘credibility’ of the deterrent . . . and the ‘rationality’ of human decisions under stress” (p. 566). He pointed out how a familiar psychological symptom, denial, works against these objectives and “represses conscious acceptance of a persisting, unsolvable threat while releasing a tendency for unconscious flirting with the same danger—what Edgar Allen Poe called ‘the imp of the perverse’” (p. 566). Denial also bars an emotional response to credible threats, and keeps them abstractions.

All of these mechanisms of cold-war thinking—denying the dangers of nuclear war, using double standards of national morality, adhering rigidly to traditional alternatives, basing decisions on mere possibilities—ride on the back of tension, and tension is a product of the arms race. There seems to be little hope of prolonging mutual deterrence when it is composed of such volatile psychological ingredients. (Osgood, 1962a, p. 566)

The working group of Bronfenbrenner, Deutsch, Fiedler, Guetzkow, Hollander, Weitz, and Osgood was made a standing Committee of the APA in 1959 led by Osgood. As part of this new constellation, a letter and survey were sent to all those who had expressed previously an interest in the subject of peace, had published papers on, or delivered speeches in this related subject area. The survey, which was open-ended, solicited psychologists’ “attitudes and ideas on contributions psychologists and the APA might make to the ‘maintenance of peace’ ” (Russell, 1960, p. 92). The original suggestion

expanded into consideration of collaboration with other fields, such as behavioral science, but later narrowed to consideration of those categories specific to psychologists. The responses provided a variety of opinions, but the overarching theme of the answers confirmed that the discipline did have a contribution to make and the query was worthy of consideration. Russell (1960), in his resulting article, “Roles for Psychologists in the ‘Maintenance of Peace’,” divided the results into three segments: (a) concerns about defining appropriately the goal of “maintenance of peace,” (b) areas in which contributions were being made and could be made, and (c) suggestions for the APA to expand those contributions (p. 97). In the first category, psychologists recognized the value-based conflicts this topic introduced that required consideration. For example, the use of psychologists at that time was recognized as assisting the government more on “cold-war one-upsmanship than with the broader context that includes the possibility of conflict reduction” (Russell, 1960, p. 97). There was an appropriate recognition of the potential for biases affecting responses as a result of this. However, the general understanding of the term *maintenance of peace* included an understanding of conflict, violence, and the tensions and risks involved in stopping short of war. Thus, they approached the topic with the assumption that “conflict will be the pervasive intercultural or international condition and that attempts should be directed toward studying ways and means of reducing conflict to some more manageable and acceptable form short of killing” (p. 97).

Psychologists expressed interest in moving from explorations to resolutions of conflicts, and acknowledged an abundance of related areas in which they had little knowledge, but which clearly had psychological components needing further study.

These included understanding (a) those conditions in which conflicts developed, (b) characteristics of compromise including individual and group interactions, (c) the process of changing attitudes and objectives, (d) the process and impact of using persuasion and deterrent strategies, and (e) cultural and individual attitudes toward contested issues and their political, social, and economic implications (Russell, 1960).

When considering specific psychological contributions, psychologists were cautious not to attribute too much to their field.

It is clearly an oversimplification to say that wars are born in the minds of men, and it is further a non sequitur to conclude that the ways of peace must be similarly psychological. . . . power conflicts are more fundamental than mere misunderstanding. . . . political and economic and historical factors play a major part. (Russell, 1960, p. 99)

Yet, there were clear sets of opinions that a consolidation of current information into a “psychology of international relations” would be useful because psychological concepts are not readily accessible to others who might wish to incorporate them. There was a recognition that psychologists were increasingly being asked to provide information on: the measurement of and methods for changing attitudes; the organization of groups for maximum functional efficiency; the nature of decision making, negotiation and bargaining, and personality factors in leadership; and answers to the general question of what psychology may be able to contribute to the nations’ present and future efforts at “maintaining the peace” (Russell, 1960, p. 101).

Reaching out to the non-psychologist was an important part of expanding recognition of psychology, and a way to use the research published after World War I on

the topic. Besides simply consolidating the research, recommendations for writing findings for non-behavioral scientists were included. Although there was recognition of the considerable research underway in psychology, researchers were encouraged to determine what types of research could specifically address the maintenance of peace and then design specific research accordingly. Publications that resulted from this effort to compile relevant research were written by Kelman, Barth, and Hefner (1955), Klineberg (1950), and Pear (1950).

In his report, Russell (1960) also cited specific areas where psychologists were using their skills in areas critical to the maintenance of peace. The broad category of communication had many areas in which the technological knowledge of psychologists was applicable. These included (a) performing attitude and opinion research, (b) understanding and improving communication between differing stakeholders, (c) improving performance in the workplace through collaborative communication between different economic and cultural groups, (d) manipulating mass communications, (e) influencing public opinion and attitude research, and (f) lobbying on issues.

Psychologists could assist in outcome predictions of the effects of deterrent actions upon other groups. Industrial psychology, which specialized in human performance, directly impacted productivity and technological changes and was already contributing to improving economic factors that had a bearing on the maintenance of peace.

Russell (1960) also encouraged psychologists to make more profound contributions, as they had more opportunities to work within government agencies and the United Nations, and learn about the complex facets of problems. Psychological knowledge could be better used to make a positive contribution to international problems

generally handled by governmental representatives. Psychologists could also contribute their knowledge of social interactions, especially among culturally diverse peoples, by training people in different nations and international organizations in the ways of peace. As Russell (1960) noted, “Psychologists have participated actively in educational programs as teaching or research scholars in foreign universities, as advisors in the administration of programs, and less frequently as advisors on matters of policy . . . economic and military programs” (p. 103).

In the report, two key areas for potential future contributions were identified (Russell, 1960). Evaluation research could help provide a matrix for the measurement of programs’ effectiveness and contributions to peace. Also, understanding attitudes about international relations issues, how public opinion is shaped and changed, and how to become more psychologically intelligent could have a bearing on the maintenance of peace.

Psychologists ought to be able to bring into the thinking of public workers more of a realization that what influences the thinking, feeling, and behaving of ourselves and others is not the objective realities as such, but our perception or representation of these objective realities. (Russell, 1960, p. 103)

Programs in the Institute of International Social Research and UNESCO that used psychologists and social scientists to add value to international understanding were cited in Russell’s report. Psychological variables apply to all disciplines; therefore, calls for increased collaboration across other scientific and professional groups were included in the report.

Psychologists could propose some joint efforts with sociologists and political scientists, people in the field of international organization, people in the field of international economic affairs, etc. particularly in efforts to understand those individual, group, and international dynamics which are relevant to the arousal and maintenance of conflict. (Russell, 1960, p. 104)

Many believed APA was an active contributor to efforts to maintain peace by supporting individual efforts, serving as a catalyst for groups to form, and creating specific communications around the issue both within the membership and among other national and international scientific and governmental groups. Specific programs mentioned as “possibilities for immediate investigation” (Russell, 1960, p. 105) included the following:

- Fully implementing the programs recommended in the APA Committee on International Relations in Psychology’s report of 1956–1957;
- Participating in the new Grants in Support of Visiting Foreign Scientists program at the National Science Foundation that earmarked grants to national associations;
- Renewing the Carnegie Corporation’s grant for psychologists’ participation in international conferences;
- Inviting the International Union of Scientific Psychology to hold its 1963 International Congress in the United States;
- Organizing a 1964 Pacific Area Congress of Psychology in Hawaii immediately following the APA Annual Convention in Los Angeles;

- Improving access to research opportunities at pre- and postdoctoral levels for foreign psychologists and students in the United States and potentially other countries;
- Strengthening ties with other international and national scientific and professional associations beyond simply appointing official APA representatives; and
- Expanding opportunities for more informal exchanges among APA and other peer organizational officers. (pp. 105–106)

Beyond simply extending existing programs, the authors of the report called for the establishment of a Committee on Psychology in National and International Affairs and gave recommendations for its member and staff composition. They identified 11 areas for program development.

- Generating clearer hypotheses and analyses on how human factors impact the maintenance of peace,
- Critically reviewing current knowledge,
- Developing research activities,
- Expanding financial support for research,
- Engaging other nongovernmental organizations (NGO) interested in the general field,
- Deepening government penetration to discover more problems that could benefit from their expertise,
- Creating a program similar to the Congressional Fellowship Program offered by the American Political Science Association to provide students

A firsthand exposure to public policy and inspire future leaders who could bridge both psychology and public policy,

- Advancing the dissemination of information,
- Cooperating in international projects that were noncontroversial (like supporting a Mental Health Year in the World Federation for Mental Health),
- Defining existing competencies and mobilizing them on behalf of peace, and
- Training future psychologists. (Russell, 1960, p. 108–109)

In the conclusion of the report psychologists were strongly encouraged not to recoil from becoming more proactive to support the maintenance of peace, and they were reminded that it is no less of an undertaking than the “implementation of war” in the 1940s (p. 109).

In August of 1987 the APA’s Council of Representatives endorsed the rejection by the authors of the Seville Statement of the idea that behavioral traits were at the root of aggressive tendencies. The APA’s Board of Scientific Affairs “emphasized that this is not a scientific statement on the issues of specific inherited behavioral traits . . . [but] rather, a social statement designed to eliminate unfounded stereotypic thinking on the inevitability of war” (APA, 1994, p. 895). This was not a new stance, but rather a renewed one. In 1932 members of the APA were asked: “Do you hold that there are ineradicable, instinctive factors that make war between nations inevitable?” (Fletcher, 1932, p. 142). Of the 528 members, 150 did not reply, 346 replied “no”, 10 “yes”, and 22 gave ambiguous answers (Fletcher, 1932). A report by psychologists and other social



scientists outlining a consensus regarding the origins of war followed in 1942 (Stagner, Brown, Gundlach, & White, 1942).

In 2003 APA's governing Council of Representatives almost unanimously voted to create a 15-member Task Force on the Psychological Effects of Efforts to Prevent Terrorism to pinpoint the effect America's anti-terrorism efforts were having on the psychological well-being of individuals, the public, and elected officials. Second, the task force was charged with making operational recommendations to changes needed in APA. The task force submitted its recommendations to APA's Board of Scientific Affairs in 2005 but the operational recommendations for APA were rejected by both the Council of Representatives and the APA Board of Directors (APA, 2014b). As of 2008 these recommendations have not been resurrected for review (Kimmel, 2008). Twelve of the task force members wrote their findings as chapters in a book, not sanctioned by APA, titled *Collateral Damage: The Psychological Consequences of America's War on Terrorism* (Kimmel & Stout, 2006). Kimmel, chairman of the task force and former president of Division 48, and task force member Stout were co-editors. In the book the authors identified affected emotions, beliefs, and behaviors of the public such as an increase in hate crimes, fear, stereotyping of foreigners, militancy and belligerence, and feelings of helplessness as direct outcomes of America's war on terrorism. Also, "this stressful environment often leads authorities to overestimate the threat and consequences of terrorist activities and to make poor decisions in trying to prevent these activities" (Kimmel & Stout, 2006, p. xvi) as well as increasing the public's acceptance of human-rights violations and restrictions on freedoms (Kimmel, 2008).

### **Society for Psychological Study of Social Issues (SPSSI).**

Keeping psychology as a pure science, separate from its application, has been a point of controversy since the inception of psychology as a science. The controversy among psychologists over engagement with social issues is part of this history (Benjamin & Crouse, 2002). Despite this professional controversy, the social ills that surfaced due to the economic crisis of the Great Depression spurred a group of psychologists to form an organization to use psychology to address the psychological social issues caused by this economic crisis. This occurred during the APA's annual convention in 1936, when a group of psychologists gathered to establish the Society for Psychological Study of Social Issues (SPSSI) with two goals: (a) encourage research upon those psychological problems most vitally related to modern social, economic, and political policies; and (b) help the public and its representatives understand and use contributions from the scientific investigation of human behavior in the formation of social policies (SPSSI, 2013). A letter written to SPSSI in May 23, 1986, by Sargent, its 50th president, pointed to the attraction of the organization in its earlier days.

It's lucky SPSSI started when it did. . . . I wasn't sure I wanted to stay in psychology—it seemed so aloof from the major problems of the day. Along came SPSSI with its focus on race prejudice, labor conflict and unemployment, the prevention of war and the achieving of peace. When I heard about it . . . I signed up like a shot. (S. Sargent, personal communication, 1986)

Over one sixth of the APA's 2,000 members joined SPSSI in its first year (Benjamin & Crouse, 2002). During World War II G. Murphy, noting the fragmentary efforts in psychological research on the topic of war and peace, published a book that focused on

the “many facets of the problem of human nature as it relates to war” (G. Murphy, 1945, p. v). Commenting on the complexity of this endeavor, Murphy wrote that “the field was so great, and its problems so complex, that some fifty different specialists had to be called in if the area was to be properly surveyed” (p. v). Under Murphy’s editorship, SPSSI published its first Yearbook, *Human Nature and Enduring Peace* (G. Murphy, 1945).

The promotion of peace has been one of the fundamental goals of SPSSI since its founding (White, 1986). In 1937 the fledgling organization set forth an Armistice Day Manifesto based on the results of a survey taken among psychologists who specialized in the study of instincts. They asked if war was a biologically determined human instinct. The results indicated that 90% of those specializing in the study of instincts agreed that war was not instinctually based (*New York Times*, 1937; see Appendix B). In the 1940s the SPSSI’s Committee on the Psychology of War and Peace produced a large body of research “that we would characterize as peace psychology today” (Kelman, 2012, p. 362). Research topics covered included “attitudes toward war, war preventions, nationalism, and aggression” (Stagner et al., 1942, p. 362). Stagner chaired the committee, which included White, Osgood, and Ralph Gundlach. Other psychological research, such as psychoanalytic research on war and peace, existed outside of SPSSI and even earlier (e.g., Droba, 1931).

In 1945 SPSSI and the APA issued a joint press release announcing their “Statement of Psychologists on Human Nature and Peace” (see Appendix C), a document that contained 2,038 psychologists’ signatures. This statement outlined 10 basic principles of human nature that were important to planning for peace. “Humanity's

demand for lasting peace leads us as students of human nature to assert ten pertinent and basic principles which should be considered in planning the peace. Neglect of them may breed new wars, no matter how well-intended our political leaders may be” (reprinted in Jacobs, 1989; G. Murphy, 1945). By the end of the war, in 1945, SPSSI had joined the APA as Division 9, the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues.

In 1945 SPSSI started publishing the scholarly, peer-reviewed *Journal of Social Issues*. Among the breadth of social issues addressed was the subject of peace. In 1955 the *Journal of Social Issues* included two articles focused on encouraging research that would have positive results in the furtherance of peace: “Research to Establish the Conditions for Peace” (Cottrell, 1955) and “Governments and Peoples as Foci for Peace-Oriented Research” (Angell, 1955).

Also in 1945, soon after the end of World War II, representatives from 44 countries gathered in London to form an organization that would embody “a genuine culture of peace” (UNESCO, 2013). They formed the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). The preamble of UNESCO’s Constitution included the observation that war denies the principles of democracy, dignity, equality, and mutual respect while simultaneously promulgating ignorance, prejudice, and inequality. The preamble goes on to note that because peace promotes justice, liberty, and prosperity among both people and governments, “peace must therefore be founded, if it is not to fail, upon the intellectual and moral solidarity of mankind” (UNESCO, 2004). Through the many uses of psychological terms, this document gave particular validation to the value of applying social psychology research

to understanding conditions that propagate peace and those that serve as barriers (Cohrs & Beohnke, 2008).

In June of 1962, 2 years after the publication of the APA's report, SPSSI's Committee on Arms Control and Disarmament produced a special newsletter titled "Psychology and Peace." Deutsch chaired the committee, which included Robert Holt, Harold Proshansky, and Milton Schwebel, all of whom had met periodically because of their concern over the threat of nuclear war and the desire to motivate other psychologists to promote peace (SPSSI Committee on Arms Control and Disarmament, 1962, p. 1). Addressing the specific roles and standards for individuals and groups of psychologists, the newsletter appeared in three sections: a listing of sources for information, a primer on how to influence congressmen, and guidelines for psychologists called to consult in the political arena. More specific action steps were described in the newsletter than the APA's 1960 report, with suggestions such as joining national organizations like SPSSI, the Federation of American Scientists, the Society for the Study of Social Problems, the Society for Social Responsibility in Science, Scientists' Committee for Radiation Information, or the APA's Committee on Psychology in National and International Affairs. Engaging with local organizations was also encouraged, but with the caveat to avoid those organizations in which time was wasted rather than applied toward working cooperatively on problems of peace. Suggestions were also made for groups to (a) consider performing cooperative research, (b) speak to or invite speakers from other groups to inform members, (c) organize a speakers' bureau, (d) create a psychological peace information center, and (e) investigate where psychological consultation could make its resources available to help local government. Readers were also reminded to

adhere to the ethical standards for psychologists and warned of pitfalls that can divert efforts and serve as counter-productive.

SPSSI's newsletter also provided a suggestive list of sources to guide psychologists in deepening their knowledge of public issues in the area of foreign policy, disarmament, arms control, civil defense, war, and peace. A bibliography of psychological literature, articles, and monographs relating to the psychology of war and peace was listed (see Appendix D; SSPI Committee, 1962, pp. 5–6). An overview of some of these resources reveals the breadth of research material available at that time. Books included Klineberg's (1950) *Tensions Affecting International Understanding: A Survey of Research*, Abelson's (1959) *Persuasion*, and SPSII's book edited by Kelman (1965), *International Behavior*. Two organizations that published numerous articles regarding research in the psychology of peace were SSPI's *Journal of Social Issues* (JSI) and the Center for Research on Conflict Resolution's *Journal of Conflict Resolution* (JCR). Additionally, the Institute for International Order, which had a Committee on Peace, had publications relevant to psychology and peace. In addition, this institute published a series of five research programs suggesting 495 projects on the prevention of war. Other literature on psychological topics important to moving toward peace was also referenced. This included "research on personnel selection, training, small group functioning, social perception, intergroup relations, attitude formation and change, communication and persuasion, social influence, the initiation of cooperation, trust and suspicion" (SSPI Committee, 1962, p. 5). For information on psychological assumptions of deterrence, Snyder's (1961) book, *Deterrence, Weapon Systems, and Decision-Making*

was listed, as well as Deutsch's (1962) papers, in which some of the psychological assumptions involved in the theory of deterrence were explained.

Osgood developed programs specifically to reduce tensions by understanding the various contributing psychological mechanisms (Osgood, 1959). Other programs developed by Osgood related to the reduction of inter-group hostility were listed (Osgood, 1962a), while still another area of research involved social perceptions (Osgood, 1962b). Psychological factors that contributed to distortions in Soviets' and Americans' perceptions appeared in articles edited by Bauer (1962). Other referenced articles discussed personality and social structures that affected international attitudes, as well as value structures of the elite Soviets and Americans. Under the topic of changing attitudes, Abelson's book *Persuasion* (1959) was a source of useful principles of attitude change with the potential for use by peace groups. SPSSI's (1954) *Public Opinion and Propaganda* included a guide to the theoretical research literature. Lippitt, Watson, and Westley (1958) published cross-cultural contact research studies concerning topics such as the impact of studying abroad.

There is a complementary overlap between social psychology and the psychological study of peace (Vollhardt & Bilali, 2008). In their article, "Social Psychology's Contribution to the Psychological Study of Peace: A Review," Vollhardt and Bilali (2008) outlined the need for a separate body of social psychological peace research (SPPR) to help highlight the contributions to peace that can accrue from social psychologists' and peace psychologists' uses of conceptual frameworks and methodological tools, thus increasing the shared domain of research programs and

questions. The field of social psychological peace research was thus focused on conflict and cooperation in social groups, and was defined specifically as:

The field of psychological theory and practice aimed at the prevention and mitigation of direct and structural violence between members of different sociopolitical groups as well as the promotion of cooperation and a prosocial orientation that reduces the occurrence of intergroup and societal violence and furthers positive intergroup relations. (Vollhardt & Bilali, 2008, p. 13)

In achieving this definition of the scope of their research and practice, social psychologists were pushing the boundaries of peace psychology embraced by Galtung's (1969) emphasis on the two sides of peace and violence. Galtung defined peace as both positive and negative. It is positive when there are social conditions that emphasize "intergroup friendships, out-group altruism, and social responsibility" (Vollhardt & Bilali, 2008, p. 13). It is negative when there is an absence of organized collective violence between nations, classes, racial, and ethnic groups (Galtung, 1969, p. 181). After defining violence and peace as both personal and structural, Galtung further broke each down as physical or psychological, and as including or excluding an object (p. 173).

After a content analysis of 2,125 research articles published from 2001–2005 in four leading social psychology journals (*Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*) and the Peace Psychology Division 48's *Journal of Peace and Conflict*, Vollhardt and Bilali (2008) found that 10% dealt with SPPR. The primary emphasis was on direct and structural violence with a focus on discrimination, race relations, and minority group prejudice. The results showed that the majority of



SPPR publications focused on conflict; the contributions to the literature regarding positive peace were minimal. They also revealed a bias towards issues in Western Europe and North America, showing a need for more global depth in understanding. The macro level of analysis of most of the studies also showed a lack of focus on “bidirectional effects of structural variables on the individual in favor of focusing on individual factors leading to structural violence” (Vollhardt & Bilali, 2008, p. 21). They concluded that both peace psychologists and social psychologists made contributions to the study of peace psychology and could have benefitted from more sharing of methodologies and findings, as well as expanding certain criteria in the “selection of research questions, operationalizations, and methodologies” (p. 22).

**Other national and international psychology association’s contributions to peace.**

Peace psychology is a worldwide movement and is practiced by psychologists individually and collectively in clinical, academic, research, corporate, non-profit, political, international, national, state, and community forums. Countries with national associations that represent peace psychologists exist in the United States (Society for the Study of Peace, Conflict, and Violence: APA Division 48), Germany (Forum Peace Psychology), and Australia (Psychologists for Peace). These associations are affiliated through their own country’s psychological associations with the International Union of Psychological Science (IUPysS). In IUPysS, the various peace associations are listed as resources, but the national associations hold the membership. In 2012 there were 82 nations participating in IUPysS (IUPysS, 2012).

A more representative international organization for peace psychology is the International Network of Psychologists for Social Responsibility (INPsySR), which was founded at the European Congress of Psychology in 2007. This organization brings together psychologists who are focused on social issues relevant to their countries or spheres of work, such as: (a) peace and justice, (b) the mental and social well-being of all people, (c) the psychological effects of rapid social change from communism to post-communist societies, (d) cessation and prevention of war and violation of human rights, (e) the creation of positive social conditions which minimize conflicts, and (f) the cultivation of attitudes and skills that foster peaceful resolutions to conflicts and promote human well-being.

In addition to the IUPsyS and the INPsySR, the International Symposia on the Contributions of Psychology to Peace was formed. This symposium brings together approximately 40 to 50 invited participants from around the world bi-annually. These international symposia were initiated by the International Union of Psychological Science and coordinated by the Committee for the Psychological Study of Peace (CPSP). The symposia allow scholars to present their current scholarship in peace psychology. Additionally, symposia provide a platform for mutual exchange of ideas and experiences in which participants engage in intercultural dialogue aimed at reducing cultural bias and ethnocentrism in research and practice in peace psychology. The goal is to bring forward voices from cultures and situations that are typically not included in peace discourses and to build an international community that promotes peace-related research and action.

Formed in 1982 in response to the Cold War, PsySR, an American association, expanded its goals to include a focus on peace building and social justice after the fall of

the Berlin Wall in 1989. The organization's efforts have expanded into six program areas: (a) human rights and psychology; (b) violence, war, and their alternatives; (c) peace building and reconciliation; (d) social health, justice, and well-being; (e) climate change, sustainability, and psychology; and (f) education for social responsibility (Psychologists for Social Responsibility, 2013). In collaboration with Counselors for Social Justice, they publish *The Journal for Social Action in Counseling and Psychology*. This peer-reviewed, online biannual publication launched in 2007 with the dual purpose of highlighting engaged scholarship in which theory is applied specifically to projects that support the mission of peace and social justice, and challenging the practices of counseling and psychology that are ineffective (Sloan & Toporek, 2007).

At the European Congress of Psychology in Prague in 2007, the International Network of Psychologists for Social Responsibility (INPsySR) was founded by the U.S. PsySR, the Finnish Psychologists for Social Responsibility, and the German Forum for Peace Psychology to provide organizational coordination on issues such as peace, conflict resolutions, and social justice. As of this writing, 10 organizations are members of the INPsySR and focus their activities on five project areas: peace psychology curriculum development, peace psychology internships, peace psychology research, building cultures of peace, and ethical oversight (INPsySR, 2013).

Formed by incorporating the International Congress Committee into an expanded organization at the International Congress of Psychology at Stockholm in 1951, the oldest organization designed to coordinate the world community of psychologists is the International Union of Psychological Science (IUPsyS). The International Congress Committee began as the conference organizer for the International Congress of

Psychology, which is held every 4 years, the first being in Paris in 1889 (Rosenweig, Holtzman, Sabourin, & Bélanger, 2000). The impetus for forming IUPsyS came from UNESCO, which in 1945 invited members of scientific fields without international organizations to form them. Psychologists responded by using the core of the International Congress organization to create IUPsyS in 1951. IUPsyS's ethical principles were described in its *Universal Declaration of Ethical Principles for Psychologists*; those principles are based on shared human values (IUPsyS, 2008). IUPsyS reaffirmed the commitment of the psychology community to help build a better world in which peace, freedom, responsibility, justice, humanity, and morality prevail, and to advance "the development, representation and advancement of psychology as a basic and applied science nationally, regionally, and internationally" (Rosenweig et. al., 2000, p. 10).

Over 82 national associations (e.g., the American Psychological Association) and 20 affiliated national and regional associations (e.g., European Association of Personality Psychology) now work collaboratively via IUPsyS (IUPsyS, 2013). IUPsyS established a Committee for Psychological Study of Peace in 1988. Deutsch was selected to represent the U.S. alongside Ruben Ardilia (Columbia), Philip Geov (Bulgaria), Klaus Helkama (Finland), Martti Takala (Finland, Vice President of IUPsyS), and the German Democratic Republic's Kossakowski (Kossakowksi, 1990). Two international symposiums on the contributions of psychology to peace resulted from this committee's work. The first was in Varna, Bulgaria in July 1989, and the second was in Jena, Thuringia, in September 1991 (Boehnke & Frindte, 1992). Other collaborative organizers in these two symposiums included the IUPsyS Division of Political

Psychology, the Division of Political Psychology of the International Association for Applied Psychology, and the Peace Studies Unit of the United Nations (Boehnke & Frindte, 1992, p. 258). IUPsyS also published articles on peace, violence, and conflict in its *International Journal of Psychology*. In 1985, the journal carried an open letter to member societies urging participation in the IUPsyS Working Group called Psychologists for Peace and Against Nuclear War. More recently, in the July 2012 issue, there was a spotlight on peace research that resulted from the XXX Congress (IUPsyS, 2012).

### **Development of Peace Psychology as a Field of Psychology**

On the eve of the recognition of peace psychology as a division of psychology in the United States, a tragic event underscored the need for the work that had been started by the early pioneers in psychology. On November 16, 1989, psychologist Ignacio Martín-Baró, Vice-Rector of Central American University Jose Simeon Canas (UCA), the most recognized university in San Salvador, was murdered along with the Rector and five others. He had been working tirelessly for peace by advocating political change through non-violence as well as equality and freedom from want for all peoples (Triandis, 1990). Particularly gruesome was his murderers' spreading parts of his brain on the front lawn of his home. This specific act symbolized their contempt for intelligent thought of any kind (Triandis, 1990). During the civil war in his country, Martín-Baró attended to the mental health needs of citizens coping with war, torture, and oppression. He performed an investigation of "the subjective state of the population that would promote insurrection" (Kelman, 1990). A prolific writer, Martín-Baró's publications centered on analyzing the role of psychology in predicting behaviors of people in less-industrialized nations. He spoke to the needs of these peoples to be liberated from the theories and

interests of the dominant psychology of western nations. He envisioned a psychology that would look at reality from the perspective of the marginalized—the mentally ill, poor, and unemployed (Marín, 1991). This hope was an essential part of the foundational goals of peace psychology. Thus Martín-Baró's horrific death put a personal imprint on the larger issue of the world-wide landscape torn by violence and the more silent, but ever-present threat, of nuclear annihilation.

Against this backdrop, peace psychology became a recognized field of practice by the Division in 1990. The path was formed specifically through the convergence of four critical factors: (a) the foundational work of the field's early pioneers (Brentano, James, Freud, Adler, and Jung); (b) the establishment of international, national, and local organizational networks to further the growth and development of the field (e.g., SPSSI, PsySR); (c) over a century of contributions from patients, researchers, psychologists, and academicians who expanded the knowledge base and treatment options; and (d) the cross-pollination among allied fields such as medicine, philosophy, sociology, mathematics, political science, and international relations.

As early as 1981 discussions were under way with the APA regarding the establishment of a new Division of Peace Psychology. This new Division would encompass research in many different areas such as crisis management, conflict resolution, mediation, aggression, decision-making, attitude change, and enemy images (Denton, 1989). The petition received 615 signatures, more than the 1% required by the by-laws. The actual petition aimed specifically at the need to reduce war or interpersonal conflict. The awarding of the 1985 Nobel Peace Prize to the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (IPPNW) served to support the beliefs of the organizing

psychologists that professionals could make a significant contribution to world peace and encouraged them to push the formation of Division 48 forward (Santi, 1991). Research such as White's 1986 book, *Psychology and the Prevention of Nuclear War*, which researched the consequences of mutual enemy images and explored tension reduction strategies (Christie et al., 2001) expanded the dimensions of peace psychology. Division 48 was also envisioned as working collaboratively with SPSSI and PsySR and providing a focus on "peace through cooperation" to complement the division representing military psychology's (Division 19) focus on peace through strength (Santi, 1991).

In his Presidential Address to the Division of Peace Psychology at the APA's centennial meeting in 1992, Wessells echoed the work and legacy of Martín-Baró by stating:

To achieve its potential, peace psychology needs to exercise leadership in cultivating the values of inclusiveness, equity, and cultural diversity in all of its activities. An essential step . . . is to build peace psychology internationally, incorporating systemic, multicultural, and multidisciplinary perspectives . . . in the realms of research, education, and activism that will enable psychology to make its fullest contribution to world peace. (p. 32)

The development of peace psychology into a division of the APA was built on a century of research and activism.

### **Pioneers in peace psychology.**

Just as psychology grew as a profession due to the landmark work of psychiatrists, psychologists, and researchers such as Brentano, Adler, James, Freud, and Jung, so did the branch of peace psychology have its roots in the specific work of

psychologists who followed these founders. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, in a series titled “Pioneers of Peace Psychology,” recognized these luminaries (Wessells et al., 2010). This recognition of Pioneers of Peace Psychology acknowledged that, although a new division, the field had a rich history exemplified by the work of nine individuals. “In a very real sense, we walk in the footsteps of giants who have gone before us and to whom we owe our enduring gratitude” (p. 332). The series began when Wessells wrote to Schwebel, who was the editor of the *Peace Psychology Bulletin* and was, himself, a pioneer. Wessells expressed his “sadness and sense of loss” (p. 332) over the deaths of eminent psychologists whose lives and highly distinguished work had set a standard that could inform and benefit the next generation of peace psychologists. His expression of sadness inspired the selection and publication of a special issue for each of the individuals. The goal of the series was to identify ways in which pioneering psychologists had made a positive difference on issues of peace and conflict resolution; explore the connections between personal and professional dimensions of work in peace psychology; collect oral historical material on the history of peace psychology; and hear the voices of pioneering peace psychologists as they reflected broadly on their careers, the world situation, and the prospects for peace (p. 322).

Selected were those nine individuals, “whose lives and work have guided our field” (Wessells et al., 2010, p. 331): Dorothy Ciarlo (1933–), Morton Deutsch (1920–), Herbert Kelman (1927–), Doris Miller (1922–), Milton Schwebel (1914–), Brewster Smith (1919–2012), Ethel Tobach (1921–), Ralph White (1908–2008), and Herbert Kelman (1927–). Their lives spanned periods of significant social and political unrest that included the Great Depression; union organization; the Spanish civil war; the



emergence of Fascism, Nazism, and Stalinism; World War II; wars in Korea and Vietnam; the Cold War; the terrorism of September 11, 2001; and current wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. Their significant contributions to their scientific fields in efforts to counterbalance war and conflict have set a standard for the field of peace psychology. These specific and unique contributions warrant a brief examination.

***Dorothy Ciarlo (1933– ).***

Dorothy Ciarlo’s lifelong activism had its early start as she was growing up in Little Rock, Arkansas, where she was greatly troubled by the racism she witnessed. When it was time for college, she enrolled in Swarthmore, a northern, Quaker college. She participated in numerous causes promoting peace, beginning with anti-war protests and then unmasking the mystery surrounding a now closed nuclear weapons manufacturing plant in Rocky Flats, Colorado. As a clinical psychologist she saw that values and behavior were informed by emotional and cultural reactions, and psychology was a field that could help people understand the interconnections (McKay, Wessells, & Roe, 2009). “Peace psychology filled a gap between peace work and psychology, which had been lacking during most of Dorothy’s professional life” (p. 340).

***Ethel Tobach (1921– ).***

Ethel Tobach was born to Jewish parents in Miaskovka, a small village in the Ukraine, during the Russian Revolution. She described her parents as Social Zionists who were “consistently salient in their concerns about stopping war, poverty, and inequality” (McKay, Roe, & Wessells, 2008, p. 4). When she was 2 weeks old, her parents fled to Palestine to escape the White Army’s pogroms against the Jewish people in her town. Her father died when she was 9 months old. Fifteen months later, her

mother immigrated to Philadelphia and became active in the garment workers' union. Tobach recalled that the injustice she saw in Palestine deeply affected her mother, who believed that it was wrong for the Israelis to take the Palestinian's land simply to make an Israeli society (McKay et al., 2008). Tobach was in high school when she began her life of activism by joining a peace committee, participating in demonstrations, and making speeches. In 1944 she "felt she should enlist in the Army during the Battle of the Bulge" (p. 2) and was assigned to work as a secretary for the chief psychiatrist at Mason General Hospital in Long Island. At a time when women were not generally accepted into graduate psychology programs, Tobach obtained her PhD in comparative psychology in 1957 and subsequently made major contributions to the field (Hyman & Ofer, 2007). Tobach began as a research fellow in the department of animal behavior at the American Museum of Natural History and served as its curator from 1969 to 1981. She still remains Curator Emerita. She has published over 117 professional articles, books, and book chapters (Hyman & Ofer, 2007). In 2003, the American Psychological Association honored her work on disproving genetic determinism. She received the APA's Gold Medal Award for Lifetime Achievement in Psychology in the Public Interest for having "exposed the unsound science and social damage of genetic determinism institutionalized as racism and sexism. She has been a leader in psychology activist groups seeking constructive policies, nuclear disarmament, and peace building—all necessary to nurture life and science. She is a socially responsible scientist" (Hyman & Ofer, 2007).

Tobach had a key role in the establishment of a peace psychology division of the APA and served as its first Secretary. When asked about her involvement in peace, Tobach commented,

To understand how I became involved in questions of peace was to realize that was part of being involved in social questions. It was a question of being against racism. It was a question of being for workers' rights. Questions of peace went together with the others. (McKay et al., 2008, p. 4)

Tobach also advocated the consideration of environmental issues as one of the concerns of peace psychology.

One of the things . . . personally in my life is my growing awareness of the impact of human beings on the environment and what is happening in the environment, that integrating human beings and their peacemaking capacity and how that intersects with broad issues of the natural world. The violence that human beings have imposed upon the environment is simply another aspect of the problems of exploitation and, shall we say, entitlement or domination that I see underlying the problems that create wars and societal injustice. (Wessells et al., 2010, p. 343)

***Morton Deutsch (1933–).***

Morton Deutsch grew up in a middle class Jewish family. His parents had emigrated from Poland to New York City in 1908 and were “liberal, but not activist in orientation” (Roe, Wessells, & McKay, 2006, p. 310). Deutsch was reading Marx and Freud at age 10 and enrolled in college at age 15. In college he was introduced both to the work of his later mentor, Lewin, and to the study of social issues. He earned a master's degree in clinical psychology at the City College of New York and he retained a clinical practice for 30 years as a psychoanalyst. Before entering a doctoral program, Deutsch enlisted in the Air Force. He began his service as a psychologist, but when he volunteered for combat he trained to be a navigator and flew 32 bombing missions. “I

felt WWII was a just war and I participated in it. But I felt it was a very destructive thing. I didn't want it to recur" (as quoted in Frydenberg, 2005, p. 47). After his service, Deutsch obtained a PhD in social psychology from MIT after meeting Lewin as part of his interview process. Deutsch felt that Lewin "represented [a] combination of science, interest in the world, and doing something about the world" (as quoted in Roe et al., 2006, p. 311). William James's profound contributions to psychology while also being "a very involved citizen, applying his ideas to the world" also impacted Deutsch (Roe et al., 2006, p. 318).

Deutsch's distinguished research, publications, and teachings made landmark contributions to understanding the dynamics of conflict, cooperation, and justice. His work impacted various fields, including law, education, business, and industrial relations, and has "a place not only in the history of social psychology but also in the history of the twentieth century" (Frydenberg, 2005, p. 3).

### ***Herbert Kelman (1920–).***

Born in Austria to Jewish parents, Kelman and his family escaped the Nazi invasion in 1940 and immigrated to New York where he attended high school and college. He became involved in peace efforts and one year after entering the United States, a chance meeting made an impact on his educational training. Kelman, returning from a conference organized by conscientious objectors in Chicago, sat next to Charles Bloomstein (1913–2002), a civil rights activist who had spoken at the event. Kelman remembered distinctly a comment that resonated with his own concerns. Bloomstein reflected that, if he were entering the field at Kelman's age, he would "go into psychology or sociology, because these are the fields that are most relevant to the issues

of peace, social justice, and social change” (as quoted in Kelman, 2012, p. 362). This inspired Kelman to add a second major, psychology, to his English major at Brooklyn College.

His class with Katz reinforced his interest in social psychology. Katz produced classic studies of attitude change, prejudice, and racial stereotyping (Katz & Schanck, 1938). Katz’s pursuit of understanding the connections between individual psychology and social systems helped establish organizational psychology as a field and led to his development of the concept of open systems theory (Katz & Kahn, 1966). Katz became Kelman’s mentor and introduced him to SPSSI, which Kelman joined during his junior year, and which has been a base of his professional activities throughout his career (Kelman, 2009).

While doing his final year of graduate work in social psychology at Yale in 1951, Kelman and Arthur Gladstone, a fellow student and friend, decided to write an open letter to the *American Psychologist*, the organ of the American Psychological Association. They made the argument that some of the assumptions made by pacifists (e.g., the idea that frustration leads to aggression, that change is more enduring with nonviolent versus violent strategies, or that attitudes developed in war will become habits in post-war times and threaten democracy) are based somewhat on psychological assumptions that can be researched, and this research could provide helpful insights. Responses to the letter were varied, but those members who were in agreement got together in 1951 at APA and by 1952 had established the first organized peace research through the Research Exchange on the Prevention of War. This group of psychologists and social scientists organized conferences and summer workshops, and held a symposium with Quincy Wright, a

political scientist known for pioneering work and expertise in international law and international relations. The goal of the group was to explore what social scientists and psychologists could contribute to the subjects of peace and war to find a niche for social psychologists. “I got frustrated with the exchange because they were talking about ‘ought-to-do’s’ but were not specialists in the field. I questioned how we could attract specialists and get moving” (Pettigrew, 2010).

In 1957 the *Peace Bulletin* published by the Research Exchange upgraded to become the *Journal of Conflict Resolution*. This occurred at the end of the McCarthy era when using the word *peace* had negative connotations and could put an organization or publication in a questionable category (MacNair, 2003). Kelman moved to the University of Michigan in 1962, where the Center for Research on Conflict Resolution was established, and then to Harvard, where he is the Richard Clarke Cabot Professor of Social Ethics, Emeritus. At the University of Michigan, Katz and Kelman developed a program on nationalism and the relationship of the individual to the national system. They concluded that international conflict is not necessarily a psychological issue, but has psychological dimensions. To avoid the dangers of over-psychologizing, Kelman advocated assessing the larger picture to understand where psychological analysis can make an appropriate entry and be relevant. A critical turning point for Kelman was reading Burton’s (1965) book *International Relations: A General Theory* and then meeting Burton in 1966. Burton discussed a quantitative method for analyzing international conflict and its application to conflicts in Korea and Singapore. This showed Kelman a methodology for developing a practice in social psychology applicable to international relations theory. Kelman perfected a quantitative framework to present

state-of-the-art social psychological contributions to international relations (Wessells et al., 2010).

The Six-Day Arab Israeli War deeply affected Kelman, who had a Jewish, Zionist background, and he started working towards practical application of the psychological research to that war. When the October War occurred in this region in 1973, Kelman decided to make a major part of his work apply to the Middle East. Kelman had been at Harvard University since 1969. He was the Richard Clarke Cabot Professor of Social Ethics from 1969–1999, and Research Professor from 1999–2004. He served as Director, Program on International Conflict Analysis and Resolution (1993–2003) at Harvard’s Weatherhead Center for International Affairs, where he has had emeritus status since 2004 (Wessells et al., 2010).

Kelman’s groundbreaking contributions included the development of a third-party approach to resolving international and intercommunal conflicts. Kelman credits the work of John Burton, who he met in 1966, with helping him bridge the theoretical knowledge of conflict resolution with a practical methodology (Kelman, 2009, p. 16). In the 1970s and 1980s he became the preeminent scholar and expert in the application of the third-party approach to the Arab-Israeli conflict, with special emphasis on its Israeli-Palestinian component (Pettigrew, 2010).

***Doris Miller (1922–).***

Doris Miller was born in New Jersey in 1922 to Jewish parents who had emigrated from Russia in 1905. Her life-long civic activism in labor unions had roots at home with her father’s work in a textile factory and his deep concern about the plight of workers. He played a key role in inviting the Industrial Workers of the World, an

international labor union formed in 1905, into his town to organize (McKay, Roe, & Wessells, 2005). Her first exposure to prejudice occurred when she sought student housing at the University of Wisconsin. She was denied rooming options except for housing that was designated for Jewish students. This bigotry sparked a strong response from her, but university officials refused to alter their policies. She responded by promoting integrated housing with African Americans, who she perceived as having an even more difficult search. She experienced further discrimination in her undergraduate studies in psychology when a professor denied use of his lab to women.

Miller struggled with psychology's relevance to social issues. She obtained her master's degree in psychiatric social work in 1946 from the Simmons School of Social Work in Boston and worked at the Veterans Administration (VA) New York regional office, which housed the largest mental hygiene clinic in the world. She immediately became active in the United Public Workers union which, because of its anti-racism focus, came under scrutiny as a communist organization. "I was always very much involved in the fight against discrimination . . . [which was] especially outrageous in the post-World War II VA installation" (Miller, as quoted in McKay et al., 2005, p. 373). Miller testified on behalf of the union at Senate budget hearings regarding issues including the VA's discriminatory practices in hiring and managing both public and private employees, and their inability to maintain confidentiality of veteran records. She was well respected and liked as a union representative (McKay et al., 2005).

Miller's life was a testament to her courage in breaking gender roles and acting on her beliefs. In her first peace activism she played a key role in developing and growing the Society Against Nuclear Explosions (SANE). She used this organization to inform



the public of the deadly effects of radioactive fallout, strontium-90, and other nuclear residuals which the government was withholding from the public. She began publishing a bulletin that quickly expanded to over 10,000 readers and attracted the attention of the journalist, author, and world peace advocate Norman Cousins, who at that time was editor of the *Saturday Review* (McKay et al., 2005). Cousins took over the publishing of SANE's bulletin and expanded the organization. Miller continued her peace activism through protests during the Vietnam War. In the 1970s she created The Dolphin Center, designed to serve as a synergistic support center for all specialized social action groups, with Howard Gruber, a cognitive psychologist and activist. The center was named after a book published in 1961, *The Voice of the Dolphin*, by Leó Szilárd, the physicist who was one of the first scientists to conceive the nuclear chain reaction which enabled both nuclear energy and nuclear weapons. Szilárd drafted the letter Einstein signed and mailed to President Roosevelt that warned of the German's development of nuclear weapons. This letter was directly responsible for the creation of the Manhattan Project. The military's use of the technology enraged Szilárd and he subsequently advocated against the use of nuclear weapons of which his book was one example (Bess, 1985). Also, in the 1970s Miller organized the first APA protest against the war and got the APA President, George Albee, to lead 50 psychologists on a march to the White House, where they delivered White's (1968) book *Nobody Wanted War: Misperception in Vietnam and Other Wars*. Miller's activism and involvement continued until recently in her retirement community where she participated in a weekly peace vigil for the community residents. Miller equated activism with social responsibility, noting that activism was essentially ensuring that one acted in a socially responsible manner (McKay

et al., 2005). Miller was opposed to the creation of a peace psychology division at the APA because she faulted the APA for not dealing with peace issues in all the divisions. As a lifelong activist, she also was concerned that the American Psychological Association would not focus on activism, but more on research. She felt all psychologists should consider the following questions.

How do you think war and peace relate to what you are doing? What is your obligation? Do you see your ability to conduct your teaching or your practice or your research in the same way in a world at war as in a world at peace? Do you think there is any connection between how you live your life and what is happening out there? . . . What does psychology have to contribute to understanding how this happens, why it happens, can it be stopped, can it be altered?" (McKay et al., 2005, p. 382)

Advancing peace psychology, she believed, would require a focus on having basic food, shelter, education, and income for people—without which peace cannot exist (McKay et al., 2005).

***Milton Schwebel (1914–).***

Schwebel grew up in New York City. His father had emigrated from Eastern Europe as an infant. Although his parents had a limited education, Schwebel described them as “politically and socially progressive” (Roe, McKay, & Wessells, 2003, p. 306). His early encounters with prejudice as a Jew spurred a life of advocating for economically and racially marginalized people. He credits his time at Union College for spurring his activism and concern with social issues and his enlightenment about the underpinnings of economics as driving the injustices. When the Civil War of Spain

broke out in 1936 and threatened to overthrow the democracy, it changed Schwebel's intermittent engagement with causes and gave rise to a "consciousness of activism that has been continuous [from that time to the present]" (p. 308) in peace and social justice. After obtaining a master's degree in Social Science he worked at the National Youth Administration where he helped youth, mostly from minority populations and low economic statuses, prepare for employment. He then became a counselor for young industrial workers through the NY State Employment Service and later the U.S. Employment Service. The outbreak of World War II interrupted this work. He was drafted into the Army's personnel department (which today is known as Organizational Psychology) and served in England. Throughout his life Schwebel had never been a pacifist. "I felt very deeply about defeating the fascists" (as quoted in Roe et al., p. 310).

Schwebel obtained a doctorate in counseling psychology at Columbia University after his honorable discharge and, among many other activities, a veterans group that was politically active and focused on the threat of another war, the American Veterans Committee (AVC). When the State and Defense Departments put out a statement that said, "No need to panic. There will be only little wars; we're not going to have a world war. We're not going to use the bomb" (Roe et al., 2003, p. 311), the AVC responded pithily with a retort that attracted attention to their cause: "A little war is like being a little bit pregnant" (p. 311). Schwebel rejected an offer to join the Central Intelligence Agency and stayed in academia. He rose to associate dean at NYU's School of Education and, among his many credits, invited Jean Piaget to give three lectures, which led to a life-long association with Piaget, who was opposed to militarism and war. Long before the creation of the Seville Statement he declared that "nothing biological, nothing in human

nature, makes war necessary or inevitable” (p. 311). In 1967 Schwebel became Dean of Graduate Studies at Rutgers University and in 1977 was appointed Professor, Graduate School of Applied and Professional Psychology, a position he maintained until he retired in 1984. At Rutgers, Schwebel engaged sympathetic faculty in diversifying the nearly all-white racial makeup of the university. He recruited Rev. Dr. Samuel Dewitt Proctor, a mentor to Martin Luther King, a former university president, and an appointee to the Peace Corp’s Chapter in Nigeria, to address the university in honor of the one-year anniversary of King’s assassination.

Schwebel’s (1940) first empirical research on student attitudes toward nuclear war and the future bore an early imprint of his life-long views of war and peace (Schwebel 1963a, 1963b, 1964, 1965a, 1965b). He argued “that if the nation wanted to be strong, it needed more than munitions. It had to overcome poverty and social justice” (p. 318). Schwebel was a prolific writer who continued to explore intelligence and cognitive development. He was the first editor of the Peace Psychology Division’s *Journal of Peace and Conflict: A Journal of Peace Psychology*. Before actively promoting the establishment of Division 48, Schwebel had been active in Psychologists for Social Action (PSA), which later became Psychologists for Social Responsibility (PsySR). He also engaged the APA and was critical of the lack of activism. “I was disappointed to see that psychology was too much removed from real world problems, except when those problems touched guild concerns, especially of professional psychologists” (Schwebel, 1940, p. 318). Schwebel was instrumental in establishing the Division of Peace Psychology and has been a leading advocate for linking work as a psychologist with political and social issues, and encouraging engagement to reduce

structural violence (Schwebel, 1993). Schwebel believed preventing war, conflict, and strife was not the primary goal of peace psychology. Instead, peace psychology needed to be a “couple of steps ahead” by helping to reduce the number of people who thought that killing others can solve a problem (McKay et al., 2008, p. 9).

***Brewster Smith (1919–2012).***

Smith grew up in Corvallis, Oregon where his father was dean of what is now Oregon State University. His parents reportedly made a particular effort to answer fully his many questions of “why” as a child, but otherwise his life with his father was contentious (Roe, Wessells, & McKay, 2008). He entered third grade at age 6, and by 16 years of age was a freshman at Reed College, where he joined the American Student Union and the Young Communist League and got “involved in the campus radicalism of the 1930s and in the dubious activities of Portland’s small Bohemia” (p. 346). Smith credits these undergraduate years as igniting a concern over the witnessed tendency of individuals to avoid challenging the status quo, choosing instead to stay in a convenient comfort zone, and avoid doing what was “socially right” (p. 347). He went on to do graduate work at Stanford which included a year at Harvard where he “was deeply affected by Gordon Allport and Henry Murray” (p. 347). His education was paused while he fulfilled his draft obligations in the Army as a psychologist. He performed mass communication and survey research and was involved in developing tests to screen Air Corp pilots, bombardiers, and navigators. His work in the Army led to several key introductions. He met his future mentor, social psychologist Stuart W. Cook, who later became known for his groundbreaking research into the effects of racial and religious prejudice on society. Smith also worked with psychologist Carl I. Hovland, who

pioneered the study of social communication and the modification of attitudes and beliefs. Hovland gained “universal recognition as a statesman of the social sciences” (Janis, 1968, p. 530).

Smith’s work with Samuel A. Stouffer, a prominent sociologist and developer of research techniques, yielded a post-war book of their research in the Army titled *The American Soldier: Combat and Its Aftermath* (Stouffer et al., 1949). “I’ve always been pleased to have had a part in doing [this book]—which, again, is not exactly a background ‘for’ being a peace psychologist” (as quoted in Roe, et al., p. 349). Smith returned with an honorable discharge to finish his PhD at Harvard’s new Social Relations Department. His distinguished career took him from Harvard to Vassar College, the Social Science Research Council (SSRC), New York University, the University of California at Berkeley, the University of Chicago, and ended with a long-term relationship with the University of California, Santa Cruz. Beyond his research, he gained national recognition by serving as Vice President of the Joint Commission on Mental Illness and Health, an organization tasked with deinstitutionalizing mental health, as well as serving in numerous leadership roles within his profession. He was editor of the *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, President of the APA in 1978, President of SPSSI in 1958–1959, and a major figure in founding the Peace Psychology Division of the APA. Smith reflected that his major contributions to “the science of psychology” (p. 353) and in particular, peace psychology, came through his role as a “commentator, critic, integrator, and perspective setter” (p. 353). His research issues have included “student activism, ethical considerations when conducting research involving minors, humanistic psychology and selfhood, racism and anti-Semitism, values and moral responsibility . . .

public policy, value dilemmas in mental health service, population and the environment, and world peace” (APA, 1992, p. 853).

During an interview conducted as a part of his designation as a Pioneer of Peace Psychology, Smith recalled an incident in which he had to defend a serious critique of nuclear depth psychology in which it was insinuated that psychologists did not know what they were talking about (Roe et al., 2006). “I thought it was important not to allow Blight’s view, [of] any psychological analysis as irrelevant, to stand unchallenged” (as quoted in Roe et al., 2006, p. 357). “His talent for exploring controversial and sensitive subject matters with such compassion and impeccable logic . . . [and his] singular ability to integrate and apply psychological science to the thorny realities of a confusing and unsettled world” (APA, 1992, p. 183) were part of the inscription given to Smith when he was honored with the APA’s Gold Medal Award for Life Contribution by a Psychologist in the Public Interest, and set a high standard for all peace psychologists.

***Ralph White (1908–2008).***

Ralph White was born in Detroit and raised in a Quaker family. He credits his activism in and study of peace as beginning at Wesleyan University where he graduated Phi Beta Kappa in 1929 (Wessells, Roe, & McKay, 2004). He earned a doctorate in psychology from Stanford and began his professional career in Kurt Lewin’s laboratory, where he participated in a seminal study of leadership styles—autocratic, democratic, and laissez-faire (K. Lewin, Lippitt, & White, 1939). Some described his work on peace psychology as “trailblazing” (Perlman, 2008). His research encompassed discussions of “realistic empathy, misperception in international relations, and the role of fear” (Perlman, 2008) and changed the paradigm of how conflict and resolution were viewed.

Robert McNamara, Former Secretary of Defense, called Dr. White “the foremost advocate of realistic empathy in foreign affairs” (Perlman, 2008).

White impacted public affairs from within the government and from without. He worked in the Central Intelligence Agency from 1947 to 1964, collecting and analyzing information, and conducted research at the U.S. Intelligence Agency (USIA) from 1959–1961. He supported these venues for psychologists who had an area specialization. White also advocated for future psychologists interested in war and peace issues to get an undergraduate training in history, political science (especially international relations), and conflict resolution. However, White believed that empathic connection with a different culture is unobtainable without knowing the history and politics of the region, having experience living in an area, and speaking the language. “In order to achieve realistic empathy . . . you need to know a great many facts, including firsthand communication with the people you’re trying to empathize with” (as quoted in Wessells et al., 2004, p. 322). He also recognized the benefits of specialization to public policy. Decision makers in government find those who know the culture, people, and language more credible. This knowledge is accessible during college with a carefully chosen year abroad.

White was able to understand the difficulty those in government sectors had in taking psychological analyses seriously. He saw that one key disconnect came from the analyses not having specific action steps. White left government in order to have a more unrestrained voice. “I left USIA in ’64 and went back to academia, which provided the big advantage of being able to say anything I wanted . . . the truth as I saw it about things like public opinion in the Soviet Union” (as quoted in Wessells et al., 2004, p. 322).

Outside of government, White recommended that psychologists could have a more



effective impact as citizens if they studied the orientation of political scientists and the use of the media. A psychology department could serve as a nucleus of psychologists of one mind who cared about an issue and wanted to become active in its defense. “Any psychology department is a potential center for bringing together like-minded people who happen to be psychologists and who are at the same time interested in peace. . . . Whatever kinds of activism are open to citizens in general can also be done by psychologists” (p. 323).

White was active in shaping and leading psychology organizations. He served as SPSSI’s first president, President of PsySR, and President of the International Society of Political Psychology. White supported the establishment of the Society for the Study of Peace, Conflict, and Violence (APA Division 48) as a place where the topics of peace, war, and conflict could receive specific attention undiluted by other social concerns. His research, published articles, and books continued to focus on peace and psychology. His books included: *Three Not-So-Obvious Contributions of a Psychology to Peace* (White, 1969), *Nobody Wanted War: Misperception in Vietnam and Other Wars* (White, 1968), *Fearful Warriors: A Psychological Profile of U.S.-Soviet Relations* (White, 1984), *Psychology and the Prevention of Nuclear War* (White, 1986), *Why Aggressors Lose* (White, 1990), and *Psychological Aspects of the Kosovo Crisis* (White, 2000).

#### **Other contributions by the authors of the Pioneers Series.**

The authors of the series on Pioneers in Peace Psychology, Wessells, Roe, & McKay, are themselves leading contributors to the field of peace psychology. In their concluding remarks at the end of the series on Pioneers of Peace in 2010, the authors commented on their observations of shared qualities among the pioneers and concluded

that the field has a rich future. Wessells et al. (2010) noted the following common themes.

The importance of early experience, family influences, and positive role models; the value of multidisciplinary approaches; the importance of linking theory and practice; the need for critical reflection on issues of gender and other forms of diversity; the importance of working at multiple levels for peace; and the value of flexible thinking, persistence, and humor. (p. 331)

Wessells was involved in establishing the Peace Psychology Division, and subsequently served as its president. He has also been President of PsySR. In addition to serving as a professor, researcher, and author, Wessells developed and promoted “the most advanced strategies for providing psychological support for children and families” (APA, 2009, p. 839) affected by ethnopolitical violence, disasters, and forced migration. When he received APA’s International Humanitarian Award in 2009, Wessells was actively involved with McKay and a few others in “participatory action research on reintegrating formerly recruited girls and girls’ mothers in Sierra Leone, Liberia, and Uganda” (p. 840).

McKay, a psychologist, author, nurse, and Professor of Gender and Women’s Studies at the University of Wyoming, has also served as President of the Peace Psychology Division. McKay has focused her teaching and research on women, girls, and armed conflict; women and peacebuilding; and feminist issues in peace psychology (Wessells et al., 2010).

Mícheál Roe, Dean of the School of Psychology, Family and Community at Seattle Pacific University, specializes in developmental and cross-cultural psychology.

He has focused his research on the psychology of war and peacemaking and ethnic identity and conflict. He works around the globe with refugee populations in order to understand their experiences and have their voices heard. Two areas of his expertise are the Pacific Northwest Native American communities as well as Irish disparate relationships to Northern Irish political conflict (Wessells et al., 2010).

### **Peace Psychology Research: 1900–1990**

More than a century of research resulting in books and peer-reviewed articles and chapters continues to expand psychologists' contributions to peacebuilding and broaden expertise and research in this field. According to Kelman (2009), the first literature categorized as peace psychology research was published in the 1940s by SPSSI's Committee on the Psychology of War and Peace, with the exception of Droba's article "The Effect of Various Factors on Militarism-Pacifism" published in 1931. Research topics of publications by SPSSI included attitudes toward war, aggression, nationalism, and war prevention, and brought the peace research movement together with psychology (Kelman, 2009). Books from the 1940s included *Drives Toward War* (Tolman, 1942), *A Social Psychology of War and Peace* (May, 1943), *Human Nature and Enduring Peace* (G. Murphy, 1945), *Tensions that Cause War* (Cantril, 1950), *Tensions Affecting International Understanding* (Klineberg, 1950), *Psychological Factors of Peace and War* (Pear, 1950), and *Towards a Science of Peace* (Lentz, 1955) which was based on research done in the 1940s.

Three bibliographies (Blumberg & French, 1992; Kramer & Moyer, 1991; Müller-Brettel, 1993) have compiled the research literature on psychological contributions to war and peace through 1991. Müller-Brettel's *Bibliography on*

*Peace Research and Peaceful International Relations: The Contributions of Psychology 1900–1991*, documented 2,600 studies from German- and English-speaking researchers. In the forward to the book, Edelstein made the case for peace psychology research by stating that since psychology deals with the “conditions of human actions, . . . psychological knowledge is required whenever action is intended to serve peace-making or peace-keeping, the resolution of conflict, or the negotiation of mutually acceptable solutions. (Müller-Brettel, 1993, p. 5)

To demonstrate the breadth of topics that comprise peace psychology research, in Table 1 the major themes of research and the number of publications are listed (Müller-Brettel, 1993). Groupings of 20 years appear until 1979. The final segment covers 1980–1991 and contains the largest number of articles published. The following criteria guided the selection of publications:

- relevance to the field of psychology either according to content, author, or journal of publication;
- status as scientific literature; no books of popular science or guides to practical peace work are included (in case of doubt, formal criteria such as the type of publication or professional position of the author were decisive);
- accessibility without restrictions imposed by the book trade or libraries; no unpublished manuscripts, no dissertations, and no papers of military institutions are included, and;

- publication in the German or English languages. (Müller-Brettel, 1993, p. 17)

Selection criteria were applied rather strictly, in order not to increase the heterogeneity with regard to content or formal characteristics of the literature.

The bibliography documents 2,604 titles. . . . 1,572 are journal articles, 471 are contributions in edited books, and 561 are monographic publications; 70 percent of the titles are in English. (Müller-Brettel, 1993, p. 17)

Table 1 shows the breakdown sorted by decade, major themes, and numbers of articles within each theme. Based on this review, the measured amount of literature in the last decade exceeds twice the literature published in all the other decades combined.

Blumberg and French's (1992) bibliography of peace psychology literature was compiled under the auspices of the APA and spans the years from 1967–1990. Together with Kramer and Moyer's (1991) *Nuclear Psychology Bibliography* (see Table 2), a total of 2000 works have been published. The peace psychology categories identified by Blumberg and French (1992) demonstrate the breadth of topics in the field as it became a specific division of the APA.

Table 1.

*Breakdown of Psychological Research, 1900–1990*

Breakdown of Psychological Research by Decade Published, Theme, & No. of Articles		
Dates Publ.	Themes	Number
1900-1919	Psychological Dimensions of the Causes of War	24
	War Experiences in World War I	41
	<b>Total</b>	<b>65</b>
1920-1939	Psychological Dimensions of the Causes of War	36
	Political Attitudes	24
	War Experiences in World War I	11
	<b>Total</b>	<b>71</b>
1940-1959	Psychological Aspects of Peaceful International Relations	38
	Psychological Aspects of Peaceful International Relations in WWII	27
	Significance of Psychology for Peace Research and Peaceful International Relations	20
	Psychological Dimensions of the Causes of War	38
	Political Behavior	30
	Political Attitudes	29
	Political Attitudes on World War II	67
	Psychological Conditions of Enemy Stereotypes and Nationalism	21
	War Experiences in World War II	58
	<b>Total</b>	<b>328</b>
1960-1979	Psychological Aspects of Peaceful International Relations and Disarmament	47
	Significance of Psychology for Peace Research and Peaceful International Relations and the Responsibility of Psychologists	42
	Psychological Dimensions of the Causes of War	38
	Political Behavior	27
	Psychological Conditions of the Behavior of Politicians	54
	Psychological Conditions of Violence, Nonviolence, and Pacifism	49
	Political Attitudes	65
	Correlations between Political Attitudes and Personality Characteristics of Political and Religious Beliefs	27
	Psychological Conditions of Enemy Stereotypes and Nationalism	35
	Psychological Aspects of the Peace Movement	35
	Psychological Aspects of the Military, the Military Personnel, and of Conscientious Objectors	31
	War and Peace: Perspectives from Developmental Psychology	22
	War Experiences	44
	<b>Total</b>	<b>516</b>
1980-1991	Psychological Aspects of Peaceful International Relations and Disarmament	87
	Significance of Psychology for Peace Research and Peaceful International Relations	98
	Psychological Dimensions of the Causes of War	81
	Political Behavior	108
	Psychological Conditions of the Behavior of Politicians	103
	Nuclear Threat and Political Behavior	103
	Psychological Conditions of Violence, Nonviolence, and Pacifism	86
	Political Attitudes	70
	Nuclear Threat and Political Attitudes	85
	Psychological Conditions of Enemy Stereotypes and Nationalism	101
	Psychological Aspects of the Peace Movement	100
	Peace Activities and the Responsibility of Psychologists	55
	Psychological Aspects of the Military, the Military Personnel, and of Conscientious Objectors	74
	War and Peace: Perspectives from Developmental Psychology	58
	Implications of the Nuclear Threat for Children and Adolescents	110
	War Experiences	95
	War Experiences in the Mideast War	54
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1468</b>
(Müller-Brettel, 1993, pp. 6-10)		

Note. From *Bibliography on Peace Research and Peaceful International Relations: The Contributions of Psychology 1900–1991* (pp. 6–10), by M. Müller-Brettel, 1993. New York, NY: K. G. Saur. Copyright 1993 by K. G. Saur.

Table 2.

*Nuclear Psychology Bibliography: Breakdown of Psychological Research by Theme and Number of Articles*

Theme	Number
Attitudes	313
History	208
War	201
Peace	201
Cognitive	179
Negotiation	144
Soviets	138
Effects-psychological	131
Effects-physical	130
Enemy-image(s)	127
Arms control	102
Deterrence	101
Arms race	95
Strategy	82
Crisis management	82
Personality	81
Aggression	81
Decision-making	80
Weapons	74
Ethics	68
Education	66
Children	55
Defense mechanisms	50
Stereotypes	40
Superordinate goals	33
Gender	31
Grit	29
SDI	28
Effects-medical	27
Propaganda	26
Civil defense	25
Adolescents	24
Helplessness	19
Authoritarianism	19
TMI	18

(Continued)

Table 2. (cont.)

Theme	Number
Freeze	18
Denial	15
Groupthink	14
Détente	12
Dehumanization	11
Self-fulfilling prophecy	10
Nuclear winter	9
Illusory correlation	9
Numbing	8
TOTALS: Themes: 43	Articles: 3214

*Note.* From *Nuclear Psychology Bibliography*, by B. M. Kramer & R. S. Moyer, 1991.

Ann Arbor, MI. Society for the Study of Psychological Issues. Copyright 1991 by

Society for the Study of Psychological Issues.

### **Peace Psychology Research: 1991–Present**

#### **Defining the field.**

The goals of the Division of Peace Psychology when it was established as Division 48 were

to encourage psychological research, education, and training on issues concerning peace, nonviolent conflict resolution, reconciliation, and the causes, consequences, and prevention of war and other forms of destructive conflict; to provide an organization among researchers, teachers, and practitioners who are working on the issues; and to apply the knowledge and methods of psychology in the advancement of peace, nonviolent conflict resolution, reconciliation and the prevention of war and other forms of destructive conflict. (Division 48 of the American Psychological Association, 1992, p. 3)



During Division 48's first year, a survey of the founding membership clarified the role that the early members believed peace psychology occupied in the lexicon of the profession. Three questions were asked as part of the research, (a) "What is the definition of peace psychology?" (b) "How is peace psychology a psychology?" and (c) "What does a peace psychologist do?" Seven hundred twenty-five members received the survey and 170 responded (23%; Brown, 1990). To the first question, respondents indicated that peace psychology "involves the identification of human behaviors, cognitions, and emotions that lead to conflict and conflict resolution" (Brown, 1990, p. 1). Participants also referred to direct application of peace psychology to (a) promote peace; (b) understand the psychological dimensions of war and potential interventions; (c) minimize poverty, hunger, racism, and homelessness; (d) improve cross-cultural appreciation; and (e) understand the impact on children, youth, and families. Nine percent of the respondents referred to attaining inner peace at the individual level. The definition of peace psychology encompassed a broad range of meanings, from the philosophical to the concrete and operational level. The area of focus also was broad and ranged from the intrapsychic, occurring within the mind, to the international, suggesting that peace needs to occur at all levels (Brown, 1990, p. 3).

In response to the question of how peace psychology is a sub-discipline of psychology, 70% of the respondents replied that it is a credible field within psychology because it is based on scientific research methodologies used to investigate human factors that promote peace and conflict (Brown, 1990). Thirty percent of the respondents described the study of cognition, personality, behavior, and factors influencing individuals' choices with respect to being either more peaceable or more violent as major

topics of exploration. Nine percent identified peace psychology not as an official branch of psychology, but rather, an offshoot of another field or as a composite of many fields of study, including political psychology, social psychology, spirituality, communication, and international relations. To the third question, “What does a peace psychologist do?”, respondents indicated that a peace psychologist

- researches topics relevant to peace issues (64%),
- engages in social and political activism (55%),
- educates and teaches (45%),
- provides therapy (42%),
- practices peace on a personal level (30%),
- writes and publishes on peace issues (5%), and
- other (including *not sure*, 5%). (Brown, 1990, p. 8)

According to Brown, the survey raises several questions. Should peace psychologists, identified by a scientific identity, stay neutral with respect to international politics given that the majority of respondents endorsed global peace issues? Is the science-based practice of peace psychology compromised when researchers who study causality of behavior engage in social activism? With the emphasis on global levels of peace, should there be an equal emphasis on less global issues such as gender-relations, prejudice, and oppression between individuals and groups? Can the theories used by psychologists to resolve disputes between couples apply to inter-nation conflicts? Brown concluded that “peace psychology involves psychologists who are professionally and personally committed toward studying and promoting peace within and between all levels

of human relations” (Brown, 1990, p. 11). She did not take a position with respect to how psychologists performed or could juggle these two roles.

Historical events in the 1990s reinforced the need for members of an internationally peace-focused group to take an active role in seeking conflict resolution within and among ethnic groups and minorities. The Soviet Union’s disintegration had given rise to new nation-states with complex conflicts arising between people living within the newly configured states. As part of increasing the visibility of scientists and practitioners concerned about peace, Division 48 launched the *Peace Psychology Bulletin* in 1992. The *Bulletin* divided its content, half was reporting on the business of the Division 48, its events, and meetings. To fulfill the other function, that of scholarship geared toward striving for answers, the *Bulletin* began to publish peace psychology research and establish a peer review process, as well as exploring the possibility of launching a more formal journal (Wessells, 1996). These efforts, it was hoped, would make the Society more credible as well as more visible.

#### **Peace Psychology Journal.**

A quarterly journal, first published in 1995, *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, was launched to encourage “the development and communication of knowledge about psychology . . . to help transform individual consciousness and social and societal behavior [so that] equity, social justice, and protection of our environment are the hallmarks of a world order” (Schwebel, 1995, p. 1). In addition to serving to encourage psychologists to write on peace, there was concern that the journal be a place where complementary contributions from other disciplines could be considered. “The basic question . . . is: How can we get sufficiently interdisciplinary? . . . [T]he various

relevant disciplines are so intertwined that the very meaning, in practice, of what we psychologists can contribute depends on combining it properly with what people with other expertise have to say” (White, 1992, p. 31).

### **Peace Psychology Book Series.**

Division 48 also assembled an international advisory board to oversee the selection and publication of *The Peace Psychology Book Series*. The goal of this series was to provide credibility for the idea that peace psychology was capable of building theory and contributing to the prevention of war. The editor of the *Peace Psychology Book Series*, Daniel Christie, summarized the series as “a place for scholars to demonstrate the usefulness of peace psychology for constructing theory and promoting activism aimed at the prevention and mitigation of violent episodes and structures around the world” (Christie, 2011). The series currently has 25 published titles (see Appendix A).

A three-volume *Encyclopedia of Peace* was published in 2012. It contains almost 300 entries contributed by leading international and American scholars who examined the specific psychological dimensions of peace and conflict studies, which included key concepts, theories, methods, issues, and practices that are defining the field of peace psychology in the 21st century (Christie, 2012). Topics relevant in the second decade of the 21st century, such as genocide, hate crimes, torture, terrorism, racism, and child abuse, also were included. The Encyclopedia is organized into three categories: (a) concepts and processes; (b) methods, research, and theories; and (c) education and applications (Christie, 2011). The encyclopedia provides a lexicon that can provide a

common reference for future peace psychology research both nationally and internationally.

### **Summary**

Starting with the efforts to form a specialty area, peace psychology has developed a credibility that allows for collaboration with other areas of psychology and other academic disciplines. Within a variety of social science disciplines, such as sociology, political science, conflict resolution, and peace studies, there has been some incorporation of peace psychology concepts and methodologies. Peace psychology as a field of academic prominence grows slowly but none-the-less continues to develop. Additional programs are being established in various parts of the world. Research continues to be a central part of the Society's mission and both its journal and book series provide for international contributions and development in the field. Most recently, the Society has set up a small grants program to nurture interesting research. At a time when current events still center on disruption of peoples and state violence, contributors to peace realize the urgent need to develop peaceful solutions that prevent massive dislocations and non-stop wars. This research will provide a snapshot of the specific efforts of members of the Society for the Study of Peace, Conflict, and Violence, Division 48 of the American Psychological Association, because this Society is the largest group within the United States over the greatest number of years that has devoted itself to finding ways to convert warring practices to peaceful ones within individuals, families, communities, and nations. Mine will be the study of peace psychology's accomplishments, challenges, and opportunities by looking into one peace psychology association's growth and development.

## Chapter 3

### Methodology

We know that on the problems of human nature and of human relationships, it is possible to get and test that knowledge which would be required to accomplish, with social problems, what the physical sciences have done with physical problems, and the biological sciences with biological problems.

—Robert Ward Leeper

This chapter is used to outline the research approach, methodology, and ethical considerations used in this study. The chapter begins with an overview of the purpose and rationale for this study and its research method, the benefits of an interview methodology over a survey approach, the researcher's personal investment in the topic, and a review of related prior research. The next section reviews the methods of the research, including the design, the details of the interview methodology (approach, participants, and questions), and the method employed to analyzing and coding the data. Finally, ethical considerations are described, including any benefits to research participants, the management of confidentiality issues, and the consent of participants.

### Research Approach

#### Research purpose.

This research project was initially designed to exploring peace psychology's contributions to promoting peacefulness within individuals and societies, as well as understanding what draws psychologists to the peace psychology field and what sustains their engagement. In particular, the goals of this project are to describe relevant psychological phenomena, determine important psychological concepts, and explore their interrelationships as they pertain to peace psychology. It is understood that psychology, a field that studies motives, attitudes, and behaviors, has been contributing to the

understanding of violence and conflict in individuals and communities since its inception in the late 1800s. At the same time, the largest employer of psychologists is the Department of Defense (DOD), whose mission is to protect freedoms of United States citizens with military solutions including engaging in war. It is not the intent of this study to examine the instruments of the DOD and the participation of psychologists in military strategies to maintain the United States' political, economic, and social goals. Rather, this study will explore the relationship of conflict, peace, and violence as defined by the field of peace psychology in the service of diverting conflict away from violence and towards peacebuilding outcomes. The research process involved interviewing presidents of the Society for the Study of Conflict and Violence: Peace Psychology Division 48, who by virtue of their serving as presidents, have helped shape the direction of the Society and, it is believed, have had a substantial grasp of the directions in which peace psychology, the discipline, is going.

It is further understood that while many psychologists practice and research peace psychology independently, without formally affiliating with others in the field, peace psychology, as a discipline, has become more clearly defined and channeled as a result of the existence of its professional organization. This study highlights the challenges and accomplishments of the field as perceived by the Society's leader-practitioners. The study of Division 48 will also describe how like minds who are motivated to incorporate socially responsible values and actions into their practices are successful or less than successful in achieving these goals.

### **Research rationale.**

It has been demonstrated in the literature review that the topic—peace and psychology—is an important one to study because it provides some direction for the questions: How can we all live together peacefully? How do we change societal focus from war to peace? If we want to expand our ability to develop peaceful societies, we need to look at groups that have been involved in studying this topic. By learning how the groups worked, what they have accomplished, and what questions they perceive need to be asked, we will have increased our understanding about how societies work and could work. I chose to study Division 48 because it defines peace psychology as a discipline and, 25 years later, continues to spearhead the growth of this field in the United States and participate in a global exchange.

The researcher undertook this work with a particular interest in understanding the implications and findings for clinical psychology generally and depth psychology in particular. Clinicians are on the front lines of helping individuals and groups who are experiencing internal and external conflicts to achieve restorative solutions. Depth psychology is included because it allows for a more complete exploration of the psychological field which is comprised of both conscious and unconscious motivations, explicit and implicit memories and reactions, local and nonlocal influences. This is important in the study of individuals and groups and their responses to war and peace, and is consistent with current research trends in social psychology.

Contemporary research in social psychology shows that people's thoughts, feelings, and actions are guided not only by the conscious, reflective, rule-based system but also by the nonconscious. . . . Ultimately, health behavior theories,



behavior change interventions, and public policy initiatives will benefit from taking cognizance of nonconscious processes as so doing will enable health psychologists to exploit the reflective and impulsive systems separately as well as their interaction in order to maximize behavior change efforts. (Sheeran, Gollwitzer, & Bargh, 2013)

To elicit applicable clinical insights including the relevance of depth psychology, three of the interview questions were designed specifically to capture this information.

#### **Research method rationale.**

A qualitative research method is being used because it best addresses the philosophical underpinnings of this study. The philosophical belief system of reality used in this study is based on the assumption that the social world is not patterned on predictability. Indeed, the social world is undergoing constant change and construction as a result of the interactions of people and what they convey within those interactions, as well as through their observable behaviors. Qualitative methodology allows researchers to undertake the reporting of these realities (Creswell, 2007).

The researcher's epistemology, the "philosophical belief system of who can and cannot be a knower" (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2010, p. 4) allows the axiological assumption that the researcher engages as an active participant in the interviewing process, and carefully brackets biases, either as these biases become known during the preparation phase prior to the interview process, that is, as they are understood in advance of the interactional experience, or during the actual interview process. By contrast, if this were a quantitative research project, the researcher would be considered a neutral observer of measurable data. The qualitative research process, which takes into

consideration the researcher's biases (which are subject to examination), is thereby holistic, including both researcher/interviewer and interviewee. Being holistic creates a research nexus "that explicitly integrates ontology, epistemology, methodology, and method" (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2010, p. 7).

The reporting style in this qualitative research contains a rhetorical assumption that the reporting will be personal and literary (Creswell, 2007). The process will allow for the discovery of data behind phenomena which may be unknown. Thus, the methodology will be "inductive, emerging, and shaped by the researcher's experience in collecting and analyzing the data" (p. 19).

The assumptions or worldviews used in the study are based on the work of pragmatist, philosopher, and social psychologist Mead, whose book *Mind, Self and Society* (1934) was published posthumously by his students. Mead's impact was due in large part to his star pupil, Blumer (1986), who capsulized three basic interactionist assumptions from Mead's philosophical pragmatism:

- human beings act toward things on the basis of the meanings that these things have for them . . .
- the meaning of such things is derived from, or arises out of, the social interaction that one has with one's fellows . . . [and]
- these meanings are handled in, and modified through, an interpretive process used by the person in dealing with the things he encounters.

(Blumer, 1986, p. 2)

Other authors who contributed to Blumer's distillation of Mead's knowledge included "John Dewey, W. I. Thomas, Robert E. Park, William James, Charles Horton Cooley,

Florian Znaniecki, James Mark Baldwin, Robert Redfield, and Louis Wirth” (Blumer, 1986, p. 1). The worldview used in this research aligns with the work of Mead and is based on the constructionist viewpoint that people create individual meanings from their own subjective experiences of themselves and their interactions with others (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). Therefore the research design of this project has been structured to find patterns and themes by gathering data from individuals’ viewpoints. This bottom-up approach is designed to generate a theory based upon multiple participants forming interconnecting themes. Differences that appear as contradictory ideas are incorporated through this framework.

#### **Interview versus survey.**

After comparing two possible approaches for information gathering for this study—idiographic versus nomothetic—the ideographic method was selected because it promises a greater overall result. An idiographic orientation towards research uses in-depth, qualitative, semi-structured interviews that allow a researcher to hone in on specifics. By contrast, nomothetic research designs such as Brown’s 1990 survey of Division 48’s membership describe broad parameters; the content areas are wide, but shallow. In 1990, Division 48’s membership was over 800. Today, it is roughly half that number. Given that response rates for the surveys of the kind Brown used are typically between 3% and 7% (Dillman, Smyth, & Christian, 2009), the use of a nomothetic survey technique today would not yield a viable sample. An idiographic design, however, allows for a few participants who provide deep and detailed knowledge on peace psychology. Presidents are chosen as participants because although their individual practice of peace psychology may be similar to the general membership, their leadership

role presumably affords them a broader understanding of the field than individual, non-leader, division members. This ideographic orientation is a more effective approach for learning more about the domain of peace psychology, Division 48, and psychologists wanting to identify with the field. Future researchers may consider looking at larger samples of group leaders and non-leader members.

The data collection technique produced both a linguistic and a symbolic representation of the data rather than a mathematical representation that results from quantitative research (Heppner, Wampold, & Kivlighan, 2008). Words are the natural material produced by open-ended, semi-structured interviews—not single words, but rather “interrelated words combined into sentences and sentences combined into discourses” (Polkinghorn, 2005, p. 138). Grounded theory, which creates theory by analyzing and categorizing data, will guide the coding and tabulation of the data collected from the interviews.

#### **Personal investment in the topic.**

My interest in peace psychology stems from circumstances somewhat like Brown's. The inspiration for her study came from the death of her primary caretaker, Izumi-san, who died from atomic bomb disease contracted in Japan during World War II when Brown was 10 years old (Brown, 1990, p. 3). Her experience with her caretaker, and mine when I witnessed my son serve and survive three tours in Afghanistan and Iraq, left us both affected by the horrors of war.

While it seems unthinkable that any mother would want her children to join the business of killing other humans, I well knew at the time that my influence in directing my adult son's life decisions was limited. My son's only contact with a recruiter was

when he, at age 22, walked into the Marine recruiting station and enlisted in the Infantry. Unlike his experience, others at much younger ages are under the aggressive and well-honed influence of military recruiters who offer direction, adventure, excitement, a GI Bill for future education, and the opportunity to serve their country. With my own history of political training and activism I began, soon after his enlistment, to question the assumptions that underlie the long history of parents accepting uncritically the idea that their sons and daughters should fight the wars started by their elders. I became curious about how leaders and their slogans, which link patriotism and war, could seduce parents and young people to romanticize aggression as the answer to conflict. In addition, I was curious whether human nature's propensity towards aggression also contributed to the inevitability of war. Like Brown, I entered this research with training in clinical psychology and an interest in "how psychological principles could be applied in order to elucidate the dynamics that underlie conflict and conflict resolution" (Brown, 1990, p. 1).

My beginning premise as articulated by Pilisuk and Roundtree (2008) and Risen (2014) was that our economy is driven by defense and military markets. Especially with my son now a part of this war economy, I wanted to go behind the business of war to look at the personal and group dynamics that underlie conflicts. Although the economics of war hinge on the creation and sale of weapons and related technologies, they also hinge on the availability of people willing to fight, and to accept the idea, however romantically constructed, that they may be severely injured or die for their country. I found myself again struggling with the same question Einstein asked Freud in their 1931–1933 correspondence:

Is there any way of delivering mankind from the menace of war? . . . [W]ith the advance of modern science, this issue has come to mean a matter of life and death for Civilization as we know it; nevertheless, for all the zeal displayed, every attempt at its solution has ended in a lamentable breakdown . . . The ill success . . . of all the efforts made during the last decade . . . leaves us no room to doubt that strong psychological factors are at work which paralyze these efforts . . .

Another question follows hard upon it: How is it possible for this small clique to bend the will of the majority, who stand to lose and suffer by a state of war, to the service of their ambitions? (S. Freud, 1933/1964, p. 210).

The literature review in Chapter 2 demonstrates that Einstein's questions have been an ongoing theme in psychology since its beginning as a science. There are well over 120 years of research applied toward expanding a psychological understanding of conflict and interventions that direct outcomes toward well-being.

In the last 25 years, psychologists have worked together to build the field of peace psychology through Division 48 in order to expand the research and practice of psychology to specifically channels conflict away from violence and toward peacebuilding outcomes. While coming from different backgrounds and orientations to psychology, the psychologists and other professionals in Division 48 share a common search for non-violent solutions that might assuage aggression and conflict. My own desire to end our children's engagement with war has attracted me to better understand the knowledge contained in Division 48.

### **Prior research in this area.**

Beyond the rich history of individual and group contributions from around the world, as outlined in the literature review, the only published research on Division 48 took place in 1990 (Brown, 1990). This was the year the American Psychological Association recognized the Division of Peace Psychology Society: Division 48 (since renamed the Study of Peace, Conflict, and Violence: Division 48 Peace Psychology). Brown surveyed the Division 48's 725 members, of which 120 responded to the questions, "(a) What is the definition of peace psychology? (b) How is peace psychology a psychology? (c) What does a peace psychologist do?" (Brown, 1990, p. 1). The survey was designed to explore the commonalities that brought individuals together under the new practice area of peace psychology. Brown concluded her survey by stating:

If someone were to ask me now: "So, what *is* peace psychology?" I would say that peace psychology involves psychologists who are professionally and personally committed toward studying and promoting peace within and between all levels of human relations. Any more would probably lose the listener; any less would not do justice to the diverse views that comprise its meaning. (emphasis in original, p. 11)

This research study serves as a natural follow-up to the initial inquiry about the first members who had joined the Society. To date, no additional published research has been undertaken that addresses the accomplishments of the group formed in 1990 or the commonalities that draw psychologists to the field. No published research study has been undertaken to examine the challenges Division 48 has faced over the years, nor has any

work been done to examine the roles of the elected presidents who have led the growth of Division 48. This researcher hopes that via this study, others will better understand the development and direction of peace psychology. Hopefully, such an understanding may inspire future research and applications, as well as inform other disciplines about the specific value of and constraints that limit the effectiveness of peace psychology in reducing violence and building peace.

## **Research Methodology**

### **Research design.**

Each research project implements a unique design for achieving the goals of the project. There are limitations to all designs (Denscombe, 2009), and each has specific philosophical assumptions that guide the process (Creswell, 2007). A qualitative research design—using an oral history methodology for interviews and analyzing data within grounded theory procedures—has been used for this study.

Qualitative research “involves understanding the complexity of people’s lives by examining individual perspectives in context. This methodology is a radically different way to approach knowing and understanding” (Heppner et al., 2008, p. 256) than is quantitative methodology. Qualitative research provides a “descrip[tion] and clarifica[tion of] experience as it is lived and constituted in awareness. In particular, the qualitative design method for this study seeks the lived meaning of human experience, a phenomenological method of inquiry involving face-to-face interviews in which participants were invited to describe specific events, circumstances, and situations in their lives. Qualitative research is also particularly useful when investigating understudied populations (Morrow & Smith, 2000), as it allows for emerging data to be freed from the



limitations of existing theories and measures; the peace psychologists I will study are an understudied group.

Division 48 will be my study group because it specifically applies psychological concepts to violence, conflict, and peace. I also chose this group because it is part of the American Psychological Association, the largest psychological association in the world and which affects policy in this country. The participant pool consists of the presidents of Division 48 who were elected by the majority of the members to serve 1-year terms as president and additional one year terms on the Executive Committee before and after their presidency. These presidents now comprise the leadership group that has collectively legitimized the field. Each brings both a group perspective of peace psychology as a field of study, and an individual perspective as a peace psychologist. There are 22 past presidents and one current president. Unfortunately, two past presidents are deceased. Where possible, the researcher has included division presidents who are also clinical/practitioner psychologists, because this research is specifically designed to explore the relevance of clinical psychology to peacebuilding. Clinical psychology has, after all, contributed significantly to understanding the mechanisms associated with conflicting thoughts and behaviors in individuals and groups.

#### **Interview methodology.**

Oral history methodology has guided the interview process. Oral histories, because they explore many facets of a narrative, are ideally suited for looking at the growth of peace psychology and the evolutions of members' approaches to the field. Specific advantages include: "(a) tapping into thought patterns, (b) micro-macro linkages, (c) comprehensive understanding, (d) bearing witness and filling in the historical record,

(e) collaboration in the meaning-making process, and (f) a focus on the participant's perspectives" (Leavy, 2011, p. 15). Participants have the opportunity to "reflect, reconstruct, and build meaning out of their past experiences" (p. 23) in the process of responding to the interview questions which were designed to look at the interaction and linkages between social/historical contexts and personal biographies, the perspectives of marginalized groups, as well as the context in which events were experienced. Oral history interviews also allow for an insight into decision making within shifting contexts, and provided a "holistic understanding of life experiences" (p. 15).

The interview data was analyzed using a grounded theory data analysis. In choosing directed, yet open-ended, interviews consistent with an oral history methodology, the participant pool of seven was small enough to carry out the rigorous analysis, yet large enough to provide substantive value. The researcher also interviewed two other division presidents to provide more context and background for the conducted interviews.

The individual interviews were designed from a constructivist worldview in which multiple realities are provided. Direct quotes from respondents are used to describe differing perspectives and similarities among respondents. This epistemological approach is collaborative, in that it includes perspectives from the researcher/interviewer and the 7 division presidents, "a voice of a multi-voice reconstruction (Voros, 2007). To maintain the integrity of the research, biases were tracked by the researcher and interpretations of the biases were explored. The methodological approach is inductive as it will begin with the interviewee's perspectives and experiences in order to discover "patterns, theories, and generalizations" (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011, p. 42). The

analyses of the interview data will use an inductive, bottom-up approach, as opposed to a deductive, top-down approach (Guba & Lincoln, 1994, 2005; J. Heron & Reason, 1997; Lincoln & Guba, 2002). Grounded theory provides a procedure for categorizing information (open coding), finding interconnections among the categories (axial coding), building a narrative that connects the categories (selective coding), and ending with a set of theoretical propositions (Creswell, 2007, p. 160; Strauss & Corbin, 1990).

Although initially guided by set interview questions, as participants answer the questions they contribute to the direction of the interviews, the language used, and how their stories are told. The process allows respondents to “reflect, reconstruct and build meaning out of their past experiences” (Leavy, 2011, p. 23). Because they will be narrating their own stories, new questions may be asked and answered. It may be that useful insights can be revealed because the interviewee has the opportunity to talk about how experiences changed over time and what caused that change. In addition, understanding what goes into subjective experience and meaning-making is an important consideration because it informs us why psychologists are attracted to peace psychology. Oral history also is designed to study “the experience of people bound by a shared sense of community” (p. 25). Selecting participants who have the shared experience of leading Division 48 will provide access to leaders’ insights that are relevant to peace psychology not only in their personal and professional lives, but through their leadership experience as well.

Oral history methodology has four primary narrative styles that may evolve in any combination during any one interview: (a) unified, those that proceed chronologically (Leavy, 2011); (b) segmented, in which the narrative shifts and may appear disconnected

(Etter-Lewis, 1991; Leavy, 2011); (c) conversational, when conversations with others form the answers (Etter-Lewis, 1991; Leavy, 2011); and (d) episodic, in which life stories are told thematically, not chronologically (Kohler-Riessman, 1987; Leavy, 2011). The choice of styles and the shifts among them can also reveal more subtle information such as “emotional distress, instances in which language is insufficient, and degrees of uncertainty” (Leavy, 2011, p. 20). When participants shift styles they offer an opportunity to gain a more nuanced understanding of the narrative.

### **Participants.**

Nine of the 24 Presidents of the Society for Peace, Conflict, and Violence: Peace Psychology consented to be interviewed for this study:

1992: Michael G. Wessells, PhD\*

1996: Daniel J. Christie, PhD\*

1997: Marc Pilisuk, PhD\*

2002: Leila F. Dane, PhD

2009: Eduardo I. Diaz, PhD\*

2011: Julie Meranze Levitt, PhD

2012: Gilbert Reyes, PhD\*

2013: Rachel MacNair, PhD\*

2014: Brad Olson, PhD\*

All participants were contacted with a letter of introduction requesting an interview, the table of contents of the study, the research questions, an informed consent form, and the researcher’s bio. Informed consent guidelines (Emanuel, Wendler, & Grady, 2000), were followed (see Appendix E). As discussed by Wendler and Grady

(2008), potential respondents were invited to participate voluntarily. Clear guidelines were given regarding the following:

1. Research contribution. Those who enroll in the study will be contributing to a project designed to gather generalizable knowledge to benefit others in the future.
2. Researcher relationship. The researcher will rely on participants' interviews to gather the generalizable knowledge to benefit others.
3. Research impact on participants. The extent of impact will be evidenced by the degree to which participating in the study alters what participants do in the future. (p. 203)

The researcher was met with sincere cooperation on the part of all participants. Four interviews were conducted in person, two by phone, and one participant responded in writing. The format was conversational and each participant was asked the same questions but follow up questions varied according to the responses of each interviewee and the flow of the interview. Seven interviews (marked with an “\*” above) were selected for grounded theory analysis. A priority was given to clinical psychologists, to representative time frames, and to diversity. Practical considerations also played a factor. Interviews ranged from one hour to two and half hours. Each recorded interview was transcribed verbatim except for pauses and breaks in the discussion. Each was returned to the interviewee for review, clarification, and final approval. The participants had the opportunity to review and adjust any statements in order to provide the clearest responses. All interviews have informed this study but reporting details that follow are only given for the seven analyzed interviewed. One in person interview and one phone

interview had to be redone due to equipment failure. These interviews followed the same protocols as the original interview.

### **Questions.**

The interview protocol included six questions. These questions were:

1. Can you take me back in time to events or people in your past that contributed to your selecting a career as a psychologist?
2. Can you also take me back in time to events or people that led you to the subspecialty of peace psychology? What drew you to join Division 48 and what has sustained your participation.
3. What psychological insights (clinical or otherwise) have you further developed or changed as a result of your work as a peace psychologist? Was any of this influenced by depth psychology—Freudian, Jungian, or related perspectives—that include a consideration of unconscious factors? How much are unconscious factors considered in peace psychology research?
4. As President, what were your challenges and accomplishments, and what do you consider the priorities for peace psychology in today's landscape?
5. What criteria would you describe as essential characteristics of a peace psychologist?
6. Does your analysis of what needs to be done to combat massive violence and destruction include what you yourself need to do?

The sixth question was changed after the first interview with Marc Pilisuk who suggested it upon responding to the original 6<sup>th</sup> question posed, “What question(s) do you wish I had asked in this interview, and how would you answer it/them?”

### **Analysis and coding.**

The data from the interviews was analyzed following the grounded theory principles of open coding for conceptual labeling, axial coding for category building, and selective coding for model building. A grounded theory approach to data analysis (Corbin & Strauss, 2008; Glaser 1978; Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Strauss, 1987; Strauss & Corbin, 1998), is specifically designed to build theory from data obtained through transcribed text. The data was “examin[ed] and interpret[ed] in order to elicit meaning, gain understanding, and develop empirical knowledge” (Corbin & Strauss, 2008, p. 1). The recognition of the importance of coding interview data as part of qualitative analysis was characterized in its early stages by G. A. Miller (1951):

In order to handle larger blocks of verbal material in a statistical way, it seems necessary to reduce the variety of alternatives that must be tabulated. This can be accomplished by putting a wide variety of different word patterns in a single category. (p. 95)

This process enabled data analysis of the interviews to be subjected to several levels of analysis of the meaning structures found in the text. Each layer provided a more crystalized view of the central themes embraced by peace psychologists.

The first level of data analysis involved an open coding process, which required a thorough reading of the text in order to extrapolate key words, phrases, and themes.

Neuman (2000) described open coding as “bring[ing] themes to the surface from deep

inside the data” (p. 422). Strauss (1987) offered several guidelines as part of the open coding process. He recommended having these questions in mind when reviewing the data: “What category does this incident indicate? What study are these data pertinent to? What is actually happening in the data?” (pp. 30–31). Strauss also emphasized that the data should be studied minutely rather than approaching it with the thought of doing a quick overview. He encouraged researchers to stop the coding process so that they may write frequent “theoretical memo[s]” (p. 32). This process was extremely helpful to this researcher during the analysis process. Lastly the research followed Strauss’ caution for researchers to consider only data such as age, sex, or race as relevant if it emerges directly from the material (p. 32).

Open coding fractured the data distinct themes. Strauss and Corbin (1998) explained, the next step of axial coding is designed to bring coherence to the themes that are generated in the material. Axial coding allowed the researcher to put the data back together in new ways by connecting categories with subcategories which extends the development of the category beyond properties and dimensions to include the context, action/interactional strategies, and the consequences of those strategies (Strauss and Corbin, 1990, p. 97). Axial coding, according to Strauss and Corbin (1998), provides insights into “when, where, why, who, how, and with what consequences” (p. 125). Several scientific schemas were applied by Strauss and Corbin to clarify these categories (Charmaz, 2006), to wit: the why, where, and how are studied by looking at the conditions surrounding the structured interview. The “who” questions are answered through actions and interactions of the participant’s “strategic responses to issues, events, or problems” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 60). Neuman (2000) described the process as allowing



the analyst to focus on coded themes rather than the raw data. In order to allow for broader connections between themes in the open coding process, the coding frames articulated by Berg and Lune (2012) will be applied to the axial coding. The coding frames provide a structure that limits the connections, which axial coding leaves potentially unlimited.

Selective coding was the third step in the process, and engaged the researcher in a systematic process of looking at core categories in order to develop a theoretical framework. Open and axial coding described the data, but these steps do not provide a theoretical structure for the data to be integrated (Creswell, 2007; Goede & Villars, 2003; Goulding, 2002; Pandit, 1996; Strauss & Corbin, 1998). The process of selective coding accomplishes this integration (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). The first step in the selective coding process was to find a central theme or main topic of the research (Goede & Villars, 2003; Strauss & Corbin, 1998); in other words, to find a guiding theoretical explanation for the data. This central category enables the integration of the other categories to form an explanatory whole, and a central category should be able to account for considerable variation within all the categories (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p. 146).

### **Ethical Considerations**

#### **Benefits to the participants.**

Although it is understood that no material or financial benefits will be offered to participants, they do have the opportunity, through an oral history interview, to experience potential benefits for their participation, although no claims can be made regarding the extent to which this might occur. The interviews provided an opportunity for participants to share their knowledge. Through this dissertation this knowledge will

be disseminated. New insights or self-awareness may evolve out of the experience of reflecting upon not only their life experiences, but also the accompanying thoughts and feelings associated with their life experiences. Thus, self-reflection can occur while telling their story aloud, even to an audience of one (Patel, 2005, p. 329; Leavy, 2011, p. 21).

### **Confidentiality.**

This research project is designed to understand lived experiences of peace psychologists from the inception of Division 48 until the present. The participants will have the opportunity to contribute to the furthering of knowledge about peace psychology. All written and electronic recordings will be maintained in a locked file cabinet and kept in the researcher's office. Results from both the interview and the survey will become the property of the researcher and confidentiality will be maintained using appropriate measures. The identities and professional accomplishments of the participants are germane to the research and will be disclosed. Information obtained through this research may be used in future publications or presentations.

### **Consent to be interviewed.**

Permissions that were needed to engage with interview participants were obtained in writing on a designated consent form (Danis et al., 2012, p. 253). See Appendix E for a copy of this form. Participants received a copy of this consent form for their records. Instructions to participants were furnished in writing, with an opportunity for discussion and questions (see Appendix F for a copy of these instructions). Participants were given ample opportunities to ask questions prior to the interview, and also reserved the right to withdraw at any time and without consequence.

The necessary Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval was requested on September 22, 2013 and obtained prior to any data collection.

## Chapter 4

### Findings

The interviews of all subjects began with the first two of the six interview questions, noted in chapter 3, that asked about influences leading interviewees to the study the discipline of psychology and then to peace psychology. Participants' responses are given in the chronological order of their presidencies, beginning with the earliest president, Wessells, who served in 1992, and ending with Olson who was President in 2014. Where biographical information was not given in the interview, it is briefly reported from their individual public biographies to provide contextual information. Subsequent questions and key excerpts from their responses follow. If a participant's response does not appear under the questions, the answer was not given directly. The Appendices contain more complete verbatim transcripts of certain questions and will be referenced within the comments following specific questions.

### Interviews

*Can you take me back in time to events or people in your past that contributed to your selecting a career as a psychologist? Can you also take me back in time to events or people that led you to the subspecialty of peace psychology? What drew you to join Division 48 and what has sustained your participation?* More complete first-person historical information regarding the beginning and development of the Peace Psychology Division can be found in Appendix G.

**Michael G. Wessells (1948– )** grew up in Richmond, Virginia during a time of segregation. He experienced the conflicts around racial prejudice, gender discrimination, and cultural stereotyping. He told of these impactful early experiences:

An early experience related to discrimination against an African American woman my mother had hired and who was a good friend and caretaker. My mom was the only mother in the neighborhood I grew up in who worked. She was a nurse, and she was way ahead of her time, but she was viewed as a bit of a misfit in our neighborhood because she worked. That was not what women were supposed to do. Women were supposed to be good moms and staying at home, caring for the family. In my opinion, she was great at caring for the family; it's just that she worked.

[W]hen I was six, I was with my mother who drove out to the country to buy eggs for the neighborhood under a rotating arrangement. You'd go out to the country to a local farm and pick up eggs so you get everybody egg orders. She was with her best friend, who was in the front seat of the car. They had different views on race and I didn't know anything about it. The woman who was in the front seat looked at my mom whose name is Ginny and she said, "I declare, Ginny," she said "You're letting those nigras get too close to your children!" My mom looked at the woman (whose name was Ida) with an angry face and said "Ida, you go to hell." I had never heard my mother cuss, ever. I didn't really understand everything that was going on, but I knew that my mom was being criticized for the closeness between me and Susie and my sister. And I was like, "Yes, go mom!"

It made a difference to have that model of someone standing up for what was right. From there, as I got older I just had many, many questions

about the system of discrimination which was very deeply entrenched in Richmond, Virginia. It was not only de facto housing segregation but was complete segregation of whites and blacks. It was white and colored—for water fountains, bus stops, and seating arrangements. I was part of it but wanted to change it. I was so naïve that one time I got on a bus and I tried to defy the local rules of segregation.

Wessells' choice of psychology was driven by his concern about violence and he attended Roanoke College for his undergraduate degree. His activism continued in college with participation in protests against the Vietnam War and organizing the first college-wide moratorium for educational purposes to allow for an open forum to exchange ideas. Wessells' graduate work was done at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, which also set the stage for Wessells to pioneer psychology's development toward a multi-disciplinary perspective while maintaining a hard science perspective.

I really enjoyed psychology. I liked social psychology because it addressed some of the issues of race and discrimination that had long been of interest. I was increasingly interested in the issues of violence about which social psychology has much to say. Yet I also remember being frustrated with psychology right from the start because it didn't make enough contact with politics. I remember in my very first psychology class wanting to debate and learn more about the differences between Chinese communism and Vietnamese communism and their implications for behavior. Although some publications were available, I was told “No, no, that's not the psychology. That's politics and history and other

disciplines.” My thought was that if one is dealing with real world problems like the Vietnam War, isn't it necessary to make connections across disciplines?

But that's how I got involved in psychology. I wanted to make connections with violence . . . . Yet I wanted my study to be multi-disciplinary.

Wessells' professional career began at Randolph Macon College where he taught psychology. His multi-disciplinary interests earned him a Kellogg National Leadership Fellowship to a 3-year study of a social problem from anthropological, historical, and political perspectives. Wessells chose peace as the problem to study, which led him to Sweden where he worked at the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, and then spent time studying in the former Soviet Union and China.

I really was becoming very interested in these international dimensions of peace work as well as an activism at home. I was getting very good exposure to some different cultures, and this raised questions about the limits of western psychology. The latter, I think, tries to too much decompose cultures and to fit them within its own framework, which means culture's a variable rather than something that's constitutive and has its own cosmology and epistemology. Basically, Western psychology takes a reductionist approach that I became increasingly skeptical of. In China, for example, nothing prepared me for seeing the impact many centuries later of Confucianism, and of a truly collectivist mindset. Some of these impacts had deep spiritual roots. I was convinced that I didn't understand those and needed to learn more. This has become part of a life-long journey of learning that continues in my current humanitarian work.

When Wessells returned to teach at Randolph Macon, his focus was developing courses in the dynamics of conflict in domestic and international settings and means of conflict transformation.

We looked at Cold War dynamics through a psychological lens, but I made no apology. Politics had to be in there, as did culture and history. You can't even begin to understand what the Israel and Palestinian conflict is about if you don't understand the history. . . . Then I developed a course on aggression. Again I took the same systems frame of aggression at the personal level and interpersonal level up to the family level, community level, society level, and global level. I really felt that the systems frame was necessary for really understanding person in environment, how social environments and systems shape people, and the influence of cultures, spirituality, the whole thing. I taught those courses on a regular basis. A bit later, I developed a course on peace psychology that was an advanced level psych class. In my professional life, then, the teaching piece fell into place, and it was no longer focused on mainstream psychology. The focus was peace psychology.

Wessells pioneered and continues to develop and promote advanced strategies for providing psychological support for children and families affected by armed conflict. This includes the development of international guidelines for the provision of community-based, culturally responsive psychosocial support in emergencies. He contributes extensively to peace and reconciliation efforts and has provided direct humanitarian services in conflict areas in Asia, Africa, Central America, Europe, and South America. Wessells was involved in the formation of the Peace Psychology



Division and became its second president in 1992. See Appendix G for Wessells' detailed description of his early discovery of PsySR and the Peace Psychology Division and how that discovery led to an important understanding of the individuals involved in the field and the dynamics that formed it.

**Daniel J. Christie (1949– )** reminisced on the maternal reinforcement of his own expression of empathy that set the stage for his entrance into psychology.

I attribute my pursuit of psychology to the influence of my mother, I think, mostly, who throughout my childhood was quite persuasive and often suggested that I had a strong sense of empathy, which was what she associated most with psychology. I would associate that with psychology too, but especially peace psychology.

Christie designed a flexible graduate program at Ohio State University, where he had received clinical training and a solid background in experimental, developmental, and psychophysiology (which today would fall within the rubric of neuroscience). Christie continued an academic career as Professor of Psychology for 36 years at Ohio State University, retiring in 2006.

Christie has worked to define, advance, and position peace psychology as a foundational discipline for programs in peace and conflict studies around the world. He writes extensively on peace, conflict, social justice, and the prevention of violence. In 2001 he co-edited *Peace, Conflict, and Violence: Peace Psychology for the 21st Century*. He is series editor of the Peace Psychology Book Series for Springer SBM, which was launched in 2007 and now contains 25 titles. Christie is the editor of the three-volume *Encyclopedia of Peace Psychology* published in 2012.

His introduction to peace psychology began with the formation of PsySR, his description of which may be found in Appendix G. He served as president of Psychologists for Social Responsibility (PsySR) in 2002 and has been active on their Action Committee on Nonviolent Social Change since 2001. Christie was elected president of Division 48 in 1996. He has served as Chair of the Committee for the Psychological Study of Peace of the International Union of Psychological Science from 2004 to the present. He served on the APA Task Force on the Prevention of Terrorism from 2002–2006.

**Marc Pilisuk (1934– )** was born and raised in New York and graduated from Queens College in 1955. Pilisuk earned his PhD in clinical and social psychology from the University of Michigan in 1961 (“About Marc Pilisuk,” 2011).

I was in college in the fifties. I was always interested in peace and justice issues, but in the McCarthy era people did not believe that speaking out was effective or safe. We could not get students to protest a black, disabled war veteran being thrown off a bus or even get people to sign the bill of rights. I thought the best we could do was to help people adjust. I got my PhD just as the anti-war and civil rights movements were taking off.

Pilisuk credits his University of Michigan mentor, Anatol Rapoport, for setting him on the path to develop a series of game simulation experiments in conflict resolution. This expanded to studying power structures and the ties that connect powerful people and organizations to their vested interests in maintaining institutions of war (“About Marc Pilisuk,” 2011). He was a founding member of the Psychologists for Social Responsibility, and an early member of the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear

Policy (SANE; now Peace Action), and one of the founders of the very first teach-in in Ann Arbor, MI in 1965 (“About Marc Pilisuk,” 2011). Pilisuk was involved in the formation of Division 48 before becoming its president in 1996.

**Eduardo Diaz (1951–)** was born in Cuba and raised by a Quaker family who immigrated to the United States in 1956 when he was 5 years old.

I have to credit both the Quaker upbringing and some good undergraduate instructors that exposed me to windows of human behavior. All kinds of behavior, because on the psychophysiological side, I grew to appreciate comparative psych, developmental psych, everything. I fell in love with everything associated with psychology. . . . I recognized that what I was really interested in was trying to figure out how people came to believe what they came to believe.

Diaz attended Guilford College where he married his wife of 45 years, and spent a few years working before he obtained his MS (1976) and a PhD (1979) from Ohio State University.

I was a Cuban guy who married a Southern belle from Georgia. She was from a Southern aristocratic family and we were living in Oneonta, Alabama, which was about 40 miles north of Birmingham, at the foothills of Sand Mountain, which was known as one of the more racist areas at the time. So anyway, that also resulted in some challenging and interesting experiences that reminded me that I really wanted to know how it is that people came to believe what they came to believe.

In his doctoral work at Ohio State he focused on the psychophysiology of sleep and dreams and counseling psychology. He became a professor upon graduating and joined the faculty there. When the Mariel Boatlift brought 125,000 Cubans to the United States in 1980, Diaz felt impelled to volunteer his services and the National Institute of Mental Health put him to work in Fort Indiantown Gap, PA.

That totally changed my life, because basically I went from an academic focus to directly dealing with people that were very humble. I ended up working at the mental health clinic at Fort Indiantown Gap and there was a riot during that time. I remember they evacuated professionals from the camp and then put us to work in emergency clinics. I would see some of the traumatized kids and, because of that experience I ended up working primarily with unaccompanied minors.

After this experience, Diaz worked for Miami-Dade County for 29.5 years, starting as a family therapist, and then going to criminal justice, and finishing his career with the Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement. When he took on the job of Executive Director of the Independent Review Panel (IRP), the entity that was providing Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement for Miami-Dade County, he became heavily involved in peace psychology and was elected president of Division 48 in 2009.

**Gilbert Reyes (1953– )** was a radio talk show host involved in environmental causes and anti-war and anti-nuclear activism when he befriended one of his guest speakers, who was an anti-nuclear activist and psychologist. This friendship awakened his curiosity about psychology and he subsequently obtained a PhD in clinical psychology from the University of Colorado, Boulder in 1998. He was interested in

helping people have better lives, with a focus on helping children who were both vulnerable and innocent victims.

There's something I think of as the heroic impulse in people. I suppose my heroic impulse was mainly in the direction of helping children, which was my first focus, to have better lives. If that meant through psychotherapy or if that meant working with their parents, I wasn't quite sure what it meant. I didn't know enough yet.

My thought was that psychology could really help with that.

He focused his clinical interests on trauma recovery and crisis and emergency mental health interventions with children and adults. His academic career has connected his social justice advocacy interests to psychology; He teaches crisis intervention, traumatic stress and PTSD, coping, resilience, attachment theory, and disaster mental health interventions. Julie Levitt, PhD, who became president of Division 48 in 2012, met Reyes at a conference he was hosting and introduced him to Psychologists for Social Responsibility (PsySR). Reyes served as president of Division 48 in 2012.

**Rachel MacNair (1958– )** grew up in Kansas City, Missouri, in a Quaker family. MacNair earned a BA degree in Peace and Conflict Studies from Earlham College in Richmond, Indiana in 1978. MacNair credits her father, who was a sociology professor, for her commitment to living a consistent life ethic, and her life-long activism in the anti-nuclear movement, anti-abortion, anti-killing, and anti-war for becoming a sociologist and psychologist. When she entered the doctoral program at the University of Missouri-Kansas City, she focused her studies on understanding the psychological impact of killing and coined the term “perpetration-induced traumatic stress,” a form of post-traumatic stress disorder.

So I'm in my mid-30s by this point and I've been an activist out in the field for a good long time, but I decided I really wanted to go and get my PhD and study this. And so every class that I took that could apply, I did a paper on all of the literature that applied to killing as the etiological stressor for PTSD. So I would take a class on administrative justice for police, and that's where I got the police shooting in the line of duty. There was a class on the death penalty. That's when I studied the execution staff. And so on.

MacNair has initiated and participated in numerous feminist pro-life activities. She is an author and lecturer who became involved in peace psychology through attending Division 48 meetings, where she became membership chair, and was then elected to the serving as president in 2013.

**Brad Olson (1970– )** is a community psychologist focusing on a wide variety of human and civil rights issues, advocacy and activism, participatory action research, mixed quantitative and qualitative methodologies, and philosophy of science. He received his BA from DePaul University and his PhD from the University of Iowa. He is currently Co-Director of National Louis University's Community Psychology PhD Program and an Assistant Professor of Psychology. He tells of his journey to peace psychology:

Honestly I'm not sure what brought me to psychology. Sometimes I wonder whether its more of a, sort of, genetic interests. I was pretty shy and introverted. And so I think I thought a lot about individuals and how people think and their attitudes. But I wouldn't necessarily trace it back to any mentors. As soon as I entered undergraduate [studies] I was certain psychology was it. I entered DePaul

University, which is right in Chicago. And it was a Catholic school, but very open, liberal, community-based Vincentian emphasis. And I think the norms of that school, the city, seeing more people who were poor, [helped me] understand more about violence. I think, probably a turning point for the peace psychology part was I was doing an independent study with a professor on *Interpretation of Dreams*, Freud's book. And we had three of us doing it. . . . And we were reading about 50 pages at a time, and I remember this was probably [when] the First Gulf War started. And I mentioned to him I just felt this urge to go and fight and be a part of this for some reason. And, you know, he's like, "That's the furthest thing from my mind." And I remember I was walking out and I saw someone had posted up a conversation between Freud and Einstein against war, and so all of that sort of converged together in terms of—I'm reading Freud. I'm a psychologist. My favorite professor is saying this to me and he's anti-war. So that was kind of a symbol. I think that might have been the turning point.

Olson has served as president of PsySR, chaired APA's Divisions for Social Justice (which involved collaboration with 12 divisions), co-founded The Coalition for an Ethical Psychology, and served as Peace Psychology Division's president in 2014.

***What psychological insights (clinical or otherwise) have you further developed or changed as a result of your work as a peace psychologist?***

**Wessells:** A social ecological approach to human development is one of the traditions that I work with—and it just makes sense. If you're not thinking materially, physically, socially, cognitively, emotionally, and spiritually—if

you're not putting all those together and looking at human relationships within the social system, you get a really skewed understanding.

I work in so many war zones where people tell you that, “It’s not the past violence that is my problem. It’s the fact that I’m a young mom and I can’t feed my baby,” or “I’m a widow and I have no rights, no land rights, so how can I support my family?” Or, “I’m a former child soldier and I’m now badly stigmatized.” So U. S. clinicians will focus on the trauma, when, from the local standpoint, it’s almost always the stigma and the aftermath and the complexities with the current situation. Former child soldiers say things like “People call me a rebel child. They fought me, or they come after me because I was a soldier who attacked the village and now they want revenge.” In the post-conflict environment, gender-based violence and sexual exploitation are often rampant. Again, it is not the violence of the armed conflict itself that may have the greatest effect. In post conflict settings, the list of stressors is so long that they are difficult to enumerate fully. To me, ideally the way you would address the basic needs would be in a manner that builds social cohesion. It needs collaboration to do that and starts right from the ground up.

**Christie:** I think that’s a tough question. I’ve reflected on it a lot, but I think over the years, I’ve come to appreciate more and more the social justice quality of peace psychology. I began with the view: “Why can’t we just get along?” To an appreciation for why we can’t just get along . . . to a lifestyle where I’ve tried to integrate both harmony and equity. And I’ve seen it pretty up-close and personally, because I do have a diverse family.



**Diaz:** One of the things that I try to do, anytime that I get a chance to, I try to at least model what I consider a minimal level of civility. This is to help us to address our differences in a manner that maximizes the probability that community can be built. I'm one of those that really believe that it is possible to live with people that don't think like I do. And, to not even live with them but actually work with them to accomplish some things we have as common goals though you may not be in the same political party. I think that's a living challenge. Peace Psychology has taught me how little is known about how to live with people of difference.

**Reyes:** Being involved with peace psychology has heightened my awareness, it hasn't created or initiated that awareness, of how connected we all are, how much it's all one environment. And we do everything we can to defy that. We look around at this edifice we're in right now, and what these architects and builders have sought to do is to create an enclosed space in which we have a finite environment. There's a beginning and an end to this hotel. But just outside these panes of glass, we're in the global environment.

You asked clinically, and I guess where my mind went with it is that I understand people clinically differently now. I understand people as organisms in an ecology. They are affected by every little thing. We're resilient, but not invulnerable. We're affected by what's in our air, what's in our water, what's in our food. We're affected by what's in our minds. We are affected by what people say to us, and what we think about it. It creates an internal drama, it creates a world that only exists inside, a world that is that unique, a world where

all the demons are real, and a world—a world that must have hope. I think that a lot of what—what we're about whether we're as clinical psychologist or we're as peace psychologist, we're about keeping hope alive. And we just cannot stand the idea of letting hope die. We can suffer a lot of other losses; but that one is more than we can psychologically bear.

**MacNair:** [D]evelopment of concepts of creativity. The concept of the creativity of the foreclosed option. The idea is that when you say there's an option that you won't take, in theory you have fewer options, but in actuality you have more. Because you engage in divergent thinking when you have fewer options. So, for example, the diet of the average vegetarian has more variety to it than the diet of the average American does. That's in the literature . . . and part of that is, I mean, you would think, “okay no meat means fewer options,” but in actuality once you are thinking in terms of “okay, no meat,” you have a creativity that flows in, in order to figure out how to not do the meat.

**Olson:** I would say there are probably three main interests right now. Most of my work still comes from—even though I'm more of a community psychologist than social psychologist—a lot of it comes from my early personality in social psychology influences. But what I've tried to do is develop a theory of social action called the Temporal Model of Social Action that tries to break down what are the psychological elements that lead to effective activism. And dealing with those issues, there is the empowerment process that occurs working with others being one—just one other person working with others to achieve goals. There's dissemination not just having unidirectional dissemination, but actually having

dialogues. So treating this whole cyclical process of a campaign as an education experience. That's sort of like taking a class in the real world and realizing that we may have our persuasive arguments. But if we're not open and listening to those other—the arguments from others, we're not going to be able to create the change. And there are certain issues where we know we're right. I mean, we can say that an issue like torture some of us believe that's absolutely wrong in every circumstance. But there are a million pieces around torture and around interrogation more broadly that we don't know everything and so the whole model is about this iterative process of moving forward, but learning at the same time, and just to continue going with it on and on and on until some progress is made.

*Were any of your psychological insights influenced by depth psychology-Freudian, Jungian, or related perspectives that include a consideration of unconscious factors? How much are unconscious factors considered in peace psychology research?*

Responses reflect thoughts on the existence of the unconscious and the influence of depth psychology to peace psychology. Participants discussed different features of the existence of the unconscious roots of conflict and how it is considered in peace psychology. See Appendix H for more complete verbatim responses from the participants regarding their views of the place of depth psychology in peace psychology.

**Wessells:** It's hard to answer because I would trace so much in psychology back—and human functioning—back to depth psychology. But I would say without getting too Jungian or Freudian about it that the very core idea that there is a lot in human motivation that is at least opaque if not inaccessible to human consciousness, is a view that I think is profound and accurate.

In countless ways, we are motivated to do things by forces, both individual and social that we are unable to articulate or are only dimly aware of yet they shape us in myriad ways. One of those forces is culture. We can't articulate our culture because we swim in it. It's sort of like being a fish and trying to describe the ocean. How could you describe the ocean as a fish? You're in it. You could talk about it and know its existence, but you couldn't describe it in the way that a land animal could. We're in a similar situation. I would say that there—that that is an enduring situation and understanding that ought to inspire more than a little humility. Because it means that a lot of the things that affect our behavior are not the things that we're conscious of and so we ought to be humble about what we think are the motives of our behavior and what in fact the real motives are for our behavior. When you look at that, it invites you and even moves you into a space where you become more deeply self-aware. Without self-awareness, we all susceptible to carrying and reproducing vestiges of racism, militarism, materialism, and destructive competitiveness. Without the capacity to recognize the unconscious, and the ways in which unconscious—the ways in which we're not fully conscious of all the influences on our behavior, I think we get caught up in hypocrisies, superficialities, and become complicit in a whole variety of things that we should not want to be complicit in from the standpoint of peace.

[Regarding depth psychology in research literature] It's usually not written about in that way, but I would argue that it's always there. As a simple example, if you grow up as a—I work a lot with children who've been recruited in the armed forces so-called child soldiers. If you've grown up in a violent society,

violence may come to seem as normal as breathing. If you're recruited into an armed group (or in our country, into a gang) and you're given a gun and told to kill a member of your family or your village or you're going to be shot, and so you do that. Without knowing it, killing becomes easy. Violence becomes normal. Many different factors—external and internal—compel this. However it happens, it's an unconscious process.

One of the main factors is the unwritten rules or social norms. These and the regularity of our experience lead us to think certain things are normal, and to even define the calculus of risks and drawbacks in ways that are culturally scripted. For example, a cultural script in this country tells men that it is a man's place to dominate, and that it is a man's responsibility to command authority and obedience in his own home. So he may not just think or want to take power over this person. Many men may not articulate the situation in that way but hold the view in an unconscious form. Unfortunately, such unconscious or seldom articulated views may contribute to violence against women. To the perpetrator, the violence may seem to be “doing the right thing” or “doing what men do.” This in no way excuses the violent behavior but calls attention to the importance of becoming aware of unconscious motives and norms and resisting the ones that are contrary to peace.

Sometimes when we do articulate them, the narratives we construct are constructed along cultural lines and lines of masculinity and roles. It's very hard for us to go deeper. Cultural psychology, community psychology, and gender psychology all feed into peace psychology and help us to begin to unpack where

those narratives come from, what they mean, why they're there, whose interests they represent, and what's wrong with the dominant narratives that most of us accept. It doesn't look and act like traditional depth psychology, but in a funny way I think it's a descendant of it.

**Christie:** My greatest familiarity with depth psychology comes from work on subtle forms of racism that we see in everyday life, and this kind of racism is very difficult of course to document, but you can get at it in the laboratory pretty easily through the implicit association test. But I think we see manifestations of that all the time . . . it takes terribly subtle forms nowadays that are difficult to confront or to change . . . I was more influenced by Piaget than Freudian notions. Piaget always said he was more concerned with the workings of the tricks of consciousness over the unconscious or something like that. But I think both the unconscious and conscious are important.

I can't tell you how many studies have been done on [terror management theory] of late. Just looking at what happens when you put somebody in a situation that threatens their worldview. I want to pull a book out if I can find it, because it was one of the first ones to address many features of terror management theory under one cover. Here it is: *In the Wake of 9/11—The Psychology of Terror*. It's written by Thomas Pyszczynski, Sheldon Solomon, and Jeff Greenberg. Solomon wrote a summary for the Encyclopedia [Encyclopedia of Peace Psychology] on terror management theory. It's a fascinating theory, and it does begin with the assumptions of the unconscious. 9/11 raised mortality salience among Americans and a chain of reactions that

were in some ways very maladaptive . . . And whenever that gets challenged, when your mortality becomes salient then all hell breaks loose. [In trauma research] you would find a lot of folks would be helpful in fleshing out unconscious kinds of issues that are present in the intergenerational transmission of trauma, and that kind of work.

**Diaz:** Yes, but I chose to not become a psychoanalyst. I'll tell you why just so you are clear. I don't know a lot of poor people that have access to a psychoanalyst. And it's always been my interest to be a psychologist that provides services to those that can't otherwise afford it . . . So, how we construct our reality is, to me, a fascinating thing. It's always been very clear to me that we are only constructing that reality based on what we have access to. And, that there is a lot of stuff that's going on inside our heads that we don't have easy access to. But that's another whole conversation. [Regarding depth psychology in the peace psychology literature] I hardly ever see evidence that it is being taken into consideration significantly.

**Reyes:** Yes and no. I don't want to exaggerate the yes. I'm always looking for the essence, and I really want to separate the 'wheat from the chaff' and say, "Well, you know, that's all part of it but that's artifactual, and what's really at the heart of it is this?" Not that I'll ever find "it", that but that's what I'm looking for.

**MacNair:** The thing about post-traumatic stress disorder is that you can get it long after the event and not necessarily associated with the event. And it would take some digging to find out, and this is particularly true if you don't know that something can traumatize you and also true if you don't even know what trauma

symptoms are. Sometimes it takes some digging and sometimes it's the dreams.

The dreams have the advantage of having content. Dreams and flashbacks.

**Olson:** Yes, most definitely. I think a lot of the social psychology work, even though they don't call it that—I mean, all of the implicit prejudice tests are really unconscious processes. And do I see enough of that work? I see it more in the activism than I see it in the research, unfortunately. I'd love to see more research on it. But I do think there are a lot of good people in PsySR, some of the people who are working with the Racial Justice Group—Gordon Lee who worked with Mary Watkins at Pacifica where they have a depth psychology program. I know he uses a lot of depth psychology in his thinking.

So in a lot of ways, I do think it's undercurrents in activism and probably in research, but I just really haven't dealt in that specific area of the research. I think all of [Eric Fromm's] adjustments of Freud's work are right on and they just helped me in a super way to understand what's happening. So, yes, to the extent that we call that depth psychology it's not the Jungian type, but certainly.

***As President, what were your challenges and accomplishments?***

The participant's responses need to be considered in the historical and cultural context at the time they served. Their responses included both the strategic challenges and accomplishments of establishing a new field of psychology as well as the management details of running an organization. Wessells stated that he was very focused on expanding peace psychology internationally. He also established working groups by subject areas to enable members to contribute substantively to the new discipline of peace psychology in areas that included Children, Families, and War; Ethnicity and Peace;



Feminism and Peace; Militarism, Disarmament, and Conversion; Education and Peace; Peace and Sustainable Development; Public Policy and Action; and Conflict Resolution.

A major focus of our early work as a division was to try at every point bringing international members, help make the division international . . . I gave my presidential address on going global and developing international peace psychology. It would be antithetical to peace to have psychology become a colonizing force. This means getting beyond peace psychology as understood only by some small group of westerners, and opening the doors for diverse cultural, historical, and socio-political perspectives. It also cautions against imposing Western ideas on other countries.

Particularly thorny challenges were presented by the global issues of that period. Probably the biggest one was, how does peace psychology reconfigure itself at a moment when the Cold War was ending? This question contributed too much of the debate that had occurred at our constitutional meeting in Boston, 1990. In many respects, the formation of the Working Groups discussed earlier was an attempt to broaden peace psychology away from the 1980s preoccupation on nuclear war, and to encourage research and action on diverse issues—the environment, sexism, militarism, children, peace education, etc. I saw my job as to try to make sure that those fundamental pillars or elements were there, and that they included and that we focused not only on negative peace, but on positive peace. We were very clear about that. But how do you do that in the post-Cold War era?

[T]he biggest challenge for me was to help create Working Groups that would give people a “home” in the division. To say “I’m a peace psychologist” is fine, but it implied different courses of action for different people. Members needed different groups that were united by a common interest and that *actually did something* in the world. One cluster was emerging around children and war, so we developed a Working Group on Children, Families, and War. Also, we were very deeply concerned that peace psychology like the wider peace movement would be “lily white.” To build bridges with, learn from, and include people in different backgrounds, we formed a Working Group on Ethnicity and Peace. Gender issues were fundamental in all aspects of peace. We agreed that patriarchy was a major source of structural violence and oppression, and that set the stage for gender based violence in all its horrible forms. Accordingly, we formed a Working Group on Feminism and Peace.

There was a no doubt that militarism and global arm sales, machismo, excessive reliance on military approaches, the military industrial complex, the profiteering via the arms trade—all of these were so huge that we formed a Working Group on Militarism, Disarmament, and Conversion. Since education for peace was widely viewed as fundamental to peacebuilding, we established a Working Group on Education and Peace. Environment and development issues were fundamental as well, leading us to establish a Working Group on Peace and Sustainable Development. Recognizing that we wanted to address key issues of policy and action, we formed a Working Group on Public Policy and Action. Later, a Working Group on Conflict Resolution was added. Although these

groups did not cover the full spectrum of work that needs to be done by peace psychologists, they provided points of entry and collective action on key issues for our members.

Christie spoke of the expansion of the Division's focus during his presidency from just covering direct violence to including structural violence. He addressed human needs as a priority for Division 48. Pilisuk followed by working on keeping concern about the dangers of war alive, but also expanding involvement on issues such as disproportionate victimization of minorities, trauma, conflict resolution methods, and the military-industrial complex. Diaz focused on growing awareness of the field of peace psychology, and mentioned his challenges in having peace psychologists' bridge differences. Reyes' presidency was challenged with issues related to the organization's maturation process and the need to widen the sphere of people engaged. He also brought a strong affinity for advocacy to the position. MacNair created the mechanism for collaboration among all interested specialty areas of psychology to work on topic-specific items. The three task forces established during her presidency focused on weaponized drones, the death penalty, and abortion. MacNair also has the goal, not yet realized, of establishing accredited online courses for peace psychology. Olson finished his presidency in 2014 with the first joint PsySR/Peace Psychology mini-convention on drone warfare at the APA convention.

The most frequently mentioned organizational challenges were finances, legitimacy and recognition for the field, getting APA to take peace seriously, conflicting visions, determining and executing priorities, member involvement, and building consensus.

**Wessells:** The other key issue was the development of the Division membership.

I can take *no* credit for this—the credit belongs to Linden Nelson who was *the most brilliant membership chair I've ever seen*.

Strategically gaining acceptance of the word “peace” as something other than soft passivism was mentioned as particularly difficult both within the APA and with other audiences.

**Wessells:** One of the bigger challenges still persists—that of trying to get the APA to take peace seriously. I don't think they were accepting of us. I would call it sort of tolerant. The APA did numerous things to help us—for example, Sarah Jordan in the Division Services Office was a great support to us in forming the division. But they didn't really do anything in regard to our core content—peace, and what psychologists could to do enable it. For example, when I was the president we had collaborative programs that we formed with the Division of Military Psychology, and very active discussions. But the APA leadership never wanted to get involved in it. They somehow viewed them as too political and may have wanted to play it safe. The concept of subjecting peace to scientific scrutiny, much less accepting it as a specialty area in the field, is still a struggle.

Wessells remembered that the association of peace psychology in his tenure had the overtones of being “lily white.” Christie mentioned that the developing world's understanding of psychology is limited to applied applications such as workplace efficiency and employment, which renders peace psychology an irrelevant psychological skill.

***What criteria would you describe as essential characteristics of a peace psychologist?***

(Please see Appendix I for complete verbatim responses.)

**Wessells:** Empathy, caring, respect—caring not just interpersonally or personally but somehow about the world. It's sort of that Gandhian capacity to caring not just about your brother whom you see in your family or the person who's homeless in your neighborhood, but what about people of Afghanistan, the people in Gaza, people in Columbia, people in Somalia? There's something global about the caring, and also vision. You can't be for peace, if you don't have imagination and a vision because the world isn't going to present you with an existing exemplar of many aspects of peace. It's racked with violence, structural violence, injustice, oppression, and we have some levels of peace. Collaboration is also key. No one can build peace alone. This requires willingness to work together, and also requires real cultural respect. This is more than sensitivity. It's about power sharing and humility, and being willing to say that I, as a U. S. trained psychologist, may in a whole variety of ways, have it all wrong. It's about recognizing that there may be other psychologies that we don't know about that offer great insight. But they are constructed by indigenous people or people who live in very difficult economic circumstances and don't have the privilege and the economic capacity to go to meetings or to publish. To learn from those, we need to go looking for them, and understand that we de facto are in the position of global hegemony, and that's a very bad position to be.

[W]hat is needed at the end of the day is to treat people with respect and justice and equality and to seek non-violence. Non-violence does not just spring

forth on its own—it requires a particular orientation and set of values that are put into practice by large numbers of people. Patience is another one, since without it, one will never be able to negotiate or to listen. If you can't listen, you'll never be a really good negotiator. You'd be too busy asserting your own position.

These things very important, yet I don't always see them amongst psychologists and APA members, nor (to be fair) in any other profession.

**Christie:** I would guess that a peace psychologist would have a great deal of empathy particularly for those who are oppressed or exploited, and would practice in a way that not only promoted the well-being of the individual but empowered the individual to grapple with and change the structures that are responsible for that oppression and exploitation. I think if that's what you're doing, then I think you're doing peace psychology. I think you have to almost always start from the perspective of the oppressed or the powerless, and in that sense, I think it's pretty much linked to a liberation approach that seeks to provide voice and representation for the voiceless. Now, I suppose in the clinical sense you have to be pretty healthy to be able to do that, but not just as a practitioner but as the individual who is in need of help. I think to the extent that we are exercising empathy with a social justice mindset I think we're practicing peace psychology, and I come back to those twin concepts I mentioned before. I didn't want to beat them in the ground, but I really do think it comes down to harmony and equity. If you're promoting that in whatever capacity, then I think you're operating like a peace technologist.

**Pilisuk:** Waking up every day with an awareness of the damage being inflicted upon the world's people and their supportive habitats and a resolve to dig in more deeply to make the world a better place. Skepticism about what passes for news in the major media. Willingness to listen, deeply. And to encourage diverse approaches while still questioning claims that they have found the true solution. Willingness to risk going beyond one's comfort zone.

**Diaz:** A Peace Psychologist, for me, is someone that is committed to the reduction of violence yet understands the role of conflict in moving things forward. But, they also understand that conflict can also move things backwards. And so that I really believe that the minimal characteristics are: a person that's interested in reducing violence, creating community and attempting to resolve conflicts in a way that is not negative. I don't think they would advocate for a militarized solution to a lot of world problems.

I believe that we, as human beings, the most violent instruments that we use are—for those of us that don't carry outside weapons—what we say, what we write and what we do. For me, a Peace Psychologist is somebody that models constructive peace, somebody that knows that justice is the essence of violence prevention, and that understands you could have some apparent peace that is not satisfactory.

To me a Peace Psychologist is also someone that respects that not everybody is at the same stage of moral development as the psychologists themselves. I think we need to work with people where they are, we can't force people to be in a place where they—where you want them to be. So to me, a

Peace Psychologist is a person that respects how much of a minority we are. We are nowhere near the center of a normal distribution of humanity. We are at a fringe. I think it's probably less than one percent of us that is inclined to practice Peace Psychology.

**Reyes:** The most important thing is to get a handle, you'll never become an unbiased instrument, but to get a handle on your biases as much as possible because we're all so biased. When it comes to love and war, you know the old saying "all is fair in love and war". And what does that mean? It means it's okay to cheat. It means the gloves are off if everything is fair. For a peace psychologist to rise to the task, you really have to know yourself, and you really have to have the humility to be able to say, I can't really trust myself totally on this. That means you've got to work collaboratively with people, and not just with people who agree with you all the time. You've really got to be open to being challenged, and to be open to it is even not enough, you've really—you've got to accept it as a greater good. You have to accept that being challenged is a greater good than being agreed with, and that's really hard.

**MacNair:** Of course, they have to be trained in psychology, this being something that makes them different from other peace movement people. And then they need to understand the peace aspects of psychology. I mean, you have to have basic intellectual understanding. I think it is also crucial to be a good listener, and to learn from experience and to understand that conflict transformation is not simply something that we go out with intractable conflicts for other people, but that we need to do ourselves. We haven't always been good at that. There have



been times when people have been belligerent. This is counterproductive and we know it, and yet it happens anyway.

**Olson:** I don't think there's one good type of peace psychologist, but I do think there is some type of balance. I think we would be more effective if we did use the guidance of people like Martin Luther King, Gandhi, Eleanor Roosevelt, and others who were super sharp in negotiating war but uncompromising—kept their eye on the prize—but with dialogue. I think empathy is probably the most important piece of it all—those who really care and really feel for those who don't have the advantages of everybody else. So I'd probably put empathy first . . . I won't say spirituality, but there is some spirituality aspect about that. But I think we need to look inward. I think we need to be brave enough to speak outward, and I think we need to have endurance to keep working on some tasks. But I think we also need skills of speaking, writing, computers, and business—all those things. And I think within the specificity of psychology sometimes our training is too narrow. So I think having been interdisciplinary is also necessary and having some history.

*Does your analysis of what needs to be done to combat massive violence and destruction include what you yourself need to do?*

**Wessells:** Yes, I cannot own stock in companies that traffic in building munitions and weapons of mass destruction just because it helps to pay the bills and then on the other hand say that I'll offset that by working for peace. Now, if one is going to work for peace, you've got to take a look at yourself, and you have to take a critical look at your life, and ask about the way that I am in the world, am I

breeding destructive competition? Am I stepping other people and using them? Am I instrumentalizing them? Am I using power dynamics to gain my own position or benefit my own standing? Because if I am, then maybe I'm doing things even within the peace division that actually undermine peace.

A key point is that one can't model violence—beat your son, beat your wife and treat people badly—and be a peace psychologist. It has to start with the person, but it also can't end with the person. And I also feel passionately about this. We had significant debates when the peace division was formed about how central that ought to be in the program of peace psychology. People like me argued that, yes, it is highly important but it's not more important than preventing a war and stopping weapons of mass destruction, creating a livable world. It's an essential central part of it. So for me personal peace is an essential piece. It's necessary, but it's not sufficient. So it's one of those pillars. For me right now it's very interesting and fulfilling to watch the idea of a personal and interpersonal peace make a comeback. It is being articulated in a very constructive way that makes good sense

**Christie:** Yes. That's a tough one because I feel like everything I'm doing. I kind of had the luxury of working around those issues my whole life. I mean, for example, I was thinking, "What do I feel like I am doing?" Right now I'm getting this symposium together in South Africa and that works towards all these ends, and then I was thinking I was revising a paper and doing work with a colleague in Malaysia and it's looking at humanizing the other. And the underlying dynamic here is dehumanization, and I think it's hard to work on harmony and equity when

you dehumanize the other. So I think to me that's a key underlying issue to work with. But I'm also looking for that in everything I'm reading daily like the newspaper and Twitter, and elsewhere, and trying to familiarize myself and also monitor myself in the process.

This is why I'm enjoying reading some of the research looking at differences between Republicans and Democrats, because now I'm starting to be able to say, wait a minute we're just operating out of a different worldview. So let's understand this better. So it's all linked in my mind to how you live your life. To try in your own personal relationships to make things harmonious and equitable, but also more broadly to look at relations you have with folks around the world in the same way. Kind of does start with yourself, I guess. I don't know where else to start from.

On a wider level, we have to be active educating people about the psychological aftermath and horrors of mass violence, engage in activism, teaching and advocacy opposing it and its horrific "allies"—things like torture, human rights violations, structural violence and oppression, and extremist ideologies and demonic images that enable mass killing.

**Diaz:** Oh, yes. See, to be perfectly honest with you, I am trying my hardest to be as good a peace psychologist as I possibly can, it is what I try to demonstrate in my relationships with everybody I interact within the field of psychology or not. It may be with my grandchildren, with my faith community, or the Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement community. I moderated a panel in Kansas City after the Ferguson incident a few weeks ago and I was able to bring some peace

psychology to that community. I thought engaging with that panel was fruitful. I thought it was helpful because I helped some people understand why it is that the other—how it is that the other functions and why. One of the things that I try to do, anytime that I get a chance to, I try to at least model what I consider a minimal level of civility. This is to help us to address our differences in a manner that maximizes the probability that community can be built. I'm one of those that really believe that it is possible to live with people that don't think like I do. And, to not even live with them but actually work with them to accomplish some things we have as common goals though you may not be in the same political party. I think that's a living challenge. Peace Psychology has taught me how little is known about how to live with people of difference.

**Reyes:** That's where I resonate with that conversation we were having today about personal peace. Because part of me says, how can you ever really effectively achieve peace if you're at war inside yourself? If you're filled with conflicts? If you're carrying hostilities and resentments? We all suffered wounds of one kind or another from very early on. And I think we carry these wounds with us a lot longer than we like to admit. If we can develop that inner peace or what they're calling personal peace, then we're going to do less to feed the cycle. That said, you can take guns and bullets away from 98% of the human race, and the other 2% will kick our ass. But that doesn't mean it's not valuable. I'm working on it myself, and I think I'm going to work on it my whole life, and I don't think it will get finished.

**MacNair:** The basic thing is that when any group is hypocritical, it is less effective. This has been noted for millennia. I mean, Jews and Christians and Muslims and Buddhists and Hindus have all noted that there is a strong correlation between practitioners being hypocritical and being ineffective. And part of what happens is that when we do that it's like institutions that have been around for a couple thousand years that have not managed to avoid people coming in and being belligerent even though it's against the principles of the institution. So why would it be surprising that we have trouble with that as well? But, nevertheless, we know it is counterproductive.

**Olson:** I think it's always a constant struggle and one of my favorite quotes from Gandhi is that “the separation between truth and love”—so the absolute honest cognitive truths and love—emotion and empathy and care, they're like walking on the edge of the sword that it's always difficult, difficult balancing act. That we need to walk a very straight line and don't do a very good job, it's a very difficult task.

*What do you consider the priorities for peace psychology in today's landscape?*

**Wessells:** First of all, be persistent. None of us will ever get where we're going without being persistent. Sometimes the challenges that we face get the better of us and we start asking, “Are we really getting there?” But I'd say be persistent. Another is, “Find good role models and emulate them. Be like people like Mort Deutsch, Marc Pilisuk, Dorothy Ciarlo, and Anne Anderson. Practice forgiveness. Don't just speak it. When we disagree and some person or subgroup

within the division gets under our collar, find a way to not get too angry and to deal with it in a constructive way.

We need to have a practice of peace that enables us to feel, see, think and imagine in peaceful ways, and then enables us to be in it for the long haul. A high priority is to create a group ethos in which we take care of each other. Without always articulating in that way, that's how it was in the group that I had the privilege of working with at the time the division formed; I think that's what we did with and for each other. There were times when we disagreed vigorously, yet we talked it through and remembered our sense of teamwork and the collective good. Sometimes as individuals we may be reassessed priorities and workloads, but we found a way to work for the division, and we'd supported each other as we went. That's good living, and it's an important way of living. (Laughter) For me it was just a huge privilege to be part of the process. As I look back, I see that it was an amazing group of people.

**Christie:** We still have some barriers, I guess, in terms of some concerns about people referring to themselves as a peace psychologist. I mean I'm happy to hear that there is a growing number of people who are comfortable saying that's their field is peace psychology. But I think we have barriers there in terms how peace is looked at: peace is viewed as soft, not amenable to scientific scrutiny, and all those issues. So I think we still have challenges just with the brand in that sense, and making it acceptable for young scholars and activists to be able to embrace peace as something that has legitimacy. Peace has far more currency now than it did 20 years ago. I just did, not long ago, a look at how many times the word

“peace” is cited in the PsychINFO database. It's just extraordinary how seldom it was cited before '95 and then it starts moving up. And it isn't because of the Journal, because I factored that out. But it shows exponential growth.

When issues have to do with war and peace, the view is that psychology doesn't play a role. Even though, in many of the countries of the world, the biggest problem is of course intrastate violence, and it's about living in harmony and equity with others who are different. Peace psychology is not seen as terribly relevant in that regard. I don't think we always have the answers, because very often answers involve multiple levels. But I think we have pretty good diagnostic tools so that we can say, “Look, here is the problem. Here are the kinds of attributions that are being made that make it impossible for you to resolve issues. Or that the complexity of the problem-solving efforts isn't where they ought to be given what we know about the complexity of humans. Or as we've seen many times it's an enemy image that makes problem solving difficult.” We just haven't made inroads in that way. But we have had some modest impacts on policy, interestingly enough . . . I think the biggest struggle we have is making it clear what we have to offer, and applying that carefully, of course, not overreaching, but also not being shy about it. And somehow we will need to get to the millennials, I think. That's where the hope lies. It's not so much the folks who are around now, but the millennials bring changes. Somehow we ought to demonstrate why peace matters. We're at a disadvantageous position to do that now. Millennials are not facing the Vietnam War, for instance. And when we go to war, sacrifices aren't shared anymore. They're not shared broadly. Somehow

we have to make it clear how we have a vested interest there as well as making it clear how all the areas of psychology have something to contribute.

**Pilisuk:** I was president at the time when the division was concerned primarily with the dangers of war, particularly nuclear war . . . . Now I and some of my colleagues deal with restorative justice, military sexual abuse, U. S. Government assisted narc-trafficking, exploitation of overseas workers, corporate displacement of local communities causing massive numbers of refugees and slave trafficking that is condoned by major corporate entities.

Peace education and practices of inner peace—I am happy to see the door opened. I also fear that the division has lost some of its excitement by losing its focus on disarmament and the dangers of nuclear war, and by failing to confront APA’s strong involvement with the defense agencies and its contractors, even to the extent of working with agencies conducting torture.

**Diaz:** I think we have a world that is polarized and we have tons of different conflicts, some of which are militarized and some of which are not. We have a lot of research, but we don’t have a—we don't have a peace party to belong to, one that has a message that is accepted by a large body of people. I feel that many of us are basically disengaged from the movement because we’re so busy doing something else.

My feet are fairly firmly placed in the ground. I've been interacting with political systems and I know that they drive all of us to play a part. There's a very strong activist part of me. But, there’s also the part of me that respects the adversary or respects a colleague that may share some similar goals in most of our



areas of interest yet may differ on a particular aspect of peace psychology. I can shake the hand of people I don't like.

However, I find that we in peace psychology are not very good at tolerating dissent. Sometimes we act like those within totalitarian systems that I've been exposed to in my life. I think that's very unfortunate. I don't think it attracts a lot of the new talent. I miss the leadership of our pioneers, who unfortunately are dying off. I think there is so much more to peace psychology than what's occurring inside of APA. I think what's occurring inside of APA, which seems to affect so much of our listserv traffic, is such a small part of what needs to be done. I'm looking forward to some leadership contributions from the younger folks and to see what happens in the future. I pray that somewhere along the line, we'd become known for something other than just trying to hold an organization accountable for the misdeeds of a few people.

And the reason I say that is because my main interest, and it still remains my main interest, is to grow Peace Psychology. To have it become more of a household word in psychology departments, and to grow the movement. I do feel that there's a need to have a larger body, a large corporate effort of folks interested in finding out how to get along with people of difference.

**Reyes:** Peace psychologists—my mind goes to the problems because I think that we have problems that we have failed to confront, and until we do, I think we're not going to have the legitimacy that we seek . . . . I prefer to think that there is a lot of variation, and that the best way to come to understand something is to look at it from a lot of different angles, a lot of different vantage points. I think that

we've under sampled from a research perspective, we haven't looked at enough vantage points. We've looked where we wanted to look, and that's the navel-gazing problem.

We've also tended the sample from the people who are easy to sample from. Just like too many psychologists have based their studies on American sophomores and juniors, mostly juniors because they've declared a major, so now they are a psychology major and they are forced to participate in research as part of being in the major. So, what about all of those other kinds of folks? I'm not saying that it's that, I'm saying is that kind of thing.

When I look at peace psychology studies, I think, "What about those other kinds of folks that you're not questioning, that you're not connecting with? What about those people who are in much more decisive positions?" If you're doing a study of business I wouldn't say that you ought not talk to the entry-level employees, but you're not going to understand upper decision-making just talking the entry-level employees. What about the people who wage war? What's their psychology? What about the people who have had to make the decisions whether or not to go to war, whether or not to fire missiles, whether or not to send combat soldiers into situations, where is that? And so I know access isn't easy, but that goes back to why we use those undergraduate slaves. I think that we've got a ways to go in developing better methodology and better access to really understand what's going on. Instead what we understand better is how people are affected by conflict and violence, and that's not going to help prevent anything. I think you can learn from those kinds of things, I thought of things like cancer and

tooth decay. I mean, you can learn a little bit about how to prevent cancer by studying it downstream and tooth decay by studying decayed teeth, studying how they're affected. But at some point you have get up upstream, and understand where is that fork in the road that goes to cancer and not cancer? Where is that fork in the road that goes to war and not war? And how much of that is individual and how much of that is collective? And we can theorize all we want, but they're just theories until we have evidence for it.

I think we do need to be a bit of a counter force to military and corporate psychology. I think we need to do that in a non-violent way. I think we need to do it in a peaceful positive way. I think we need to use logic and persuasive arguments and make sure those get out there. And I think if we do that, we're going to achieve an incredible amount, but I do think that we need to stand up and be heard. But to do that in a very paradoxical way and a way that combines being critical, but also being positive—sort of Gandhi or Martin Luther King approach where there's not hatred in one's heart, but there is firm demand that this is what's right morally and ethically.

**MacNair:** I have to say everything. We need research. We need practice. We need activism. We need theory. We need to cover every topic we can think of covering because it is all connected and it all gets around. I like the way Daniel Berrigan put it. He said we know that all these kinds of violence are connected and there's just this web of connections to violence, but that also means that whenever you effectively counter one kind of violence, you're not only countering that one kind—it gets around to all the other kinds too. If you say we are not

dehumanizing in this situation, other situations will have more problem with dehumanizing as well. If we don't have school bullies then people grow up without having been bullies or having been bullied, then there's going to be less support for war because the theoretical underpinnings are sabotaged. Every place that you work to stop violence you're stopping one kind of violence, you're helping to stop all kinds of violence. And we need to spread. We need to have education go in with the activism and the research and all that. Education is in on that list. And we need to have people knowing more about these things.

And then get plenty of joy, take plenty of breaks, and don't get burned out because we're all in this for the long haul. I mean, it is one of the most definite things. I made a big point of it in my intro psych textbook. Everybody needs to know about burnout. We need to be really familiar with that. We are in this for the long haul. There is this story about this woman goes down for six weeks to a Latin American country and she's working hard. Then the locals there have a dance. And she says, "How can you have a dance? There is this emergency going on." And they say to her "You're leaving in 6 weeks. You can handle six weeks of emergency. We live here. This is the rest of our lives. We need some joy."

**Olson:** I think we do need to be a bit of a counter force to military and corporate psychology. I think we need to do that in a non-violent way. I think we need to do it in a peaceful positive way. I think we need to use logic and persuasive arguments and make sure those get out there. And I think if we do that, we're going to achieve an incredible amount, but I do think that we need to stand up and

be heard. But to do that in a very paradoxically way and a way that combines being critical, but also being positive—sort of Gandhi or Martin Luther King approach where there's not hatred in one's heart, but there is firm demand that this is what's right morally and ethically.

I feel like the American Psychological Association—I feel like psychology should be looking out for the most vulnerable. I think psychology should be looking out for those who are having the biggest psychological struggles. I think they should be working to change the macro structure to benefit those people. And I have the feeling that there's too much of a draw being in Washington, DC. There's too much of a draw for lobbyists and power and military influences that the American Psychological Association is saying “We want more and more power.” And they are sort of, in a lot of ways, going against what I and many others have entered psychology to do. So we sort of feel like the field, the American Psychological Association, is a current that's working against the ability of psychology to do good and help people who really need it.

## Chapter 5

### Discussion

The central theme that emerged from the participant interviews is that these peace psychologists all apply psychologically informed interventions to direct conflict away from violent outcomes and toward peaceful outcomes. The participants in this research each demonstrated how peace psychology is a field in which this is specifically applied to individual and collective conflicts.

The types of conflicts the participants engage with varies. For example, Wessells currently travels worldwide and is an expert on treating children who are victims of war. At Randolph-Macon College, Wessells pioneered teaching a course on aggression at the personal, interpersonal, family, community, societal, and global levels using a systems frame that allowed students to understand how social environments and systems shape people. He then went on to create a peace psychology curriculum and developed courses in the dynamics of conflict in domestic and international settings and the means of conflict transformation. Christie has positioned peace psychology as a foundational discipline for programs in peace and conflict studies around the world. His co-edited textbook, *Peace, Conflict, and Violence: Peace Psychology for the 21st Century*, which may be viewed and downloaded for free online, has been used in classrooms globally. Christie is also editor of the *Peace Psychology Book Series*, which has 25 titles as of this writing, and the editor of the landmark three volume *Encyclopedia of Peace Psychology*, which was published in 2012 and contains over 300 peace psychology topics. Pilisuk teaches extensively on conflict resolution, globalization, ecological psychology, and sustainability. Reyes' academic career has connected his social justice advocacy interests

to psychology. He teaches crisis intervention, approaches to traumatic stress and PTSD, coping, resilience, attachment theory, and disaster mental health interventions. Diaz has provided mental health services in his work with traumatized and displaced children in Cuban refugee camps, provided family therapy services to low-income and culturally diverse communities, and worked in criminal justice heading the Independent Review Panel for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement in Miami-Dade County. MacNair focuses her research on the psychology of peace, perpetration-induced traumatic stress (PITS), and topics which align with her personal commitment to a consistent life ethic. Olson, as a community psychologist, focuses his teaching on a wide variety of human and civil rights issues, advocacy and activism, participatory action research, and ethics, and has developed a theory of social action called the temporal model of social action, which connects psychological elements with actions that lead to effective activism.

While the applications of peace psychology are varied, the underlying psychological principles upon which peace psychology is practiced are constant. They have emerged from the development of a psychological understanding of conflict, violence, and peace which have been central themes since the psychology's inception. It is the specific interrelationship of these three elements that forms the central axis upon which peace psychologists provide effective interventions. This chapter contains an outline of the key findings in the literature review that describe the dynamics involved in interrelationships of conflict, peace, and violence, and how these were reported by the participants.

## The Psychology of Conflict

**Conflict is a both a conscious and unconscious process.**

Psychologists expanded the consideration of voluntary and involuntary conflicts occurring in the biology of nervous and muscular systems to include emotional and psychological areas. Conflict is described in the Encyclopedia Britannica as follows.

Conflict, in psychology, the arousal of two or more strong motives that cannot be solved together. . . . Conflicts are not all equally severe . . . The conflicts that involve intense threat or fear are not solved readily but make the person feel helpless and anxious. Subsequent adjustments may then be directed more to the relief of anxiety than to the solution of real problems. Conflicts are often unconscious, in the sense that the person cannot clearly identify the source of his distress. Many strong impulses—such as fear and hostility—are so much disapproved by the culture that a child soon learns not to acknowledge them, even to himself. When such impulses are involved in a conflict, the person is anxious but does not know why. He is then less able to bring rational thinking to bear on the problem. (“Conflict,” 2014)

Freud’s work on the conscious and unconscious workings of the inner psyche was critical to this discovery of the layers of consciousness (S. Freud & Billet, 1939/1999). Freud described the areas of the psyche that are available to us cognitively as conscious, those that are just below consciousness, pre-conscious, and those that are inaccessible to consciousness, unconscious. He described the unconscious as “the deepest strata of our minds, made up of instinctual impulses” (S. Freud, 1915/1953, pp. 21–22). Freud’s theory of the unconscious was expanded though object relations theory developed by



Rand and reintroduced in the 1940s and 1950s by Fairbairn, Klein, Winnicott, Guntrip, Stuart, and others (Hartman, 1999). Jung expanded Freud's theory to discover not only an individual unconscious, but also a collective unconscious that operates in larger contexts such as groups, cultures, and shared experiences (N. A. Lewin, 2009). Bion added further contributions by discovering the unconscious elements that work within groups and the roles of splitting, projection, apportioning roles, and scapegoating (Bion, 1961). These concepts have been continually expanded by psychologists such as Mosses (1966), Meissner (1984). Volkan (1996) focused on the effects of intergenerational transmission of trauma on both groups and individuals. Volkan (1988) also focused on how specific ethnic groups' experiences of conflict become deeply ingrained in the psyche of the culture.

Defining conflict as having both conscious and unconscious elements suggests that depth psychology is suited to studying the full range of dynamics in conflicts. A confirmation or disavowal of the importance of the unconscious processes to peace psychology was sought from the participants. The participants responded affirmatively when asked if the unconscious is a component of peace psychology. Wessells noted that "so much in psychology . . . and human functioning [can be traced] back to depth psychology." "The core idea," Wessells stated, "that there is a lot in human motivation that is at least opaque if not inaccessible to human consciousness, is profound and accurate." He mentioned culture, social norms, and other forces influence our motivations in ways "we are only dimly aware of, yet they shape us in myriad ways." He stated,

Without the capacity to recognize the unconscious . . . I think we get caught up in hypocrisies, superficialities, and become complicit in a whole variety of things that we should not want to be complicit in from the standpoint of peace. . . .

Cultural psychology, community psychology, and gender psychology all feed into peace psychology and help us to begin to unpack where those narratives come from, what they mean, why they're there, whose interests they represent, and what's wrong with the dominant narratives that most of us accept. It doesn't look and act like traditional depth psychology, but in a funny way I think it's a descendant of it.

Christie mentioned that “early in the development of peace psychology, there were a lot of folks who spoke and wrote about depth psychology,” including analyzing the “nuclear war issue” from a depth perspective. Subsequent issues such as “chosen traumas” and Volkan’s (1988) book, *The Need to Have Enemies and Allies* referred to depth psychology’s contributions to understanding “subtle forms of racism seen in everyday life.” More recently, Christie mentioned the many studies done on terror management theory, which research “what happens when you put somebody in a situation that threatens their worldview.” Reactions in the United States to 9/11, for example, “were more easily understood through the lens of terror management theory.” Christie discussed the possibility that the next international symposium of the Committee for the Psychological Study of Peace could focus on immigration. “I expect a great deal of the discussion will center on the role of peace psychology in dealing with the unconscious as people look at social identity, racism, and immigration.” Christie also referenced studies in Europe on “implicit kinds of prejudice.” MacNair explained that to properly diagnose

a patient presenting with PTSD symptoms, the clinician needs to do “some digging” and that sometimes content is found in the person’s dreams which refer to depth psychology’s domains. Diaz responded affirmatively, but cautioned that “few psychologists that are involved in peace psychology, that I am aware of, spend a lot of time even mentioning the unconscious. Yet I think most of what is available to know, we still haven’t accessed.” Olson referred to the implicit prejudice tests used in social psychology as “unconscious processes.” He also referenced the undercurrents in activism as another example.

**Conflict creates an imbalance in a system designed to be in balance.**

Psychologists have applied functions to the mind that are similar to those physiologists apply to an organism’s function. Physiologists use the term *homeostasis* to refer to an organism’s innate ability to maintain internal stability in the face of environmental changes. The human body’s ability to maintain a constant temperature is an example of homeostasis. This self-regulating capacity also applies to the psychological domain. Freud proposed that all mental processes operate within a system that tends toward equilibrium and stability. Freud called this “the principle of constancy” (S. Freud, 1922/1949). Thus, when conflict disrupts equilibrium, the principle of constancy pushes for rebalancing, for equilibrium. This principle of constancy has no moral or value-based agenda, just a requirement that imbalance demands a re-balance. Freud, Jung, James, and others recognized that it was the inner conflicts within the psyche that caused mental anguish and suffering which, in their more extreme presentations, present as mental illness and psychotic states. The growth of the fields of depth and clinical psychology that specifically address mental imbalances and conflicts in

clinical settings was discussed in the literature review. However, the study of conflict permeates many other areas of psychology

**Conflict engages defense mechanisms which mask root causes.**

Balance, or equilibrium, is a psychological necessity, and the preferred emotional state is positive affect; therefore, the psyche has many techniques that can avoid the pain of negative affects. The literature review included a discussion of the discovery of unconscious psychological mechanisms that block awareness of the root causes of conflict. S. Freud (1989/1964), A. Freud (1946), and Vaillant (1977) have grounded the theory of defense mechanisms in psychology. As unconscious processes, defense mechanisms can be deciphered by paying attention to conscious behaviors, thoughts, and actions. through their aftermath, but operate as automatic unconscious processes. The complexity of an individual's biological, psychological, cultural, and other factors makes defense mechanisms as individual as a fingerprint. Unexamined, the individual remains unaware of the root cause of conflict and remains captivated by the activated results of the defense mechanism's strategy. In essence, defense mechanisms distract or mislead a conscious awareness of the cause of conflict. MacNair touched on the effect of this phenomenon as it applies to groups when she remarked, "The basic thing is that when any group is hypocritical, it is less effective."

Issues peace psychologists work with all include evidence of defense mechanisms ignited by conflict. Denial is one that Christie anecdotally referenced in politicians' reactions to Lasswell's book, *Psychopathology and Politics* (1930/1977), which was published in the 1930s. Christie remarked their statements would align with those that reaffirmed "I don't want to hear that! It's not me!" Christie gave examples of repression

via authoritarian personality research that “was thought to be mainly due to harsh parenting that somehow winds up being internalized and finds expression in things like the endorsement of capital punishment.” Christie also mentioned the use of projection when dehumanizing others. “I was revising a paper and doing work with a colleague in Malaysia and it's looking at humanizing the other. And the underlying dynamic here is dehumanization, and I think it's hard to work on harmony and equity when you dehumanize the other.” Pilisuk commented, “I recall taking time from our very busy meetings to ask whether we were sufficiently addressing the needs of minorities and of women. Now I and some of my colleagues deal with restorative justice, military sexual abuse, U. S. government-assisted narco-trafficking, exploitation of overseas workers, corporate displacement of local communities causing massive numbers of refugees, and slave trafficking that is condoned by major corporate entities.” Making the point that even peace psychologists have room to improve how they interpersonally deal with conflict, Diaz stated, “However, I find that we in peace psychology are not very good at tolerating dissent. Sometimes we act like those within totalitarian systems that I've been exposed to in my life. I think that's very unfortunate.”

**Conflict involves the coexistence of opposites.**

The existence of another underlying property of the psyche is also a critical factor in peace psychology. This factor is the coexistence of opposites. This is key to peace psychology because it explains why emotions can instantly switch into their opposites. In Freud's terms, Eros (love, joy, and peace) is also present in its opposite form Thanatos (hatred, grief, and aggression; Ikonen & Recharadt, 1978). Jung used the analogy of archetypes to describe the continuum where the opposites interplay (Mansfield &

Spiegelman, 1991). Jung (1963/1989) wrote in his autobiography about getting a glimpse of this as a teenager.

Faust struck a chord in me and pierced me through in a way that I could not but regard as personal. Most of all, it awakened in me the problem of opposites, of good and evil, of mind and matter, of light and darkness. (p. 235)

Jung explored the wider resonances of this in his writings and used terms such as the coincidence of opposites (*coincidentia oppositorum*); the conjunction of opposites (*coniunctio oppositorum*); and “the tension of opposites, compensation, complementarity, enantiodromia, and psychic balance” (Henderson, 2010, p. 101). Reyes spoke anecdotally to this in his interview.

When I was looking at those [depth psychological] traditions, I did some reading in Jungian psychology. To be honest with you, I thought it was right in essence, and I had a signal-to-noise ratio problem with it. Meaning that there’s a lot of stuff that I would read that people would come up with, and I was like, yes either that or the opposite is true which is something I say to myself. That’s not me pointing the finger at other people. The first time I ever said that, I said that about myself because I had a really strong opinion that I was sharing with a friend of mine. I realized that I was allowing myself to have a pretty extremely strong opinion which is fine, I don’t like to be wishy-washy, but if you think of an opinion as having a line and it’s like really strongly on this side or really strongly on that side of the teeter-totter. I was way to one side and that meant the whole continuum was over on the other side. So I turned to my friend and I said, “Well either that, or the opposite is true.” And he busted out laughing! It was just a

moment of insight—that the more strongly you believe that you're right, the more you've raised the possibility—to the extent that you're being extreme, at least—that there's that whole rest of the continuum that you're leaving out.

**Conflict is resolved either with violent or peacebuilding strategies.**

Two directions for resolution are available when conflict is present. One direction is to move toward aggression and anger (of which violence is the most extreme expression) to provide immediate relief to the disruption of constancy. The other direction is to interrupt the trend toward anger and engage processes that cause peaceful resolution of the conflict. Research undertaken by the Uppsala Conflict Data Program revealed that post-conflict peace lasted longer when peacekeepers intervened. The literature review in chapter 2 provides a chronological overview of how these three concepts—conflict, peace, and violence—have developed and expanded within the theory and practice of psychology. Research studies regarding conflict and violence have been a focal point since psychology was founded and culminated in the establishment of peace psychology in 1990; research and refinement continue to this day. Diaz summarized this when he said, “a peace psychologist, for me, is someone that is committed to the reduction of violence yet understands the role of conflict in moving things forward. But, they also understand that conflict can also move things backwards.”

**The Psychology of Violence**

**Violence is both overt and subtle.**

Peace psychology was initially focused on the threat of nuclear warfare.

However, participants mentioned that changing global dynamics, such as perestroika in

1989, required looking at violence beyond just direct conflict. Violence as researched in peace psychology has expanded as outlined by Christie:

Substantive challenges dealt with the question, “What’s the division about now that the Cold War is over?” That’s when I think we made a good and important move towards enlarging the scope of our work and our interests and our activism to include structural violence and peace building so that we weren’t narrowly focused on the prevention of violent episodes, and in particular a nuclear “exchange.” Having backed out of that, we enlarged our scope of interest, at least here in the west. I know they had structural violence as a focal interest in other parts of the world all the while. But we were quite unaware of global developments in what would later fall under the rubric of peace psychology in other parts of the world. But this notion of structural violence became important and I remember giving a talk; my Presidential Address was on human needs. Then Marc Pilisuk followed the next year with structural violence, and same kind of theme. Milton Schwebel published something in the Journal about the same time on structural violence. So it seemed like the division had moved from its original narrow focus, I would say, on nuclear issues to broader substantive issues that pertain not just to direct violence but to structural violence, and the roots of violent episodes, the structural and cultural roots of violence. There was, I think, a fairly important substantive shift sometime around the mid 90s.

**Violence destroys relationships and health.**

The need for violence reduction globally has made peace one of five millennium goals of the United Nations. The damage to human health resulting from violence



globally is recognized by the World Health Organization; violence was named the leading risk factor to health. The study of violence for the purpose of alleviating human suffering has permeated psychological research. However, the research demonstrates that since WWII psychology has been considered the third leg of warfare by the military. Recent revelations have led to allegations that the APA has supported the application of psychology to the torture of suspected terrorists and colluded in the Department of Defense's application of psychology to do harm (Goodman & Gonzales, 2015; McCarthy, 2015; Risen, 2015). Hedges (2009) stated that "psychologists are the only group of health care providers who openly participate in interrogations at military and CIA facilities," noting that both the American Psychiatric Association and the American Medical Association both forbid such practices (p. 128). Olson spoke about peace psychology being a "counter force to the military and corporate psychology" in a "non-violent way." He referred to the examples of Gandhi or Martin Luther King's approaches "where there's not hatred in one's heart, but there is firm demand that this is what's right morally and ethically." He also reaffirmed his view of psychology as "looking out for the most vulnerable . . . those with the biggest psychological struggles." However, the actions comprising the APA's support of the military, Olson stated, "is a current that's working against the ability of psychology to do good and help people who really need it . . . and I don't blame them as individuals, but those who are in a structural system of violence and profit are dominant."

The participants were also very frank about how disagreements have been handled within the membership in ways that have both built the organization and diminished it. Wessells mentioned,

To me it's natural within any group of human beings no matter how loving, no matter how well-intentioned, there will be disagreements. The impact of them comes down to how we are in the midst of the disagreements. Are we true to our values of peace? Or, are we allowing ourselves to become in a way that—on our better days—we might look and say, “That's not how I ought to be.”

Two participants gave examples that reinforce peace psychology's premise that conflict can either tend toward peacebuilding or violence, and the importance of peacebuilding interventions. Wessells praised the teamwork that he experienced in the formation of the division. “There were times when we disagreed vigorously, yet we talked it through and remembered our sense of teamwork and the collective good.” MacNair discussed the internal disagreements over the response to APA's Psychological Ethics and National Security (PENS) report. “[I]f you look at the membership figures this is the elephant in the room. Nobody said it, but the downturn in the membership figures, and then the holding steady, tracks almost perfectly with people being belligerent on the listserve over that issue.”

Psychologists have demonstrated that a mind's operations are value-neutral and operate in response to certain patterns outlined by the governing principles of constancy, the co-existence of opposites, and defense mechanisms. Conflict creates a disruption of constancy and an immediate demand for resolution in either one of two directions: toward violence or toward peacebuilding. Research study results also confirm the complexity of the influencing elements that affect whether conflict is resolved with equity and harmony or whether aggression is activated.

## The Psychology of Peace/Peacebuilding

### Peace psychology redefines peace.

James established an understanding of how peace was conceived as the field of psychology emerged in the early 1900's. He noted (1911/2008b) that "every up-to-date dictionary should say that 'peace' and 'war' mean the same thing" (p. 110). The topic of peace in psychological literature has been analyzed by Christie:

It's just extraordinary how seldom it was cited before '95 and then it starts moving up. And it isn't because of the Journal, because I factored that out. But it shows exponential growth. So I think the study of peace is more acceptable, but I think there's still a major barrier. In part because of positivism, and the sort of defensiveness that's built into psychology. Most intro books start with, "We are a science and here's why." But it isn't just that. It's that peace is associated with passivism, rather than social justice. In many parts for the world, peace has terrible connotations because it's associated with being passive under authoritarian rule. And so, outside the United States, we have that issue to deal with. It's a big one. What we mean is peace with social justice. Well, it's better called *just peace*. We have yet to make it clear that we are talking not just about living harmoniously, but we are talking about living with equity in relationships.

Proponents of peace psychology have redefined peace to include a requirement for peace to include, as Christie stated, "harmony and equity in relations not just between people, but between and among networks of people, globally." Participants discussed the difficulty in using the word *peace* because it is viewed, as Christie stated, as

soft, not amenable to scientific scrutiny, and all those issues. So from the Western perspective, peace doesn't have the trappings of a scientific construct the way it ought to. And then internationally it has this connotation of passivism. So when you move out of the West you start to deal with the passivism issue. There are other conceptual barriers as well.

### **Peacebuilding in peace psychology.**

Peace psychology was initially founded to address the threat of nuclear war. Christie described how peacebuilding was quickly added as a goal at the same time the division expanded to include the study of structural violence. Peacebuilding was described as an open, emergent, exploratory process designed to discover harmonious and equitable resolutions of conflict using nonviolent interventions.

Participants echoed the premise that peacebuilding is not an exclusive domain of psychology, but is a process informed by the best research psychology has to offer in combination with many other disciplines and participants. Christie stated, “Besides the larger framework of peace and conflict studies, the multidisciplinary look at the same issues that psychologists and peace psychologists look at was already there.” Participants described essential components of peacebuilding as questioning the status quo, observing interactions, collaboratively determining needs, and empowering individuals and groups to meet those needs.

Peacebuilding is a collaborative endeavor. It also entails a willingness to be immersed in the heat of negative emotions and tensions without being unduly affected by them, as well as an ability to keep an unwavering focus on mutual goals rather than individual agendas. Strategies are cohesive and comprehensive and use combinations of

the best scientific results from all areas of psychology (e.g., social, political, community, developmental, humanistic, experimental, clinical, neuropsychology), as well as other disciplines such as sociology, political science, history, and cultural anthropology.

Researchers test the scalability, adaptability, and results of various interventions. Their goal is to discover psychologically informed interventions that can replace traditional power-over processes, which perpetuate direct and structural violence, with transformative processes that achieve solutions that are both harmonious and equitable.

The image of a kaleidoscope evolved in my imagination when considering how to describe peace psychology's applications to peacebuilding. This kaleidoscope has three parts, two functions, and one guaranteed outcome. The parts are: (a) a cylinder with an opening through which a viewer may observe, (b) a cell containing many colorful bits that can create an infinite number of random combinations, and (c) very precisely placed mirrors. The function of the cylinder is to serve as the container (a safe space) in which the mirror functions (reflecting, questioning, transparency, allowing), presenting the viewer with an unlimited set of designs that are balanced (equitable) and aesthetically pleasing (harmonious) no matter how the cell of bits and pieces is moved. Without the containment and mirroring, the bits would simply be unrelated bits. This symbolized to me that the psychological processes of peace psychology allow the same symmetry and beauty to emerge out of the conflicting elements that challenge harmony and equity in human, societal, or international relationships.

### **Peacebuilding and personal peacefulness.**

Throughout the development of concern over war and peace in the field of psychology, a common theme arose that there could be no peace in the world if there was

not peace in oneself. I am grateful to Pilisuk, who added this specific question to the interview: “Does your analysis of what needs to be done to combat massive violence and destruction include what you yourself need to do?” All participants responded in the affirmative to the question, and brought out important aspects of how this plays out in their individual lives. It was clear that simply intending to pursue peace is not enough, although it is a beginning point. Rather, it involves individuals committing to an ongoing process of monitoring their own prejudices, judgments, reactions, and inner peacefulness. In no case was attaining and maintaining personal peacefulness portrayed as easy, and one participant referred to it as “a constant struggle.” All participants noted that while peacebuilding begins within the person, it does not end there. It involves how individuals conduct themselves within all relationships, starting with their relationships with themselves. Wessells articulated the need to:

Have a practice of peace that enables us to feel, see, think, and imagine in peaceful ways, and then enables us to be in it for the long haul. So for me personal peace is an essential piece. It’s necessary, but it's not sufficient. So it's one of those pillars. For me right now it's very interesting and fulfilling to watch the idea of a personal and interpersonal peace make a comeback. It is being articulated in a very constructive way.

The question of why psychologically informed strategies are useful in peacebuilding was answered by the evidence. It works. Not as a one-time remedy, but as an expanding capacity within people to suspend judgments and trust that revealing their own authenticity can serve as an open invitation to others to do the same. This creates an

environment in which equitable solutions can be built, relationships can be improved, and long-term resiliency to manage future challenges can be sustained.

### **Peacebuilding's essential tools.**

Peacebuilding is a relational endeavor involving an individual's relationship with self and with others. Clinical psychologists laid the groundwork for treating conflicts within oneself which, in turn, can improve external relationships. Clinical psychologists have also undertaken decades of research in family, group, and couples therapy, all of which treat the relationship as the client. Depth psychologists use the transference and countertransference that occurs in the therapeutic relationship to inform their interventions. Other specialties of psychology contribute significantly to understanding the psychology of how we relate to ourselves and others. Peace psychologists have built on the psychological knowledge gained from treating conflict in relationships to identify specific psychological tools that are essential to peacebuilding. Participants' responses to describing the essential characteristics of peace psychology started with their own self-care, and expanded from there. Personal health and self-care were mentioned as foundational to the effective use of the identified psychological tools, especially because the work involves maintaining equanimity amid the stressors involved when serving as the midwife in the process of redirecting conflicts toward integration and resolution. Diaz stated, "A peace psychologist is someone that is committed to the reduction of violence yet understands the role of conflict in moving things forward."

Important tools also included the qualities of empathy, caring, listening, self-awareness, respect, vision, collaboration, humility, curiosity, openness, justice, equality, creating community, and an orientation of non-violence when negotiating. A knowledge

of psychology was implied and specifically addressed by MacNair. However, Reyes cautioned that “within the specificity of psychology, our training is too narrow. So being ‘interdisciplinary and having some history’ are also important.” The quality of caring was expanding to include not just caring for those in an individual’s relational circle, but also a global caring for humanity. Wessells mentioned starting from the perspective of the “oppressed or the powerless . . . [which is] linked to a liberation approach that seeks to provide voice and representation for the voiceless.” Christie emphasized the need for interventions to build the capacity of others to “grapple with and change the structures that are responsible for that oppression and exploitation. . . . It comes down to harmony and equity. If you’re promoting that in whatever capacity, then I think you’re operating like a peace technologist.” Deep listening, questioning, and maintaining a healthy skepticism about the media’s interpretations of news or presented solutions encourages flexibility and an openness to diverse approaches according to Pilisuk. Also mentioned was the need for realism to accept that some peace may not be satisfactory and that militarized solutions are not a sustainable solution to the world’s problems. Diaz cautioned that “what we say, what we write, and what we do” can all serve as violent weapons. He also emphasized the need to “work with people where they are; we can’t force people to be in a place where . . . you want them to be.” Reyes emphasized managing one’s biases. “We need to look inward. We need to be brave enough to speak outward, and we need to have endurance to keep working.”



### **Psychologically informed peacebuilding is effective.**

Research continues to support the effectiveness of peacebuilding strategies using the tools developed by peace psychologists. Participants' input highlighted several roles in which these tools are producing positive results. They include:

- mediators whose psychological training and personal skills of non-judgment, deep listening, empathy, and curiosity are applied toward interceding or acting as intermediaries in conflictual situations in order to facilitate a process that promotes both harmony and equity;
- researchers who conduct scientific investigations using quantitative and qualitative methodologies to study violence, peace, and conflict in order to design interventions that are preventative, restorative, skill-building, self-reinforcing, durable, portable, scalable, and culturally sensitive;
- humanitarians who seek to promote human welfare and well-being at all levels of society with a sensitivity to honoring all cultural contexts;
- reformers who work to correct structurally violent flaws within the parent organization such as the APA's changes in ethics policies allowing psychologists to participate in torture, and its allegiances to specific military operations that apply the psychology of fear and intimidation to maintain peace;
- educators teaching in undergraduate and graduate disciplines focused on diplomacy, conflict resolution, and conflict and peace studies; and
- diplomats advocating policy change directed toward alleviating human suffering.

Wessells gave these examples:

We have had some modest impacts on policy, interestingly enough. Herbert Kelman years ago talked about how the kind of unofficial diplomacy work he was doing created the conditions that made the Oslo Accord possible. The Accord hasn't been sustainable, of course, in Israeli and Palestinian relations. But he did feel like those inputs did make a difference at that point in time. And then you have, of course, some real obvious policy impacts on structural issues, like testimonies psychologists gave for the problem of separate but equal, and integrating schools in the U. S. A lot of that was based on psychologically informed research and testimony by psychologists. So, there was a role there. A major one in South Africa was that the Truth and Reconciliation Commission that was going to take place behind closed doors until political groups organized and changed the law so that many testimonies were made public. These changes were a result of political actions by Khulumani groups that were actually formed by psychologists for people who were going to testify, and the notion was that we'll need to provide support for victims prior to, during, and after their testimony. And these groups became politically empowered and active and changed the articles that described how the truth and reconciliation commission would work. Not all, but a lot of the testimony was broadcast publicly. So that change in policy was in part due to the role of psychologists who were there providing support to Khulumani groups.

It was psychologists who testified at The Hague that women who experienced rape during the Bosnian War needed more support in order to come

forward, and that made a difference. So there are places where psychologists have made a difference. It's just that we don't often explore these things carefully enough. I think a lot of times it's a matter of reverse engineering things: here's the policy, now let's back up and see how this happened, what were the inputs early on. That's how I don't despair personally. I start thinking well, the profession has had a big input and a lot of times it's been negative, admittedly in matters of war, but we've also had inputs in matters of peace. So I think the biggest struggle we have is making it clear what we have to offer, and applying that carefully, of course, not overreaching, but also not being shy about it.

## Chapter 6

### Conclusions and Implications for Future Research

If civilization is to survive, we must cultivate the science of human relationships—the ability of all peoples, of all kinds, to live together, in the same world at peace.

—Franklin D. Roosevelt

The culture of peace and non-violence is a commitment to peace-building, mediation, conflict prevention and resolution, peace education, education for non-violence, tolerance, acceptance, mutual respect, intercultural and interfaith dialogue and reconciliation.

—UNESCO

### Conclusions

This research study was designed to examine the contributions of peace psychologists (a) to psychology in general, and clinical and depth psychology in particular, to peacebuilding; (b) clarify the roles, individual characteristics essential to the practice, and the lived examples of how the participants' own personalities, psychological training, and social justice orientations brought them to establish this new field of psychology; and (c) the future of peace psychology. The research and findings demonstrate that peace psychology is built upon the psychological interrelationship of conflict, peace, and violence.

Peace psychology specifically focuses on conflict because it is the cause of disequilibrium and the nexus between violence and transformation of conflict toward peacebuilding. Conflict disrupts psychological stasis. It is also value neutral because it does not assign judgement to conflict or preferences to outcomes. Conflict and constancy co-exist as the operational paradigm of the psyche that is co-located in differences, opposites, limitations (structural, resource, physical, mental), mortality, survival needs,

instincts, and laws of nature, to name a few. Thus, the distinctive feature of conflict is that it consists of binary, two-valued oppositions or contrasts, such as love and hate, or violence and peace, which are operating in a system driven toward equilibrium. Conflict is both a conscious and unconscious process and the tools of depth psychology and clinical psychology have had a direct bearing on an understanding of how conflict operates in these domains. The difficulty of getting to root causes of conflict is that the psyche has unconscious mechanisms, albeit well intended, to maintain our psychological state in positive affects, but that actually deflect the negative affect away from consciousness, creating a false peace that is not sustainable. Defense mechanisms work both within individuals and within all group relationships. Psychology is the science that has offered an understanding of how these operate and how they can be treated to bring awareness to deep conflicts and then assist in permanent growth and transformation of conflicts.

Violence is understood in peace psychology as starting as a psychological state before it manifests in the many forms it takes today. The focus of peace psychology expanded very soon after its establishment as a practice area to include not just direct, but also structural, violence. Violence is specifically addressed because it destroys relationships at all levels. Violence is also the leading stressor to health. Psychology has been addressing violence in its many variations since the field's inception, and with peace psychology channels this knowledge to assist directly in its reduction.

Peace psychology has also redefined peace as a psychological state within relationships and shown that it can be evaluated through scientific research. The definition of peace is centered on two measures of a relationship—harmony and equity.

This applies not only to individuals' relationships with themselves, but is also a factor that can be measured in all external relationships. The instrument of measure is not as precise as a reading on a temperature thermometer because a psychological state, often including many relationships that are not accessible, is evaluated. This increases the complexity of assessment and treatment. Research is a central focus of the field of peace psychology and continues to contribute to the expansion of knowledge in this field. The first tool peace psychologists' use is their own personal peacefulness. With conscious awareness of their own psychological state, they then access a range of tools in their relational work. These include empathy, caring, deep listening, respect, collaboration, humility, curiosity, openness, justice, and many others. The examples given by the participants as well as published research presented in *Conflict and Peace: Journal of Peace Psychology* demonstrate that peacebuilding using these tools is effective. Evidence was given on both an individual and global scales.

In conclusion, the research and findings demonstrate that peace psychology provides an open, multi-platform, and scientific process with which to explore the applications of psychology specific to a reduction of violence at all levels of human relationships. Many disciplines contribute to an understanding of violence prevention, conflict mediation, and conflict resolution; however, the operation of conflict within the psychological framework has been the focus of this discipline since its inception. The literature review contains a historical review of the evolution of this study in the field, the diversification that happened in the middle of the 20th century, and the further specialization that resulted in the launch of peace psychology in 1990. The participants

clearly established their applications of psychology to a reduction of conflict and explained how those applications are woven into the larger context of peace psychology.

History demonstrates that peacebuilding is an essential component of sustaining life. Its study as a science has been undertaken in many disciplines. Psychology contributes an understanding of the emotional, psychological, neurological, and behavioral factors that promote wellbeing. Thus, peace psychology is contributing to the science of psychologically informed interventions to reduce violence in human relationships.

### **Implications for Future Research**

Peace psychologists demonstrated that all situations involving human interactions, both internally and externally, involve the psychological process of managing conflict. This study indicates that the application of peace psychology to societal and national conflicts is not only minimized within its own profession, but also not acknowledged within other disciplines focused on peace studies, conflict mediation, violence reduction, and conflict resolution. Future research that is interdisciplinary and focused on higher levels of decision making would add significantly to the peacebuilding reservoir of interventions.

The findings also indicate that peace psychology blends many special areas of psychology beyond clinical psychology, and that future peace psychology practitioners could benefit from identifying and understanding this. In addition, results point to the legitimacy of depth psychology as it pertains to more fully analyzing causes of conflict, instances of violence, and the durability of peacebuilding. The desirability of conducting more research linking depth psychology findings to the fields of conflict, violence, and

peace was mentioned. Peace psychologists study the spectrum of conflicts to understand how and where they affect people both internally (within oneself) and externally, for example, in relationships, groups, communities, and nations. A confirmation or disavowal of the importance of unconscious processes in peacebuilding was sought from the participants. The participants' responses confirmed that the unconscious is a component of peace psychology. A theme among the responses was that more research should be encouraged.

The findings demonstrate that peace psychology lacks visibility within the field of psychology even within its parent organization. It was noted that to overcome this, the field could benefit from further integration with other disciplines and other specialty areas of psychology. Additionally, the findings showed that there are still branding difficulties the field faces in using the term *peace* as part of a scientific process such as the use of the word peace in authoritarian countries because it's associated with passivism rather than resolution and equality. This serves as a barrier to receiving input from other disciplines and specialty areas of psychology. Peace psychology's future depends on intermixing the best from all fields of study. Eliminating the perceptual barriers is essential.

Finally, peace psychology sets a high standard for the humanitarian applications of psychology, and by contrast, calls into question the relationship of psychology to military operations that support aggression. The findings indicate that this is a central challenge to psychology's future as a credible, helping profession.



## References

- Abelson, H. J. (1959). *Persuasion*. New York, NY: Springer.
- About Marc Pilisuk. (2011). Retrieved from <http://marcpilisuk.com/bio.html>
- Adams, D. (1996). *War is not in our biology: A decade of the Seville statement on violence*. Paris, France: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. Retrieved from [www.culture-of-peace.info/vita/1997/biology.pdf](http://www.culture-of-peace.info/vita/1997/biology.pdf)
- Adams, D., & Bosch, S. (1987). Peace by young people. In J. M. Ramirez, R. Hinde, & J. Grobel (Eds.), *Essays in violence* (pp. 121–127). Seville, Spain: University of Seville.
- Albertazzi, L., Libardi, M., & Poli, R. (Eds.). (1996). *The school of Franz Brentano*. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer Academic.
- American Peace Society. (1915). International meeting at The Hague. *Advocate of Peace*, 77, 147–148.
- American Philosophical Association. (1906). Proceedings of the American Philosophical Association: The fifth annual meeting, Emerson Hall, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., December 27–29, 1905. *Philosophical Review*, XV(2).
- American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders: DSM-5*. Washington, D.C: American Psychiatric Association.
- American Psychological Association. (1992). APF Gold Medal Awards and Distinguished Teaching of Psychology Award. *American Psychologist*, 47, 851–859.
- American Psychological Association. (1994). The Seville Statement on Violence. *American Psychologist*, 49(10), 845–846. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.49.10.845

- American Psychological Association. (2014a). APA response to Risen book and allegations of support for torture [Press release]. Retrieved from <http://www.apa.org/news/press/response/risen-book.aspx>
- American Psychological Association. (2014b). Statement of APA Board of Directors: Outside counsel to conduct independent review of allegations of support for torture [Press release]. Retrieved from <http://www.apa.org/news/press/releases/2014/11/risen-allegations.aspx>
- American Psychological Association. (2015). *APA and affiliated journals*. Retrieved from <http://www.apa.org/pubs/journals/pac/>
- Angell, R. C. (1955). Governments and peoples as foci for peace-oriented research. *Journal of Social Issues, 11*(1), 36–41.
- .
- Antonovsky, A. (1993). Complexity, conflict, chaos, coherence, coercion and civility. *Social Science & Medicine, 37*(8), 969–974. doi:10.1016/0277-9536(93)90427-6
- Association for Psychological Science. (2006). *James McKeen Cattell Fellow Award*. Retrieved from <http://www.psychologicalscience.org/awards/cattell/citations/deutsch.cfm>
- Bajaj, M. (Ed.). (2008). *Encyclopedia of peace education*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age.
- Baron, R. A., & Richardson, D. R. (2004). *Human aggression* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Springer.
- Bauer, R. A. (Ed.). (1962). *Some views on Soviet psychology*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

- Beardslee, W. R. (1983). Adolescents and the threat of nuclear war: The evolution of a perspective. *Yale Journal of Biology and Medicine*, 65, 79–91.
- Benjamin, L. R., & Crouse, E. M. (2002). The American Psychological Association's response to Brown v. Board of Education: The case of Kenneth B. Clark. *American Psychologist*, 57(1), 38–50. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.57.1.38
- Berg, B. L., & Lune, H. (2012). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences*. Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Berkowitz, L. (1962). *Aggression: A social psychological analysis*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Bernstein, J. S. (1985). Guest editorial. *Quadrant: The Journal of the C. G. Jung Foundation for Analytical Psychology*, 18(2).
- Bess, M. (1985). Leo Szilard: Scientist, activist, visionary. *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, 3(3), 11–17.
- Bexton, W. H., Heron, W., & Scott, T. H. (1954). Effects of decreased variation in the sensory environment. *Canadian Journal of Psychology*, 8(2), 70–76. doi:10.1037/h0083596
- Bion, W. R. (1961). *Experiences in groups*. London, England: Tavistock.
- Blumberg, H. H., & French, C. C. (Eds.). (1992). *Peace: Abstracts of the psychological and behavioral literature, 1967–1990*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Blumer, H. (1986). *Symbolic interactionism: Perspective and method*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

- Board of Social and Ethical Responsibility for Psychology. (1986). Mini-convention examines empowerment. *APA Monitor*, 17(6), 13.
- Boehnke, K., & Frindte, W. (1992). Report on the second international symposium on contributions of psychology to peace. *International Journal of Psychology*, 27(2), 258–260. doi:10.1080/00207599208246879
- Bowins, B. (2004). Psychological defense mechanisms: A new perspective. *American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 64(1), 1–26.
- Boyer, R. M., & Grolnick, S. A. (1988). Preface. *The Psychoanalytic Study of Society*, 13, xiii–xvii. Hillsdale, NJ: Analytic Press.
- Brehm, S. S. (2007, May). *APA and VA psychology: An enduring partnership*. Presented at the 10th Annual Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) Psychology Leadership Conference, Dallas, TX.
- Brentano, F. (1978). *Aristotle and his world view* (R. George & R. M. Chisholm, Eds. & Trans.). Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press. (Original work published 1911)
- Bretherton, D., & Balvin, N. (Eds.). (2013). *Peace psychology in Australia*. New York, NY: Springer.
- Breuer, J., & Freud, S. (2000). *Studies on hysteria* (J. Strachey, Ed. & Trans.). New York, NY: Basic Books. (Original work published 1895)
- Brown, N. S. (1990, August). *Defining peace psychology and the role of peace psychologists: A survey of Division 48 members*. Presented at the 98th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Boston, MA. Retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/search/>

detailmini.jsp?\_nfpb=true&\_&ERICExtSearch\_SearchValue0=ED349190&ERIC  
ExtSearch\_SearchType\_0=no&accno=ED349190

Burton, J. W. (1965). *International relations: A general theory*. Cambridge, England: University Press.

Butcher, S. H. (Trans.). (1917). *The poetics of Aristotle*. London, England: MacMillan.

Cantril, H. (Ed.). (1950). *Tensions that cause wars*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Carroll, P. N., Nash, M., & Small, M. (2006). *The good fight continues: World War II letters from the Abraham Lincoln Brigade*. New York, NY: New York University Press.

Carter, L. F. (1958). Proceedings of the 66th annual business meeting of the American Psychological Association: Report of the Recording Secretary. *American Psychologist*, 13, 691–710. doi:10.1037/h0039626

Cattell, J. M. (1895). Proceedings of the third annual meeting of the American Psychological Association. *Psychological Review*, 2, 149–152.  
doi:10.1037/h0068598

Ceci, S. J. (2006). Urie Bronfenbrenner (1917–2005). *American Psychologist*, 61(2), 173–174. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.61.2.173

Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Christie, D. J. (2006). What is peace psychology the psychology of? *Journal of Social Issues*, 62(1), 1–17. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4560.2006.00436.x

- Christie, D. J. (2011, August). *Some peace psychology publications and resources*. [PowerPoint® presentation]. Presented at the 2011 Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Washington, DC.
- Christie, D. J. (Ed.). (2012). *The encyclopedia of peace psychology*. West Sussex, England: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Christie, D. J., Wagner, R. V., & Winter, D. D. (Eds.). (2001). *Peace, conflict, and violence: Peace psychology for the 21st century*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Cohrs, J. C., & Boehnke, K. (2008). Social psychology and peace, an introductory overview. *Social Psychology, 39*(1), 4–11. doi:10.1027/1864-9335.39.1.4
- Cole, C. E., & Norander, S. (2011). From Sierra Leone to Kosovo: Exploring possibilities for gendered peacebuilding. *Women & Language, 34*(1), 29–49.
- Collins, J. (1931). Lightner Witmer: A biological sketch. In R. W. Brotmarkle (Ed.), *Clinical psychology: Studies in honor of Lightner Witmer to commemorate the thirty-fifth anniversary of the founding of the first psychological clinic* (pp. 3–9). Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Conflict. (2014). In *Encyclopedia Britannica*. Retrieved from <http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/132060/conflict>
- Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2008). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Corsini, R. J. (2002). *The dictionary of psychology*. New York, NY: Brunner-Routledge.
- Cottrell, W. F. (1955). Research to establish the conditions for peace. *Journal of Social Issues, 11*(1), 13–20. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4560.1955.tb00301.x

- Cramer, P. (2000). Defense mechanisms in psychology today: Further processes for adaptation. *American Psychologist*, 55(6), 637–646. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.55.6.637
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2011). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Daffern, T. C. (1999). Peacemaking and peacebuilding. In L. Kurtz & J. Turpin (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of violence, peace, & conflict* (pp. 755–770). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Daly, M., & Wilson, M. (1988). *Homicide*. Chicago, IL: Aldine Transactions.
- Dane, P. G. (1949). Shell shock or traumatic neurosis. *Psychoanalytic Review*, 36(3), 296–301.
- Danis, M., Largent, E., Grady, C., Wendler, D., Hull, S. C., Shah, S., . . . Grady, C. (2012). *Research ethics consultation: A casebook*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Denscombe, M. (2009). *Ground rules for social research: Guidelines for good practice*. Berkshire, England: McGraw-Hill.
- Denton, L. (1989). Pro-choice statement approved by Council. *APA Monitor*, 20(10), 17.
- Deterding, R., Hay, W., Levin, M., & Sondheimer, J. (2006). *Current diagnosis and treatment in pediatrics*. Columbus, OH: McGraw-Hill Medical.

- Deutsch, M. (1962). Cooperation and trust: Some theoretical notes. In M. R. Jones (Ed.), *Nebraska symposium on motivation* (pp. 275–319). Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
- Deutsch, M. (1973). *The resolution of conflict: Constructive and destructive processes*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Diaz, K. F. (2009). *Federal regulations of chemicals in the environment* [PowerPoint® slides]. Retrieved from <http://siri.uvm.edu/ppt/40hrenv/index.html>
- Dillman, D. A., Smyth, J. D., & Christian, L. M. (2009). *Internet, mail, and mixed-mode surveys: The tailored design method*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Division 48 of the American Psychological Association. (1992). Division 48 goals. *Peace Psychology Bulletin*, 1(3), 3.
- Division of Peace Psychology. (1996). Meeting report. *Peace Psychology Newsletter*, 5(3).
- Dollard, J. (with assistance from Horton, D). (1943). *Fear in battle*. New Haven, CT: The Institute of Human Relations, Yale University.
- Dougherty, W. E. (2006). *An account of the origin of the terms PsyWar and PSYOPS*. Retrieved from [www.psywar.org/terminology.php](http://www.psywar.org/terminology.php)
- Droba, D. D. (1931). Methods used for measuring public opinion. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 37(3), 410–423. doi:10.1086/215733
- Druckman, D. (2011). Remembering Harold Guetzkow. *Simulation & Gaming*, 42(3), 290–293. doi:10.1177/1046878110393881
- Dudley, D. R. (1974). *A history of cynicism from Diogenes to the 6th century A.D.* New York, NY: Gordon Press.



- Einstein, A. (1960). *Einstein on peace* (O. Nathan & H. Norden, Eds.). New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.
- Elias, N. (2000). *The civilizing process: Sociogenetic and psychogenetic investigations*. Oxford, England: Blackwell. (Original work published 1939)
- Emanuel, E. J., Wendler, D., & Grady, C. (2000). What makes clinical research ethical? *The Journal of the American Medical Association*, 283(20), 2701–2711.  
doi:10.1001/jama.283.20.2701
- Erikson, E. H. (1962). *Young man Luther, A study in psychoanalysis and history*. New York, NY: Norton.
- Erikson, E. H. (1964). *Childhood and society*. New York, NY: Norton.
- Erikson, E. H. (1965). Psychoanalysis and ongoing history: Problems of identity, hatred and nonviolence. *The American Journal of Psychiatry*, 122(3), 241–253.
- Erikson, E. H. (1974). *Dimensions of a new identity: The 1973 Jefferson lectures in the humanities*. Oxford, England: Norton.
- Etter-Lewis, G. (1991). Black women's life stories: Reclaiming self in narrative texts. In S. Gluck & D. Patai (Eds.), *Women's words: The feminist practice of oral history* (pp. 43–58). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Falk, A. (2004). *Fratricide in the Holy Land: A psychoanalytic view of the Arab-Israeli conflict*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Falk, A. (2008a). *Anti-semitism: A history and psychoanalysis of contemporary hatred*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Falk, A. (2008b). *Islamic terror: Conscious and unconscious motives*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

- Farber, I., Harlow, H., & West, L. (1957). Brainwashing, conditioning, and DDD (debility, dependency, and dread). *Sociometry*, 20, 271–285. doi:10.2307/2785980
- Ferenczi, S., Abraham, K., Simmel, E., Jones, E., & Freud, S. (1921). *Psychoanalysis and the war neuroses*. London: England: The International Psycho-analytic Press.
- Fernberger, W. W. (1932). The American Psychological Association: A historical summary, 1892–1930. *Psychological Bulletin*, 29(1), 1–89.  
doi:10.1037/h0075733
- Fisher, R., & Ury, W. (1981). *Getting to yes: Negotiating agreement without giving in*. New York, NY: Houghton Mifflin.
- Fletcher, J. M. (1932). Verdict of psychologists on war instincts. *Scientific Monthly*, 35, 142–145.
- Ford, M., & Ford, J. (2003). *Dreams and inward journeys: A rhetoric and reader for writers* (5th ed.). Harlow, England: Longman.
- Forel, A. (1937). *Out of my life and work* (B. Miall, Trans.). New York, NY: Norton.  
(Original work published 1935)
- Fornari, F. (1975). *Psychoanalysis of nuclear war*. Bloomington, IN: University of Indiana.
- Frank, J. (1961). Emotional and motivational aspects of the disarmament problem. *Journal of Social Issues*, 17(3), 20–27. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4560.1961.tb01680.x
- Freiberg, P. (1961). *BAPPI theme—violence in society: New board maps out strategies for the year*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

- Freud, S. (1922). *Beyond the pleasure principle* (C. J. M. Hubback, Trans.). London, England: The International Psycho-Analytic Press. (Original work published 1920)
- Freud, A. (1946). *The ego and the mechanisms of defense*. New York, NY: International Universities Press. (Original work published 1936)
- Freud, S. (1949). *Group psychology and the analysis of the ego* (E. Jones, Ed., & J. Strachey, Trans.). London, England: Hogarth Press. (Original work published 1922) Retrieved from <http://archive.org/stream/grouppsychologya00freu#page/n5/mode/2up>
- Freud, S. (1953). Thoughts for the times on war and death. In J. Rickman (Ed.), *Civilization, war and death* (pp. 1–25). London, England: Hogarth Press and The Institute of Psycho-analysis. (Original work published 1915)
- Freud, S. (1957). Repression. In J. Strachey (Ed. & Trans.), *The standard edition of the complete works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 14, pp. 141–158). London, England: Hogarth Press. (Original work published 1915)
- Freud, S. (1958). *Civilization and its discontents*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday. (Original work published in 1929)
- Freud, S. (1959). Inhibitions, symptoms and anxiety. In J. Strachey (Ed. & Trans.), *The standard edition of the complete works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 20, pp. 77–174). London, England: Hogarth Press. (Original work published 1926)
- Freud, S. (1959). *Moses and monotheism* (K. Jones, Trans.). London, England: Hogarth Press. (Original work published 1939) Retrieved from <https://archive.org/stream/mosesandmonothei032233mbp#page/n7/mode/2up>

- Freud, S. (1958). Civilization and its discontents. In J. Strachey (Ed. & Trans.), *Standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 21, pp. 86–145). London, England: The Hogarth Press and The Institute of Psycho-analysis. (Original work published 1929)
- Freud, S. (1964). The neuro-psychosis of defense. In J. Strachey (Ed.), *Standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 3, pp. 45–61). London: Hogarth Press. (Original work published in 1894)
- Freud, S. (1964). Why war? In J. Strachey (Ed. & Trans.), *Standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 22, pp. 199–215). London, England: The Hogarth Press and The Institute of Psycho-analysis. (Original work published 1933)
- Freud, S. (1969). *An outline of psycho-analysis* (J. Strachey, Trans.). New York, NY: Norton. (Original work published 1940)
- Freud, S. (1989). The future of an illusion. In Peter Gay (Ed.), *The Freud reader* (pp. 685–722). New York, NY: Norton. (Original work published 1927)
- Freud, S. (1990). *The question of lay analysis* (J. Strachey, Trans.) New York, NY: Norton. (Original work published 1926)
- Freud, S., & Bullitt, W. C. (1999). *Thomas Woodrow Wilson: A psychological study*. Piscataway, NJ: Transaction. (Original work published 1939)
- Froese, K. (2006). *Nietzsche, Heidegger, and Daoist thought: Crossing the in-between*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Frydenberg, E. (2005). *Morton Deutsch: A life and legacy of mediation and conflict resolution*. Brisbane, Australia: Australian Academic Press.

- Fuller, J. F. C. (1920). *Tanks in the Great War, 1914–1918*. London, England: Murray.
- Galtung, J. (1969). Violence, peace, and peace research. *Journal of Peace Research*, 6(3), 167–191.
- Gay, P. (Ed.). (1989). *The Freud reader*. New York, NY: Norton.
- Ginsburg, B. E. (1958). Genetics as a tool in the study of behavior. *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine*, 1, 397–424.
- Glaser, B. G. (1978). *Theoretical sensitivity*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory*. Chicago, IL: Aldine Press.
- Goede, R., & Villers, C. D. (2003). The applicability of grounded theory as research methodology in studies on the use of methodologies in IS practices. *Proceedings of SAICSIT 2003* (pp. 208–217). New York, NY: ACM Press.
- Goodman, A., & Gonzalez, J. (2015, May). Emails show American Psychological Association secretly worked with Bush admin to enable torture. *Democracy Now!*  
Retrieved from:  
[http://www.democracynow.org/2015/5/5/emails\\_show\\_american\\_psychological\\_association\\_secretly](http://www.democracynow.org/2015/5/5/emails_show_american_psychological_association_secretly)
- Goulding, C. (2002). *Grounded theory: A practical guide for management, business and market researchers*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Greenfield, P. (1977). CIA's behavior caper. *APA Monitor*, 8(12), 1–11.
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 105–117). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 191–215). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hamson, D. (2013, March 13). *The American-Philippine War of 1899–1902* [Web log post]. Retrieved from <http://suite101.com/article/the-americanphilippine-war-of-18991902-a189071>
- Hartman, J. J. (1999). Psychoanalysis. In L. Kurtz & J. Turpin (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of violence, peace, & conflict* (pp. 331–338). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- .
- Health Service Psychology Education Collaborative. (2013). Professional psychology in health care services. *American Psychologist*, 68(6), 411–426.  
doi:10.1037/a0033265
- Hebb, D. O., Heath, E. S., & Stuart, E. A. (1954). Experimental deafness. *Canadian Journal of Psychology*, 8(3), 152–156. doi:10.1037/h0083605
- Hebb, D. O. (1949). *The organization of behavior: A neuropsychological theory*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons, Inc. doi: 10.1002/cne.900930310
- Hedges, C. (2009). *Empire of illusion: The end of literacy and the triumph of spectacle*. New York, NY: Nation Books. doi:10.1111/j.1542-734x.2009.00722\_5.x
- Henderson, D. (2010). The coincidence of opposites: C. G. Jung's reception of Nicholas of Cusa. *Studies in Spirituality*, 20, 101–113. doi:10.2143/SIS.20.0.2061145
- Heppner, P. P., Wampold, B. E., & Kivlighan, D. M., Jr. (2008). *Research design in consulting*. Belmont, CA: Thompson Higher Education.

- Herman, E. (1995). *The romance of American Psychology: Political culture in the age of experts*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Heron, J., & Reason, P. (1997). A participatory inquiry paradigm. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 3(3), 274–294. doi:10.1177/107780049700300302
- Heron, W. (1957). Perception as a function of retinal locus and attention. *The American Journal of Psychology*, 70, 38–48. doi:10.2307/1419227
- Hesse-Biber, S. N., & Leavy, P. (2010). *The practice of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hillman, J. (2005). *A terrible love of war*. New York, NY: Penguin Group.
- Högbladh, S. (2011). Peace agreements 1975–2011: Updating the UCDP peace agreement dataset. In P. Therése & L. Themnér (Eds.), *States in armed conflict 2011* (Report 99). Uppsala, Sweden: Uppsala University, Department of Peace and Conflict Research. Retrieved from [http://www.pcr.uu.se/digitalAssets/142/142371\\_peace-agreements-1975-2011final.pdf](http://www.pcr.uu.se/digitalAssets/142/142371_peace-agreements-1975-2011final.pdf)
- Hogenson, G. (2011, January 11). IAJS discussion seminar with George Hogenson—Introduction by Warren Colman [Web log post]. Retrieved from <http://www.jungianstudies.org/pdf/George-Hogenson-Emergence-Discussion.pdf>
- Hollander, E. P., Park, J., Boyd, B., Elman, B., & Ignagni, M. E. (2008). Inclusive leadership and leader-follower relations: Concepts, research, and applications. *The Member Connector, International Leadership Association (ILA)*, 6(5), 4–7.
- Holshek, C. (2013, April). *Effective counterterrorism for a new era*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Alliance for Peace, Washington, DC.

- Human Security Centre. (2006). *Human security report 2005: War and peace in the 21st century*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Humphreys, K. (1996). Clinical psychologists as psychotherapists: History, future, and alternatives. *American Psychologist*, *51*(3), 190–197. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.51.3.190
- Hyman, P. E., & Ofer, D. (Eds.). (2007). *Jewish women: A comprehensive historical encyclopedia*. Retrieved from <http://jwa.org/encyclopedia/cdrom>
- Ikonen, P., & Rechartt, E. (1978). The vicissitudes of Thanatos: On the place of aggression and destructiveness in psychoanalytic interpretation. *Scandinavian Psychoanalytic Review*, *1*, 79–114. doi:10.1080/01062301.1978.10592195
- Institute for Economics and Peace. (2014). *Global peace index 2013*. Sydney, Australia: Author. Retrieved from <http://economicsandpeace.org/research/iep-indices-data/global-peace-index>
- International Network of Psychologists for Social Responsibility (INPsySR). (2013). *History*. Retrieved from <http://www.inpsysr.org/>
- International Union of Psychological Science. (2008). *Universal declaration of ethical principles for psychologists*. Retrieved from [http://www.ucc.ie/acad/psycho/ethics/universal\\_declaration\\_of\\_ethics.pdf](http://www.ucc.ie/acad/psycho/ethics/universal_declaration_of_ethics.pdf)
- International Union of Psychological Science. (2012). Research area: Peace. *International Journal of Psych*, *47*, 594–597. doi:10.1080/00207594.2012.709118
- International Union of Psychological Science. (2013). *Members*. Retrieved from <http://www.iupsys.net/index.php/members/national-members>



- Jacobs, M. S. (1989). *American psychology in the quest for nuclear peace*. New York, NY: Praeger.
- James, W. (2008). Remarks at the Peace Banquet. In *Memories and studies* (pp. 121–123). Rockville, MD: Arc Manor. (Original work published 1904)
- James, W. (2008). The moral equivalent of war. In *Memories and studies* (pp. 110–121). Rockville, MD: Arc Manor. (Original work published 1911)
- Janis, I. L. (1968). Carl I. Hovland, 1912–1961. In D. L. Sills (Ed.), *International encyclopedia of the social sciences* (Vol. 6, pp. 526–310). New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Jones, E. (1953). *The life and work of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 1). New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Jones, E. (2004). War and the practice of psychotherapy: The UK experience 1939–1960. *Medical History*, 48, 493–510. doi:10.1017/S0025727300007985
- Jung, C. G. (1916). *Psychology of the unconscious: A study of the transformations and symbolisms of the libido, a contribution to the history of the evolution of thought* (B. M. Hinkle, Trans.). New York, NY: Moffat, Yard. (Original work published 1911)
- Jung, C. G. (1970). Civilization in transition (G. Adler & R. F. C. Hull, Trans.). In R. F. C. Hull (Ed.), *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (Vol. 10, pp. 207–254). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. (Original work published 1922)
- Jung, C. G. (1970). *Analytical psychology: Its theory and practice* (Tavistock Lectures). New York, NY: Vintage Books and Anchor Books. (Original work published 1935)

- Jung, C. G. (1977). *Two essays on analytical psychology*. (R. F. C. Hull, Trans.). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. (Original work published 1917)
- Jung, C. G. (1989). *Memories, dreams, reflections* (A. Jaffé, Ed., R. Winston & C. Winston, Trans.). New York, NY: Vintage Books. (Original work published 1963)
- Karcher, E. (1962, March). Army social science programs and plans. In *Symposium proceedings. The U. S. Army's limited war mission and social science research* (p. 348). Washington, DC: American University, Special Operations Research Office. Retrieved from <http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=AD0613594&Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf>
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R. (1966). *The social psychology of organizations*. New York, NY: Wiley & Sons.
- Katz, D., & Schanck, R. L. (1938). *Social psychology*. New York, NY: Wiley & Sons.
- Keeley, L. H. (1996). *War before civilization: The myth of the peaceful savage*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Kelman, H. C. (1965). *International behavior: A social-psychological analysis*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Kelman, H. C. (1990). Ignacio Martín-Baró: A personal remembrance of a martyred peace psychologist. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 1(1), 11–15.
- Kelman, H. C. (2009). The beginnings of peace psychology: A personal account. *Peace Psychology*, 18(2), 15–18.

- Kelman, H. C. (2012). Social psychology and the study of peace: Personal reflections. In L. R. Troop (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of intergroup conflict* (pp. 361–372). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Kelman, H. C., Barth, W. P., & Hefner, R. A. (Eds.). (1955). Research approaches to the study of war and peace. *Journal of Social Issues*, 11(1), 1–57.
- Kimmel, P. R. (2008). Response to “At What Cost? Psychological Fallout From the ‘War on Terrorism’ ” (A review of collateral damage: The psychological consequences of America's war on terrorism). *PsycCRITIQUES*, 53(3). doi:10.1037/a0010521
- Kimmel, P. R., & Stout, C. E. (Eds.). (2006). *Collateral damage: The psychological consequences of America’s war on terrorism*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Klein, M. (1932). *The psycho-analysis of children*. London, England: Hogarth Press.
- Klein, M. (1958). On the development of mental functioning. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 39, 84–90.
- Klineberg, O. (1950). *Tensions affecting international understanding: A survey of research*. New York, NY: Social Science Research Council.
- Kohler-Riessman, C. (1987). When gender is not enough: Women interviewing women. *Gender & Society*, 1(2), 172–207. doi:10.1177/0891243287001002004
- Kossakowski, A. (1990). Committee for psychological study of peace. *International Journal of Psychology*, 25(2), 239–241. doi:10.1080/00207599008247860
- Kramer, B. M., & Moyer, R. S. (Eds.). (1991). *Nuclear psychology bibliography*. Ann Arbor, MI: Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues.

- Kreutz, J. (2010). How and when armed conflicts end: Introducing the UCDP Conflict Termination Dataset. *Journal of Peace Research*, 47(2), 243–250.  
doi:10.1177/0022343309353108
- Krug, E. G., Dahlberg, L. L., Mercy, J. A., Zwi, A. B., & Lozano, R. (Eds.). (2002). *World report on violence and health*. Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization.
- Kurtz, L. R., & Turpin, J. E. (Eds.). (1999). *Encyclopedia of violence, peace & conflict*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Lamberty, G. (2008). *Understanding somatization in the practice of clinical neuropsychology*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Lasswell, H. D. (1977). *Psychopathology and politics*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. (Original work published 1930)
- Leavy, P. (2011). *Oral history: Understanding qualitative research*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Le Bon, G. (2001). *La psychologie des foules* [The crowd: A study of the popular mind]. Mineola, NY: Dover. (Original work published 1895)
- Lentz, T. F. (1955). *Towards a science of peace*. London, England: Halcyon Press.
- Levine, H. (1986, March). *Welcome and introduction* [Speech]. Symposium on Psychoanalytic Explorations of the Nuclear Threat: Aggression, Projection, and Identity, Boston, MA.
- Levine, H. (1987). The psychology of the nuclear threat: A bibliography. *International Review of Psycho-Analysis*, 24, 13–19.

- Levine, H., Jacobs, D., & Rubin, L. J. (Eds). (1988). *Psychoanalysis and the nuclear threat: Clinical and theoretical studies*. Hillsdale, NJ: Analytic Press.
- Lewin, K., Lippitt, R., & White, R. (1939). Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created “social climates.” *Journal of Social Psychology, 10*, 271–299.
- Lewin, N. A. (2009). *Jung on war, politics and Nazi Germany: Exploring the theory of archetypes and the collective unconscious*. London, England: Karnac Books.
- Lifton, R. J. (1968). *Death in life: Survivors of Hiroshima*. New York, NY: Random House.
- Lifton, R. J. (1975). The postwar war. In D. M. Mantell & J. H. Laurence (Eds.), *Journal of Social Issues: Soldiers in and after Vietnam, 31*(4), 181–195.  
doi:10.1111/j.1540-4560.1975.tb01020.x
- Lifton, R. J. (1988). *The Nazi doctors: Medical killing and the psychology of genocide*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Lifton, R. J. (2005). *Home from the war: Learning from Vietnam veterans*. New York, NY: Other Press.
- Lifton, R. J. (2011). *Witness to an extreme century: A memoir*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Lifton, R. J., & Falk, R. (1982). *Indefensible weapons: The political and psychological case against nuclearism*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Lifton, R. J., & Olson, E. (1975). *Living and dying*. New York, NY: Bantam Books.

- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (2002). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 163–188). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Lippitt, R., Watson, J., & Westley, B. (1958). *Dynamics of planned change*. New York, NY: Harcourt Brace.
- Lorenz, K. (1937). On the formation of the concept of instinct. *Natural Sciences*, 5(19), 289–300.
- Mack, J. E. (1988). The threat of nuclear war in clinical work: Dynamic and theoretical considerations. In H. B. Levine, D. Jacobs, & L. J. Rubin (Eds.), *Psychoanalysis and the nuclear threat* (pp. 189–214). Hillsdale, NJ: Analytic Press.
- MacNair, R. M. (2003). *The psychology of peace: An introduction*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Mansfield, V., & Spiegelman, J. M. (1991). The opposites in quantum physics and Jungian psychology: Part I: Theoretical foundations. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 36(3), 267–287. doi:10.1111/j.1465-5922.1991.00267.x
- Matthews, M. D., & Laurence, J. H. (Eds.). (2012). *Military psychology* (Vols. 1–4, SAGE Library of Military and Strategic Studies). London, England: Sage.
- May, M. A. (1943). *A social psychology of war and peace*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Mayer, M. (2007). *Bodymind healing psychotherapy: Ancient pathways to modern health*. Orinda, CA: Bodymind Healing.

- McCarthy, M. (2015, May). American Psychological Association colluded with US officials to bolster CIA torture program, report alleges. *BMJ*.  
doi:10.1136/bmj.h2380
- McGuire, W., & Hull, R. F. C. (Eds.). (1977). *C. G. Jung speaking: Interviews and encounters*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- McKay, S. A., Roe, M. D., & Wessells, M. G. (Eds.). (2005). Pioneers in peace psychology: Doris K. Miller [Special issue]. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, *11*(4), 369–386. doi:10.1207/s15327949pac1104\_2
- McKay, S. A., Roe, M. D., & Wessells, M. G. (Eds.). (2008). Pioneers in U.S. peace psychology: Ethel Tobach [Special issue]. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, *14*(1), 1–14. doi:10.1080/10781910701839643
- McKay, S. A., Wessells, M. G., & Roe, M. D. (Eds.). (2009). Pioneers in U.S. peace psychology: Dorothy Day Ciarlo [Special issue]. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, *15*(4), 325–341. doi:10.1080/10781910903206732
- McKoy, A. (2006). *A question of torture: CIA interrogation, from the Cold War to the War on Terror*. New York, NY: Henry Holt.
- McReynold, P. (1997). *Lightner Witmer: His life and times*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Mead, G. H. (1934). *Mind, self, and society: From the standpoint of a social behaviorist*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Meissner, W. W. (1978). *The paranoid process*. New York, NY: Jason Aronson.
- Meissner, W. W. (1984). *The borderline spectrum*. New York, NY: Jason Aronson.

- Melicharova, M. (Ed.). (n.d.). *1930–39: Which way to peace?* London, England: Peace Pledge Union. Retrieved from, <http://www.ppu.org.uk/century/century4.html>
- Menand, L. (2005). Introduction. In J. Strachey (Trans.), *Sigmund Freud: Civilization and its discontents* (pp. 9–32). New York, NY: Norton.
- Menninger, W. C. (1948). *Psychiatry in a troubled world: Yesterday's war and today's challenge*. New York, NY: MacMillan.
- Miller, E. J. (1976). *Task and organization*. Chichester, England: Wiley.
- Miller, E., & Crichton-Miller, H. (Eds.). (1940). *The neuroses in war*. London, England: Macmillan.
- Miller, G. A. (1951). *Language and communication*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Mindell, A. (2000). *The leader as martial artist: Techniques and strategies for resolving conflict and creating community*. Portland, OR: Lao Tse Press.
- Mindell, A. (2002). *The deep democracy of open forums: Practical steps to conflict prevention and resolution for the family, workplace, and world*. Charlottesville, VA: Hampton Roads.
- Mindell, A. (2007). *Earth-based psychology: Path awareness from the teachings of Don Juan, Richard Feynman, and Lao Tse*. Portland, OR: Lao Tse Press.
- Mindell, A. (2013). *Quantum mind: The edge between physics and psychology*. Portland, OR: Deep Democracy Exchange.
- Morrow, S. L., & Smith, M. L. (2000). Qualitative research for counseling psychology. In S. D. Brown & R. W. Lent (Eds.), *Handbook of counseling psychology* (3rd ed., pp. 199–230). New York, NY: Wiley.



- Moses, L. (1966). Object loss and mourning during adolescence. *Psychoanalytic Study of the Child*, 21, 269–294.
- Moyers, W. (2002, October 18). Bill Moyers interview with Robert Jay Lifton [Transcript]. Retrieved from [http://www.pbs.org/now/transcript/transcript\\_lifton.html](http://www.pbs.org/now/transcript/transcript_lifton.html)
- Mueller, J. (1989). *Retreat from doomsday: The obsolescence of major war*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Müller-Brettel, M. (1993). *Bibliography on peace research and peaceful international relations: The contributions of psychology 1900–1991*. New York, NY: K. G. Saur.
- Mullner, R. M. (Ed.). (2009). *Encyclopedia of health services research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Murphy, G. (Ed.). (1945). *Human nature and enduring peace: Third yearbook of the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Murphy, J. F. A. (2002). World report on violence and health. *Irish Medical Journal*, 95(10), 1.
- Myers, G. E. (2001). *William James—His life and thought*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Neuman, W. L. (2000). *Social research methods* (4th ed.). Boston, MS: Allyn & Bacon.
- New York Times. (1937, November 14). *Psychologists deny war is a necessity: Armistice Day Manifesto takes exception to the theory of “aggressive instincts.”*

- Osgood, C. E. (1959). Suggestions for winning the real war with Communism. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 3, 295–325. doi:10.1177/002200275900300401
- Osgood, C. E. (1962a). *An alternative to war or surrender*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Osgood, C. E. (1962b). Studies of the generality of affective meaning systems. *American Psychologist*, 17, 10–28. doi:10.1037/h0045146
- Paddock, A. H., Jr. (1982). *US Army Special Warfare: Its origins, psychological and unconventional warfare, 1941–1952*. Washington, DC: National Defense University Press.
- Paddock, A. H., Jr. (1999). Robert Alexis McClure: Forgotten father of Army Special Warfare. *Special Warfare*, 12(4), 2–9. Retrieved from <http://www.dvidshub.net/publication/issues/8276>
- Page, H. (1954). The role of psychology in ONR. *The American Psychologist*, 9, 621–628. doi:10.1037/h0056373
- Pandit, N. R. (1996). The creation of theory: A recent application of the grounded theory method. *The Qualitative Report*, 2(4), 1–20.
- Patel, T. (2005). *Introduction to memory and totalitarianism*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Pear, T. H. (Ed.). (1950). *Psychological factors of peace and war*. London, England: Hutchinson.
- Perlman, D. (2008). *Ralph White gives gift to SPSSI*. Retrieved from <http://www.spssi.org/index.cfm?fuseaction=page.viewPage&pageID=1040&nodeID=1>

- Pettigrew, T. F. (2010). Herbert C. Kelman: A tribute. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology, 16*(4), 341–348. doi:10.1080/10781919.2010.518063
- Pfister, O. (1950). War and peace as a psycho-analytic problem. *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis, 31*, 150–151.
- Pilisuk, M. (1965). The evolution of the teach-in. *The Canadian Forum, 176–177*.
- Pilisuk, M. (1992). An agenda for peace psychology. *The Peace Psychology Bulletin, 2*(1), 22–36.
- Pilisuk, M. & Roundtree, J. A. (2008). Not quite a conspiracy: Networks of power. *Peace Magazine, 24*(3), 20–23.
- Pinker, S. (2011). *The better angels of our nature*. New York, NY: Viking.
- Plato. (2006). *The republic* (R. E. Allen, Trans.). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Polka, B. (2001). *Depth psychology, interpretation, and the Bible: An ontological essay on Freud*. Montreal, Quebec, Canada: QCL McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Polkinghorne, D. E. (2005). Language and meaning: Data collection in qualitative research. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52*(2), 137–145. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.52.2.137
- Pols, H., & Oak, S. (2007). War & military mental health. *American Journal of Public Health, 97*(12), 2132–2142. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2006.090910
- Poster, M. (1978). *Critical theory of the family*. New York, NY: Seabury Press.
- Powell, K. E., Mercy, J. A., Crosby, A. E., Dahlberg, L. L., & Simon, T. R. (1999). Public health models of violence and violence prevention. In L. R. Kurtz & J. Turpin (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of violence, peace, and conflict* (Vol. 3, pp. 1806–1819). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

- Psychologists for Social Responsibility. (2013). *Who we are*. Retrieved from <http://www.psysr.org/about/whoweare/>
- Purkarthofer, P. (2006, March). *Gender and gender mainstreaming in international peacebuilding*. Paper presented at the 2006 International Studies Association Annual Meeting, San Diego, CA.
- Quinn, J. M., Mason, T. D., & Gurses, M. (2007). Sustaining the peace: Determinants of civil war recurrence. *International Interactions*, 33(2), 167–193.  
doi:10.1080/03050620701277673
- Raimy, V. C. (Ed.). (1950). *Training in clinical psychology*. New York, NY: Prentice-Hall.
- Rank, O. (1978). *Truth and reality*. New York, NY: Norton. (Original work published 1936)
- Rank, O. (1989). *Art and artist: Creative urge and personality development*. New York, NY: Norton. (Original work published 1932)
- Rank, O. (2010). *The trauma of birth*. Eastford, CT: Martino Fine Books. (Original work published 1924)
- Reisman, J. M. (1966). *The development of clinical psychology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Rice, J. L. (1993). *Freud's Russia: National identity in the evolution of psychoanalysis*. Piscataway, NJ: Transaction.
- Risen, J. (2014). *Pay any price: Greed, power, and endless war*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

Risen, J. (2015, April). American Psychological Association bolstered C. I. A. torture program, report says. *New York Times*. Retrieved from:

[http://www.nytimes.com/2015/05/01/us/report-says-american-psychological-association-collaborated-on-torture-justification.html?\\_r=0](http://www.nytimes.com/2015/05/01/us/report-says-american-psychological-association-collaborated-on-torture-justification.html?_r=0)

Robinson, J. M. (1968). *An introduction to early Greek philosophy: The chief fragments and ancient testimony, with connecting commentary*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Roe, M. D., McKay, S. A., & Wessells, M. G. (Eds.). (2003). Pioneers in peace psychology: Milton Schwebel [Special issue]. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 9(4), 305–326. doi:10.1207/s15327949pac0904\_2

Roe, M. D., Wessells, M. G., & McKay, S. A. (Eds.). (2006). Pioneers in U. S. peace psychology: Morton Deutsch [Special issue]. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 12(4), 309–324. doi:10.1207/s15327949pac1204\_2

Roe, M. D., Wessells, M. G., & McKay, S. A. (Eds.). (2008). Pioneers in peace psychology: M. Brewster Smith [Special issue]. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 14(4), 345–363. doi:10.1080/10781910802435580

Rogers, C. R. (1980). *A way of being*. New York, NY: Houghton Mifflin.

Rosen, G. (1975). Nostalgia: a “forgotten” psychological disorder. *Psychological Medicine*, 5, 340–354. doi:10.1017/S003329170005697X

Rosenweig, M. R., Holtzman, W. H., Sabourin, M., & Bélanger, D. (2000). *The history of the International Union of Psychological Science*. Philadelphia, PA: Taylor & Francis.

- Rothman, J. (Ed.). (2012). *From identity-based conflict to identity-based cooperation: The ARIA approach in theory and practice*. New York, NY: Springer.
- Rudmin, F. W. (1991). Seventeen early peace psychologists. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 31*(2), 12–43. doi:10.1177/0022167891312003
- Rudmin, F. W., & Ansbacher, H. I. (1989). Ante-war psychologists: Alfred Adler. *Psychologists for Social Responsibility Newsletter, 8*(4). Washington, DC: Psychologists for Social Responsibility.
- Russell, R. W. (1958). Contemporary issues of concern to psychologists. *American Psychologist, 13*(5), 199–216. doi:10.1037/h0042198
- Russell, R. W. (1960). Roles for psychologists in the “maintenance of peace.” *American Psychologist, 15*(2), 95–109. doi:10.1037/h0043914
- Santi, R. (1991). *One hundred years of peace making: A history of the International Peace Bureau and other international peace movement organisations and networks*. Retrieved from <http://www.santibox.ch/Peace/Peacemaking.html>
- Sargent, S. S. (1986, May 23). [Remarks at 50th Anniversary Celebration]. Washington, DC: SPSSI Archives.
- Schwartz-Salant, N., & Stein, M. (Eds.). (1987). *Archetypal processes in psychotherapy*. Wilmette, IL: Chiron.
- Schwebel, M. (1940). This too for defense. *Social Work Today, 8*, 11–13.
- Schwebel, M. (1963a). Nuclear cold war: A selected bibliography. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 33*, 60–71. doi:10.1111/j.1939-0025.1963.tb00359.x
- Schwebel, M. (1963b). Students, teachers and the bomb. *National Educational Association Journal, 52*, 46–48.

- Schwebel, M. (1964). What do they think about war? In Child Study Association (Ed.), *Children and the threat of nuclear war* (pp. 25–33). New York, NY: Duell, Sloan and Pearce.
- Schwebel, M. (1965a). Human survival: A selected bibliography. In M. Schwebel (Ed.), *Behavioral science and human survival* (pp. 248–266). Palo Alto, CA: Science and Behavior Books.
- Schwebel, M. (1965b). Student opinions and professional responsibility. In M. Schwebel (Ed.), *Behavioral science and human survival* (pp. 210–233). Palo Alto, CA: Science and Behavior Books.
- Schwebel, M. (1982). Effects of the nuclear war threat on children and teenagers: Implications for professionals. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 52, 608–618. doi:10.1111/j.1939-0025.1982.tb01450.x
- Schwebel, M. (1993). What moves the peace movement: Psychosocial factors in historical perspective. In V. K. Kool (Ed.), *Nonviolence: Social and psychological issues* (pp. 59–77). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Schwebel, M. (1995). Introduction: Peace and conflict. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 1(1), 1–2. doi:10.1207/s15327949pac0101\_1
- Scott, J. P. (1989). The dog as a model for human aggression. In K. J. Flannelly, R. J. Blanchard, & D. C. Blanchard (Eds.), *Biological Perspectives on Aggression* (pp. 97–107). New York, NY: Alan R. Liss.
- Seville Statement on Violence. (1986). Paris, France: United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

- Shakow, D. (1969). *Clinical psychology as a science and profession: A forty-year odyssey*. Oxford, England: Aldine.
- Sheeran, R., Gollwitzer, P. M., & Bargh, J. A. (2013). Nonconscious processes and health. *Health Psychology, 32*(5), 460–473. doi:10.1037/a0029203
- Sherif, M. (1966). *In common predicament: Social psychology of intergroup conflict and cooperation*. Boston, MA: Houghton-Mifflin.
- Simmel, E. (1941). The neuroses in war. *Psychoanalytic Quarterly, 10*, 646–651.
- Simpson, C. (1994). *Science of coercion: Communication research and psychological warfare 1945–1960*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Sloan, T., & Toporek, R. L. (2007). On social action in counseling and psychology: Visions for the journal. *Journal for Social Action in Counseling and Psychology, 1*(1), 1–6.
- Snell, B. (1960). The discovery of the mind. In *Greek philosophy and literature* (T. G. Rosenmeyer, Trans.). New York, NY: Harper.
- Snyder, R. C. (1961). *Deterrence, weapons and decision-making*. China Lake, CA: US Naval Ordnance Test Station.
- Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues. (1954). *Public opinion and propaganda*. New York, NY: Dryden Press.
- Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues (SPSSI) Committee on Arms Control and Disarmament. (1962). Psychologists and peace. *SPSSI Newsletter*. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research.



- Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues. (2013). *History of SPSSI*. Retrieved July 24, 2013 from <http://www.spssi.org/index.cfm?fuseaction=Page.viewPage&pageId=540&parentID=479>
- Society for the Study of Peace, Conflict & Violence. (2012). *Division 48 handbook*. Retrieved from [http://secured.peacepsych.org/textonly.asp?Dept\\_ID=0&NavButton=01&Main=Y.asp&ProductsAutonum=](http://secured.peacepsych.org/textonly.asp?Dept_ID=0&NavButton=01&Main=Y.asp&ProductsAutonum=)
- Sokal, M. M. (1992). Origins and early years of the American Psychological Association, 1980–1906. *American Psychologist*, 47(2), 111–122. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.47.2.111
- Sorenson, G. (2008). [Review of the book *Inclusive Leadership*, by E. P. Hollander]. Retrieved from [http://rvelayo.com/Div52Announcements/Books\\_files/Hollanderflyer.pdf](http://rvelayo.com/Div52Announcements/Books_files/Hollanderflyer.pdf)
- Stagner, R., Brown, J. F., Gundlach, R., & White, R. K. (1942). Analysis of social scientists' opinions on the prevention of war. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 15, 381–394. doi:10.1080/00224545.1942.9921548
- Staub, E. (1989). *The roots of evil: The origins of genocide and other group violence*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Staub, E. (2011). *Overcoming evil: Genocide, violent conflict and terrorism*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Stevens, A. (1985, March). *The archetypes of war*. Three papers presented presented by the C. G. Jung Foundation for Analytical Psychology, New York.
- Stevens, A. (2004). *The roots of war and terror*. New York, NY: Paragon.

- Stockholm International Peace Research Institute. (2013). *SIPRI yearbook 2013: Armaments, disarmament and international security*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Stouffer, S. A., Lumsdaine, A. A., Lumsdaine, M. H., Williams, R. M., Jr., Smith, M. B., Irving, L. J., . . . Leonard, S. (1949). *The American soldier: Combat and its aftermath. Studies in social psychology in World War II* (Vol. 2). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Strauss, A. L. (1987). *Qualitative analysis for social scientists*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Strauss, A. L., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Strauss, A. L., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Summers, F. (2008). Making sense of the APA: A history of the relationship between psychology and the military. *Psychoanalytic Dialogues, 18*, 614–637.  
doi:10.1080/10481880802297665
- Taylor, H. (2006). Psychology in Air Force training and education. In A. D. Mangelsdorff (Ed.), *Psychology in the service of national security* (pp. 111–124). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Thrasher, F. M. (1927). *The gang: A study of 1313 gangs in Chicago*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

- Tinbergen, N. (1963). On aims and methods of ethology. *Zeitschrift fur Tierpsychologie* [Journal for Animal Psychology], 20, 410–433. doi:10.1111/j.1439-0310.1963.tb01161.x
- Tolman, E. D. (1942). *Drives toward war*. New York, NY: Appleton-Century.
- Triandis, H. (1990). Obituary for Ignacio Martín-Baró. *International Journal of Psychology*, 25, 123. doi:10.1080/00207599008246819
- Trotter, W. (1916). *Instincts of the herd in peace and war*. London, England: Fisher Unwin.
- Tzeng, O. C., Landis, D., & Tzeng, D. Y. (2012). Charles E. Osgood's continuing contributions to intercultural communication and far beyond! *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 36(6), 832–842. doi:10.1016/j.ijintrel.2012.08.011
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2004). *Basic text*. Paris, France: Author.
- United Nations. (2011). *Basic facts about the United Nations*. New York, NY: Author.
- United Nations. (2013). *A new global partnership: Eradicate poverty and transform economies through sustainable development*. New York, NY: Author.
- Uppsala Conflict Data Program. (2013). *UCDP conflict encyclopedia*. Uppsala, Sweden: Uppsala University Department of Peace and Conflict Research. Retrieved April 4, 2013 from [www.ucdp.uu.se/database](http://www.ucdp.uu.se/database).
- U. S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Military Affairs, Hearings on Science Legislation (5.1297), 79th Cong., 1st Sess. part 4, 899–902 (1945) (statement of J. Magruder).
- Vaillant, G. E. (1977). *Adaptation to life*. Boston, MA: Little Brown & Co.

- Vaillant, G. E. (1984). A debate on DSM–III: The disadvantages of DSM–III outweigh its advantages. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, *141*, 542–545.  
doi:10.1176/ajp.141.4.542
- Vaillant, G. E. (1994). Ego mechanisms of defense and personality psychopathology. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, *103*(1), 44–50. doi:10.1037/0021-843X.103.1.44
- Valent, P. (1982). Psychological attitudes and war. *Social Alternatives*, *3*, 55–58.
- Volkan, V. D. (1988). *The need to have enemies and allies: From clinical practice to international relationships*. Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson.
- Volkan, V. D. (1996). Intergenerational transmission and “chosen” traumas: A link between the psychology of the individual and that of the ethnic group. In L. Rangel & R. Moses-Hrushovski (Eds.), *Psychoanalysis at the political border* (pp. 257–282). Madison, WI: International Universities Press.
- Vollhardt, J. K., & Bilali, R. (2008). Social psychology’s contribution to the psychological study of peace: A review. *Social Psychology*, *39*(1), 12–25.  
doi:10.1027/1864-9335.39.1.12
- Voros, J. (2007). On the philosophical foundations of futures research. In P. Van der Duin (Ed.), *Knowing tomorrow: How science deals with the future* (pp. 71–90). Delft, The Netherlands: Eburon.
- Walcott, W. (1982). Jungians for peace? [Editorial]. *Psychological Perspectives: A Quarterly Journal of Jungian Thought*, *13*(2), 111–113.
- Walter, B. (2004). Does conflict beget conflict? Explaining recurring civil war. *Journal of Peace Research*, *41*(3), 371–388. doi:10.1177/0022343304043775.

- Watson, C. E. (2005). *Gertrude Stein and the essence of what happens*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.
- Watson, R. I. (1968). *The great psychologists from Aristotle to Freud* (2nd ed.). Philadelphia, PA: Lippincott.
- Webster. M. (1967). *An American dictionary of the English language*. San Francisco, CA: Foundation for American Christian Education. (Original work published 1828)
- Wendler, D., & Grady, C. (2008). What should research participants understand to understand they are participants in research? *Bioethics*, 22(4), 203–208.  
doi:10.1111/j.1467-8519.2008.00632.x
- Wertheimer, M. (2000). *A brief history of psychology*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Group/Thomson Learning.
- Wessells, M. G. (1992). Building peace psychology on a global scale: Challenges and opportunities. Presidential Address. *The Peace Psychology Bulletin* (1), 32–44.
- Wessells, M. G. (1996). A history of Division 48 (Peace Psychology). In D. A. Dewsbury (Ed.), *Unification through division: Histories of the divisions of the American Psychological Association*, 1 (pp. 265–298). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Wessells, M. G., McKay, S. A., & Roe, M. D. (2010). Pioneers in U. S. peace psychology: Reflections on the series. (Special issue: Pioneers in U. S. Peace Psychology: Herbert C. Kelman.) *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 16(4), 331–339. doi:10.1080/10781919.2010.518559

- Wessells, M. G., Roe, M. D., & McKay, S. A. (2004). Pioneers in peace psychology: Ralph K. White [Special issue]. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology, 10*(4), 317–334. doi:10.1207/s15327949pac1004\_2
- Wetzel, M. (2005). *Encyclopedia of history of American management* (pp. 157–160). Bristol, England: Thoemmes Continuum.
- White, R. K. (1968). *Nobody wanted war: Misperception in Vietnam and other wars*. New York, NY: Doubleday.
- White, R. K. (1969). Three not-so-obvious contributions of psychology to peace. Lewin memorial address. *Journal of Social Issues, 25*(4), 23–29.
- White, R. K. (1984). *Fearful warriors: A psychological profile of U.S.-Soviet relations*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- White, R. K. (Ed.). (1986). *Psychology and the prevention of nuclear war*. New York, NY: New York University Press.
- White, R. K. (1990). Why aggressors lose. *Political Psychology, 11*, 227–242. doi:10.2307/3791688
- White, R. K. (1992). Ralph White receives division award. *Peace Psychology Bulletin, 1*(3), 32.
- White, R. K. (2000). Psychological aspects of the Kosovo crisis. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology, 4*, 93–128. doi:10.1207/s15327949pac0402\_2
- Witmer, L. (1931). Clinical psychology. In R. A. Brotemarkle (Ed.), *Clinical psychology: Studies in honor of Lightner Witmer to commemorate the thirty-fifth anniversary of the founding of the first psychological clinic* (pp. 314–352). Baltimore, MD: University of Pennsylvania Press.

- World Health Organization. (1996). *WHO global consultation on violence and health. Prevention of violence: A public health priority* (Doc. No. WHO/EHA/SPI.POA.2). Geneva, Switzerland: Author.
- Wundt, W. (1984). *Principles of physiological psychology* (5th ed., E. B. Titchener, Trans.). New York, NY: Macmillan. (Original work published 1904)
- Yerkes, R. M. (1918). Psychology in relation to war. *Psychological Review*, 25(2), 85–115. doi:10.1037/h0069904
- Zajtchuk, R., & Bellamy, R. F. (Eds.). (1995). *War psychiatry*. Washington, DC: Department of the Army, Office of the Surgeon General.
- Zoja, L., & Williams, D. (Eds.). (2002). *Jungian reflections on September 11: A global nightmare*. Einsiedeln, Switzerland: Daimon.

## Appendix A

### Peace Psychology Book Series

- Blumberg, H., Kent, M. V., Hare, A. P., & Davies, M. F. (2012). *Implications for peace psychology and conflict resolutions*. New York, NY: Springer.
- Bretherton, D., & Balvin, N. (Eds.). (2012). *Peace psychology in Australia*. New York, NY: Springer. New York, NY: Springer.
- Bretherton, D., & Law, S. F. (Eds.). (2016). *Methodologies in peace psychology: Peace research by peaceful means*. New York, NY: Springer.
- Carpenter, A. C. (in press). *Community resilience to sectarian violence in Baghdad*. New York, NY: Springer.
- Coleman, P. T. (Ed.). (2011). *Conflict, interdependence, and justice*. New York, NY: Springer.
- Coleman, P. T., & Deutsch, M. (Eds.). (2012). *Psychological components of sustainable peace*. New York, NY: Springer.
- Hamber, B. (2009). *Transforming societies after political violence*. New York, NY: Springer.
- Kalayjian, A., & Paloutzian, R. F. (2010). *Forgiveness and reconciliation*. New York, NY: Springer.
- Malley-Morrison, K., McCarthy, S., & Hines, D. (Eds.). (2013). *International handbook of war, torture, and terrorism*. New York, NY: Springer.
- Malley-Morrison, K., Mercurio, A., & Twose, G. (Eds.). (2013). *International handbook of peace and reconciliation*. New York, NY: Springer.
- Mayton, D. (2009). *Nonviolence and peace psychology*. New York, NY: Springer.



- Moghaddam, F. M., Harré, R., & Lee, N. (Eds.). (2008). *Global conflict resolution through positioning analysis*. New York, NY: Springer.
- Montero, M., & Sonn, C. C. (Eds.). (2009). *Psychology of liberation*. New York, NY: Springer.
- Montiel, C. J., & Noor, N. M. (Eds.). (2009). *Peace psychology in Asia*. New York, NY: Springer.
- Rivera, J. (Ed.). (2009). *Handbook on building cultures of peace*. New York, NY: Springer.
- Rothman, J. (Ed.). (2012). *From identity-based conflict to identity-based cooperation*. New York, NY: Springer.
- Simić, O., Volčič, Z., & Philpot, C. R. (Eds.). (2012). *Peace psychology in the Balkans*. New York, NY: Springer.
- Sims, G. K., Nelson, L. L., & Puopolo, M. R. (Eds.). (2014). *Personal peacefulness* (Peace Psychology Book Series, Volume 20). New York, NY: Springer.
- Spini, D., Elcheroth, G., & Corkalo Biruski, D. (Eds.). (2013). *War, community, and social change*. New York City, NY: Springer.
- Vallacher, R. R., Coleman, P. T., Nowak, A., Bui-Wrzosinska, L., Liebovitch, L., Kugler, K., & Bartoli, A. (2013). *Attracted to conflict: Dynamic foundations of destructive social relations*. New York City, NY: Springer.

## Appendix B

## New York Times Article

Published: November 14, 1937

Copyright © The New York Times

## **PSYCHOLOGISTS DENY WAR IS A 'NECESSITY'**

### ***Armistice Day Manifesto Takes Exception to the Theory of 'Aggressive Instincts'***

The Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues, which numbers among its members such distinguished scientists as Drs. Goodwin Watson, G. W. Hartmann and Gardner Murphy (all of Columbia), Dr. I. Krechevsky (University of Chicago) and Dr. E. C. Tolman (University of California), celebrated Armistice Day by sending out a manifesto denying that war is a psychological necessity.

To those who believe that man's "aggressive instincts" cause war, the society puts questions: "Whose aggressive instincts? Those of the men who fight war or those whose acts lead into war?"

The society's spokesmen see no analogy between a war and two men fighting. "When two men get into a personal fight," says the manifesto, "each knows why he is fighting and has the alternative of not fighting." But war? "The psychologist sees people fighting who, for the most part, are prevented from knowing the real reasons for the war, and are instead artificially motivated by propaganda often composed of falsehoods."

Is there a fighting instinct in man? The society denies it. "In a recent poll of several hundred American psychologists, all of whom have studied the instinct question thoroughly," it sets forth, "over 90 per cent denied that any proof existed for the view that man's instinct leads to war."

## Appendix C

### 1945 APA Human Nature and Peace: Statement by Psychologists

*Context: "On April 5th Gordon Allport and Gardner Murphy released to the press the statement which had been drafted by an informal committee of psychologists and submitted to the entire APA membership. SPSSI bore the cost of mailing the statement.*

*Over 2,000 psychologists signed the statement. The members of the committee that drafted the statement, in addition to Allport and Murphy, were: R. S. Crutchfield, H. B. English, Edna Heidbreder, E. R. Hilgard, Otto Klineberg, Rensis Likert, Mark A. Ma, D. H. Mowrer, C. C. Pratt, W. S. Taylor, and E. C. Tolman.*

**Statement:** "Human Nature and Peace: Statement by Psychologists"

"Humanity's demand for lasting peace leads us as students of human nature to assert ten pertinent and basic principles which should be considered in planning the peace. Neglect of them may breed new wars, no matter how well-intended our political leaders may be.

1. War can be avoided: War is not born in men; it is built into men. No race, nation, or social group is inevitably warlike. The frustrations and conflicting interests which lie at the root of aggressive wars can be reduced and re-directed by social engineering. Men can realize their ambitions within the framework of human cooperation and can direct their aggressions against those natural obstacles that thwart them in the attainment of their goals.

2. In planning for permanent peace, the coming generation should be the primary focus of attention. Children are plastic; they will readily accept symbols of unity and an international way of thinking in which the evils of imperialism, prejudice, insecurity, and ignorance are minimized. In appealing to older people, chief stress should be laid upon economic, political, and educational plans that are appropriate to a new generation, for older people, as a rule, desire above all else, better conditions and opportunities for their children.

3. Racial, national, and group hatreds can, to a considerable degree, be controlled. Through education and experience people can learn that their prejudice ideas about the English, the Russians, the Japanese, Catholics, Jews, Negroes, are misleading or altogether false. They can learn that members of one racial, national, or cultural group are basically similar to those of other groups, and have similar problems, hopes, aspirations, and needs. Prejudice is a matter of attitudes, and attitudes are to a considerable extent a matter of training and information.

4. Condescension toward "inferior" groups destroys our chance for a lasting peace. The white man must be freed of his concept of the "white man's burden." The English-speaking peoples are only a tenth of the world's population; those of white skin only a third. The great dark-skinned populations of Asia and Africa, which are already moving toward a greater independence in their own affairs, hold the ultimate key to a

stable peace. The time has come for a more equal participation of all branches of the human family in a plan for collective security.

5. Liberated and enemy peoples must participate in planning their own destiny. Complete outside authority imposed on liberated and enemy peoples without any participation by them will not be accepted and will lead only to further disruptions of the peace. The common people of all countries must not only feel that their political and economic future holds genuine hope for themselves and for their children, but must also feel that they themselves have the responsibility for its achievement.

6. The confusion of defeated people will call for clarity and consistency in the application of rewards and punishments. Reconstruction will not be possible so long as the Germans and Japanese people are confused as to their status. A clear-cut and easily understood definition of war-guilt is essential. Consistent severity toward those who are judged guilty, and consistent official friendliness toward the democratic elements, is a necessary policy.

7. If properly administered, relief, and rehabilitation can lead to self-reliance and cooperation: if improperly, to resentment and hatred. Unless liberated people (and enemy people) are given an opportunity to work in a self-respecting manner for the food and relief they receive, they are likely to harbor bitterness and resentment, since our bounty will be regarded by them as unearned charity, dollar imperialism, or bribery. No people can long tolerate such injuries to self-respect.

8. The root-desires of the common people of all lands are the safest guide to framing peace. Disrespect for the common man is characteristic of fascism and all forms of tyranny. The man in the street does not claim to understand the complexities of economics and politics, but he is clear as to the general directions in which he wishes to progress. His will can be studied (by adaptation of the public opinion poll). His expressed aspirations should even now be a major guide to policy.

9. The trend of human relationships is toward ever wider units of collective security. From the caveman to the twentieth century, human beings have formed larger and larger working and living groups. Families merged into clans, clans into states, and states into nations. The United States are not 48 threats to each other's safety; they work together. At present moment the majority of our people regard the time as ripe for regional and world organization, and believe that the initiative should be taken by the United States of America.

10. Commitments now may prevent postwar apathy and reaction. Unless binding commitments are made and initial steps taken now, people may have a tendency after the war to turn away from international problems and to become preoccupied once again with narrower interests. This regression to a new postwar provincialism would breed the conditions for a new world. Now is the time to prevent this backward step, and to assert

through binding action that increased unity among the people of the world is the goal we intend to attain.

(American Psychological Association, 1945)

## Appendix D

### Psychological Literature Listed in SPSSI's 1962 Newsletter, "Psychologists and Peace"

#### General references:

Various articles on psychological factors of foreign policy, social perception, reducing international tensions, disarmament, bargaining, negotiation, conflict resolution, changing attitudes, arms control, and civil defense in: *Journal of Conflict Resolution* (CR), Ann Arbor, MI & *Journal of Social Issues* (ISI), Ann Arbor, MI.

*Current thought on war and peace*. Duke Station, Durham, NC. [This is a quarterly publication of abstracts of the books, articles, and research in progress in the broad field of international relations.]

#### Bibliographies and Abstracts:

Institute for International Order. (1965). *Current thought on peace and war: A world affairs digest of literature and research in progress on current international issues* (Vol. 5). New York, NY: Current Thought.

#### Articles and books

Blackett, P. M. S. (1962). Steps toward disarmament. *Scientific American*, 206(4), 45–53.

Brennan, D. B. (Ed.). (1961). *Arms control, disarmament, and national security*. New York, NY: American Academy of Arts and Sciences.

Cantril, H. (1950). *Tensions that cause war*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Cook, F. J. (1961). Juggernaut: The warfare state. *The Nation*, 193, 111.

Deutsch, M. (1962). Cooperation and trust: Some theoretical notes. In M. Jones (Ed.), *Nebraska symposium on motivation* (pp. 275–318). Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

- Deutsch, M. (1962). A psychological basis for peace. In Q. Wright, W. M. Evan, & M. Deutsch (Eds.), *Preventing World War III: Some proposals*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.
- Etzioni, A. (1961). *The hard road to peace*. New York, NY: Collier Books.
- Frank, J. D. (1960). Breaking the thought barrier: Psychological challenges of the nuclear age. *Psychiatry*, 23, 245–266.
- Fromm, E. (1961). *May man prevail? An inquiry into the facts and fiction of foreign policy*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday-Anchor.
- Gilbert, G. M. (Ed.). (1956). *Psychological approaches to intergroup and international understanding: A symposium*. Austin, TX: University of Texas.
- Kahn, H. (1961). *On thermonuclear war*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Kelman, H. (Ed.). (1965). *International behavior: A social-psychological analysis*. Austin, TX: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Klineberg, O. (1950). Tensions affecting international understanding: A survey of research. *Social Science Research Council Bulletin*, 62.
- Klineberg, O. (1964). *The human factor in international relations*. Montreal, Canada: Sir George Williams University, Association of Alumnae.
- Mack, R. W., & Baker, G. W. *The occasion incident: The structure of social responses to repeated air raid warnings*. [Disaster Study, No. 15]. Washington, DC: National Academy of Sciences, National Research Council.
- Melman, S. (1961). *The peace race*. New York, NY: Ballantine Books.

- Murphy, G. (Ed.). (1945). *Human nature and enduring peace: Third yearbook of the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- New York Peace Information Service. (1964). *The poor man's guide to war/peace literature*. New York, NY: Author.
- Nordlie, P. G., & Popper, R. D. (1961). *Social phenomena in a possible nuclear attack situation*. Arlington, VA: Human Sciences Research.
- Osgood, C. E. (1962). Reciprocal initiative. In J. Roosevelt (Ed.), *The liberal papers* (pp. 155–228). Garden City, NY: Anchor.
- Pool, I. D. (1961). *Communication and values in relation to war and peace*. New York, NY: Institute for International Order.
- Pope, T. H. (Ed.). (1950). *Psychological factors of peace and war*. New York, NY: The Philosophical Library.
- Riesman, D., & MacCoby, M. (1962). The American crisis. In James Roosevelt (Ed.), *The liberal papers* (pp. 13–48). New York, NY: Anchor Books.
- Russell, R. W. (Ed.). (1961). Psychology and policy in a nuclear age [Special issue]. *Journal of Social Issues*, 17(3), 1–87.
- Schelling, T. C., & Halperin, M. H. (1961). *Strategy and arms control*. New York, NY: Twentieth Century Fund.
- Sherif, M., Harvey, O. J., White, B. J., Hood, W. R., & Sherif, C. W. (1961). *Intergroup conflict and cooperation: The robbers cave experiment*. Norman, OK: University Book Exchange.



Snyder, R. C. (1961). *Deterrence, weapon systems, and decision-making*. Inyokern, CA: U.S. Naval Ordnance Test Station.

Snyder, R. C., & Robinson, J. A. (1961). *National and international decision-making: Toward a general research strategy related to the problem of war and peace*. New York, NY: Institute for International Order.

Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues (SPSSI) Committee on Arms Control and Disarmament. (1962). *Psychologists and peace: A special SPSSI newsletter*. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research.

Warburg, J. P. (1961). *Disarmament: The challenge of the nineteen sixties*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Waskow, A. O. (1962). The shelter-centered society. *Scientific American*, 206(5), 46–51.

Waskow, A. O. (1962). *The limits of defense*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Wright, Q., Evan, W. M., & Deutsch, M. (Eds.). (1962). *Preventing World War III: Some proposals*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.

**Publications of the Institute for International Order's Committee on Peace:**

American Academy of Arts and Sciences. Committee on the Technical Problems of Arms Limitation. (1960). *The technical problems of arms control*.

Boulding, K. E. (1960). *Economic Factors Bearing Upon the Maintenance of Peace*.

Larson, A. (1961). *The international rule of law*.

Snyder, R. C., & Robinson, J. A. (1963). *National and international decision-making; toward a general research strategy related to the problem of war and peace*.

## Appendix E

### Sample Informed Consent Form

TITLE OF THE STUDY: Peace Psychologists–Determining the Critical Contributions

1. I agree to have Henriette Warfield (investigator) ask me a series of questions about my history as a peace psychologist and as the President of APA's Division 48.
2. These questions will be asked in a mutually agreed upon location and will take about 60 minutes. A second interview of no more than 30 minutes will be scheduled to clarify responses from the first interview.
3. The purpose of asking these questions is to understand my background as a psychologist and as a peace psychologist; to understand the dynamics in the field of peace psychology during my tenure as President; to hear of both my accomplishments and challenges as President; and to understand my concerns and hopes for the future of peace psychology.
4. I understand that none of the questions is designed to be embarrassing or annoying to me. I understand that I can choose whether to answer any question and can withdraw from this study at any time without jeopardizing my standing. Confidentiality, as I request it, will be respected at all times.
5. I understand that this research may benefit the field of peace psychology and the study, yet not be of immediate value to me personally.
6. I understand the interview contents are the sole property of the researcher and may be referenced in other electronic or print format. The researcher also reserves the right to present findings at professional gatherings.
7. The researcher has explained that my name will be used and that I will have the opportunity to approve any quotes directly attributable to me.
8. Information about this study and the place of my interview in it has been given to me by Henriette Warfield. I can reach her when I have questions by calling 703-408-8066 or emailing her at [henriettev@earthlink.net](mailto:henriettev@earthlink.net).
9. I am not receiving any compensation for participating in this study.
10. This research is part of a dissertation study at Pacifica Graduate Institute, 249 Lambert Road, Carpinteria, CA 93013. This research is conducted under the supervision of Michael Sipiora, PhD who can be reached at 805-969-3636 x 189.

---

Signature

---

Date

## Appendix F

### Sample Instructions to Participants

Interviews will take place in a mutually agreed upon location. One 60-minute interview and a follow-up interview to clarify my responses will be conducted on separate days at mutually agreed times. You will be asked the attached questions (questions will be attached). Although I will initiate discussion with these questions, the dialogue will be open, and you are free to comment on anything that seems significant to you.

During the course of the interviews, strong emotions and memories may surface. You may feel some psychological discomfort. You are free to take a break from the interview or discontinue the interview at any point.

The interviews will be recorded, and then transcribed into a written format. Your confidentiality will be respected at all times during this process. The transcriber will not know your identity.

Following the transcription of the interview, you will be sent a copy of the transcript (approximately one week after the interview). After reviewing the document you will be contacted by the researcher for a follow up in-person or telephone interview and offered the opportunity to add comments and/or clarify points. Added comments will be quoted verbatim and kept separately but added to the interview data.

The responses will be analyzed in a qualitative grounded methods approach by the researcher. The researcher may contact you for further clarification if questions arise that cannot be answered by the researcher.

The intellectual property generated through this research will remain the property of the researcher. The term *intellectual property* refers to all ideas, information, creation, and knowledge that are protected by law. Intellectual property concerns everything that human minds have created as opposed to physical property. For example, the Microsoft® butterfly is not a physical object, but it is a fixed form protected by Intellectual Property Rights. You also may use your own interview material for your own research or personal communications.

## Appendix G

### Recollections of Engagement with Peace Psychology Division's Development

**Wessells.** [Outside of establishing a peace psychology curriculum at Randolph Macon] The other thing I decided to work on in the most concerted way was to help to develop the psychology of peace and non-violent conflict resolution through scholarship, activism, and all forms of making a difference in the world which includes education, training, etc. I basically found open minds and common spirits in PsySR and in the group that had been trying to form a Division of Peace Psychology.

I'll talk about Division 48 first. In the movement to form Division 48, I found this incredible group of people. Marc Pilisuk, Milton Schwebel, the Morton Deutch's, the Ralph White's, the Herb Kelman's—all of these people who in my estimation are giants who had just paved the way. There was real organizational work that needed to be done. But the basic vision, I think, a lot of it was already there, and certainly the passion and the framework were there. What was missing was an organization that would give it a foothold within the APA. I entered the work stream to form a peace division with Jim Polyson, who lives in Richmond. He and I picked up where I would say things were struggling just a little bit. Alan Nelson had been a key initiator and organizer of the movement to form a division of peace psychology. He was certainly not the only person. Gregory Sims had been very involved. Marc Pilisuk and a lot of the seniors had been very supportive. In terms of the organizational work—what it took to form a new division was formidable. One had to get a petition that would be approved by the APA governing body, the Council of Representatives. The petition had to be signed by 10% of the APA membership which at that time meant about 600 people. The people who signed had to be current APA members.

To make a long story short, Alan Nelson and Greg Sims had initially led the petitioning effort. Alan had become injured, had suffered a very serious back injury around, I think it was 1985, and he could no longer continue. Greg Sims wanted help and said, "I'm happy to contribute but someone else really needs to sort of carry the banner." And so Jim Polyson and I took it on. What we discovered was that although many people had expressed interest, but that a lot of the signatures were not from current APA members. So there was a lot of drudge work to identify who were current APA members and who weren't. We had something like 750 signatures, but only about 375 of them who were APA members. We were far short of where we needed to be, meaning that there was a large task of salesmanship that was needed. Being a traditionalist organization, the APA needed to see that there was real scholarship backing us and the petition—one petition had been put together and it had been rejected. I don't think it went to the floor of Council since it lacked the number of needed signatures and also a scholarly approach.

Jim and I worked together on getting the signatures. My son and I did a lot of work on the mailings and spent many a weekend licking stamps and envelopes and sending out letters. I also went to meetings of parallel groups with kindred spirits like ORTHO, the American Orthopsychiatric Association, drumming up potential members and so on. But a lot of the work that I did was more organizational in nature—convening meetings of the Steering Group that worked to form the new division, negotiating with

people who held divergent views, and helping to reconfigure the steering group and petition so that we would obtain Council approval.

In 1987, we developed our first full petition. It had a fair number of references to psychological work that was being done on peace by some very reputable people like Brewster Smith, Morton Deutsch, Milton Schwebel, Ralph White, Herb Kelman, and others. But it got rejected. The Cold War was on, and I think that we had not learned how to do things on the floor in Council.

Again I was naïve. I had thought that a good idea would be obvious and that people would come around to it. I didn't understand. With that setback we set about reformulating our steering group. We brought on, as I recall, Milton Schwebel and Janet Schofield who added scholarly punch. Morton Deutsch and Marc Pilisuk remained members and continued to be good visionaries and cheerleaders. But we realized that, next time around we would need a floor general—someone on the floor who could speak for us, whose voice cannot be denied. We wanted someone of unassailable integrity who was well known and respected by Council members. Our man was Brewster Smith.

He was known as the conscience of APA, and he had been a former APA president. He knew council upside down and inside out. We ask him to speak on the floor, and he kindly agreed. We called around to advocate in favor of the Division. Jim and I called many Council members and learned what the objections were and also how to speak to them. It turned out the single biggest objection was that APA had a proliferation of divisions, and they wanted no new ones. The argument was that if you get too many divisions they get watered down. People don't become active members and it weakens our organization. My response was, well, create divisions that speak to people's felt needs and the situation of the world and you will get new members. Many people wouldn't ordinarily join the APA because they don't see it as speaking to their interest and nurturing their souls. We thought that having a peace division would give such people a home within APA.

On the Council floor, Brewster spoke to the concern over the excessive number of divisions. But the way that he said it was brilliant. It was just classical Brewster. He said, "Adding another division at this point will not even be a JND." In perception and psychophysics talk of JNDs (just noticeable differences) was common, and all the classical psychologist knew what a JND was. By putting it in those terms he indicated that he had not lost the moorings of classical psychology and had injected in just the right element of humor. He invited people to not be so concerned about that issue but to bring in a new division and make psychology broader. He, of course, pointed out that there had long been a division of military psychology and there needed to be people working on peace.

A significant factor was the changing context. It was 1989, the era of perestroika in which the Soviet Union was less scary that it had been previously. Maybe that contributed to the positive reaction by Council. But I think our organizational work had paid off. We had a stronger, scholarly petition, had done our homework on Council, and had arranged for Brewster to support the petition publicly. Having addressed the concerns around scholarship and divisional proliferation, our petition passed—Council approved it. In order to become a division, however, APA rules required that we have a constitutional meeting in which 10% of the membership was present. We needed 60 psychologists who had signed the petition present at our constitutional meeting. In

preparation of that meeting, we beat the wood work. We really got the word through all our networks, sent out many letters, and licked more envelopes. Lots of phone calls were made, and in the end we had our constitution meeting in 1990 in Boston.

It was an historic meeting. It was there that we began to do the hard work of hammering out the exact vision, by-laws, procedures, processes of the division. We wanted to embody inclusivity and democracy, and other values that contribute to peace. We wanted women to be prominent and active, and we wanted people with different ethnic backgrounds prominent and active. Yet we knew that we had an uphill battle. So that's the story of my involvement. I had the honor of co-chairing that steering group during that period that went through developing the winning petition, helping it to gain approval by Council, and finally organizing and conducting the consolidating meeting.

We created Bylaws, because we had been advised by Sarah Jordan of the APA Membership Office (who was a huge support), that all the divisions needed under the APA Constitution to have their own bylaws. The bylaws had to be reviewed by APA Council to make sure that there were no conflicts with APA policy or the law. Steering Group asked Alan Nelson and I to draft initial Bylaws, which we did. Alan was extremely active but out of the limelight on this. We reviewed models from as many different organizations as we could find. We had very active, robust discussions, in which Alan rigorously applied a peace lens, and looked very carefully at each word and its implications.

An important question was how could one make amendments to the bylaws? Could that be done by a small group, such as a steering committee? We thought, of course not. That ought to be done with two-thirds of the membership voting, and then that raised the question, "Could you get response from two-thirds of the membership? Or was it only two-thirds of the people who responded?" These questions of democracy and inclusivity had to be ferreted out. Over time we did that and then took the draft by-laws to the steering group. The draft stimulated many discussions that extended over a period of a couple of years. We didn't want to move too quickly since the issues required debate and care. I am happy to say it was a very inclusive and robust process. Once division had officially formed and had approved its bylaws, the steering committee to form the division dissolved. We then elected officers and formed an executive committee. The executive committee would set policies within the framework set forth by the bylaws, and then we began the arduous process of really developing a division. Because there were huge questions about vision and niche.

There was an extensive debate behind the scenes about whether this was good for PsySR and peace. At that same period, I was chair of the operations committee of PsySR and that was a sort of the equivalent of a chair of an executive committee. There was a steering committee, but it was the operations committee that really guided the operations and activities of PsySR. Some people said, "It's great to have a footing within the APA because a peace division will be able to hold the APA accountable, and to develop peace psychology as a sort of a set part of U.S. and global psychology. Who knows, maybe the division would build the peace scholarship and younger psychologists could someday earn tenure as peace psychologists." Other people said, "No, if we go that route, we will lose our effectiveness to criticize the APA, because one can only do so much inside. It takes an outside body to really criticize APA and hold them to the fire. And that group is PsySR."

Another dimension of the debate was a bit more territorial. The question, I suppose, was, “will members drift away from PsySR to the peace division?” Is there really enough membership because, speaking with my PsySR hat on, we had a small membership and an inadequate budget. We used to sweat bullets over how to be sustainable and accountable to our members. A significant question was would people rather join the division of peace psychology, and if they did, would they be less likely to support PsySR?

My view was that if you want to build scholarship, you're better off doing it within the APA. If your aim is to build activism, then you're better off doing that within PsySR. Eventually, this was the division of labor that people came to, seeing both organizations as complementary and needing to support each other. This view succeeded in part because we had a lot of crossover members: Morton Deutsch, Herb Kelman, Ethel Tobach, Dorothy Ciarlo, Milton Schwebel, and Brewster Smith, for example. Brewster had been a president of PsySR, or was to be a president of PsySR pretty soon, and the same was true for Milt and for Ralph White. Being both scholars and activists, all were interested in the division and were interested in PsySR. Slowly, the dominant view emerged that this is not a threat but an opportunity—an opportunity to expand the pie—to build a scholarly arm through the peace division and to have an organization external to the APA–PsySR—continue to be the action arm, as Doris Miller taught us to call PsySR

Early on, there was good collaboration between the division and PsySR. We formed a collaborative suite every year at the APA Convention—the division of peace psychology was very poor in the early days. We had no journal and scraped together enough to run a newsletter. PsySR, on the other hand, had a long history of having its own suite because there had been very few peace events on the APA program throughout the 1980s. Also, in the suite one could find community as wonderful individuals examined an array of timely issues. If one had attended a PsySR meeting in, say, 1988 before the peace division had been established, there would have been avid discussion about Cold War policies, the war in El Salvador and Nicaragua, the ongoing nuclear threat, and so on. Such issues seldom made their way on to the APA program yet needed extensive analysis and discussion. In the suite, there were many discussions and collaborative activities that were facilitated in part by virtue of the crossover in membership and also by the leadership of Anne Anderson who was (and is) an excellent facilitator who encouraged collaborative and was very good at building bridges.

**Christie.** PsySR was beginning. That's where I met some folks with whom I could share these concerns about nuclear war, and the role of psychology, activism, and all those kinds of PsySR-type things that were going on at that time.

And fortunately, shortly thereafter Division 48 started to be formed. I remember petitions for a new division being passed out along with other efforts to get a peace division established. There were false starts and failures here and there, but it stumbled along and eventually some influential psychologists (like Brewster Smith) gave the prospect of a division on peace a strong endorsement and by the time the Cold War ended, Division 48 was born.

And then I was surrounded by family. I mean, people like Morton Deutsch who was just a kind human being, and a terrific intellectual, and leader, and mentor. It was wonderful to get to know him and befriend others who were peers like Dick Wagner and

Mike Wessells and Susie McKay and Milton Schwebel—all of whom formed a community and together pretty much gave me a professional home. Those turned out to be lifetime friendships. They fortunately, altogether, had pretty good reputations in academics which made it possible to say to my Psychology Department faculty, “It’s a legitimate area of study because there are folks there who are studying peace and they have good reputations.” Step-by-step all of these things came together.

Then when the international group, the Committee for the Psychological Study of Peace [CPSP], was formed (they actually had several bi-annual meetings before I went to one) I was invited to one. Then I found, “There’s a global network starting to develop,” and from that I was able to form some collaborative relationships and developed a book on peace psychology which was published by Prentice-Hall and now is open access. I’m really happy Prentice-Hall was willing to revert the copyright to us so that now it’s available to everybody, and I get emails from all over the world on that saying, “We found this book and what can you tell me about peace psychology, and can you tell me more?” I think initially it was worth doing just to pull together scholars from around the world. And when the book was under the aegis of Prentice-Hall, all the royalties went to Division 48, which was sorely needed at the time.

*I read the minutes of the meetings in the formative year of trying to collect 600+ signatures, and discovering at the last minute that people had signed twice. It really it was amazing the amount of tedious legwork that you and others did to launch the division. Sarah Jordan was extremely helpful.*

Yes, exactly. I think people often don’t know it but Sarah Jordan did a lot for the division. She gave a lot of good advice and was just very, very patient, and she helped educate a bunch of us about how things were done within APA and what it was going to take. I think, early on there were a few of us who didn’t understand how APA worked, and we got a bit disheartened when the initial petition was turned down. We didn’t understand why these things were happening. Sarah helped us get on track—she was really great.

**Pilisuk.** I was a founding member of Psychologists for Social Responsibility [PsySR was established in 1982], an early member of SANE [The Committee for a SANE Nuclear Policy (SANE) began in 1957] now [since 1993] called Peace Action. And I was one of the founders of the very first teach-in (Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1965). I was inspired by the work of Eric Fromm, and non-psychologists such as Kenneth Boulding and Anatol Rapaport were also early inspirations. . . . I am attaching an article on the teach-in [Pilisuk, 1965] since my participation shaped much of my subsequent development as a scholar/practitioner and another dealing with structural violence.

Attached articles included:

Pilisuk, M. (1965). The evolution of the teach-in. *The Canadian Forum*, 176–177.

Pilisuk, M. (2001). Humanistic psychology and peace. In K.J. Schneider, J. F. T.

Bugenthal, and J. F. Pierson (Eds.). *The handbook of humanistic psychology:*

*Leading edges in theory, research, and practice.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.



Pilisuk, M. (2013). Malnutrition. In K. Keith, (ed.) *The encyclopedia of cross-cultural psychology*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.

Pilisuk, M. & Hall, M. Psychological capacities for cultivating a killing-free world. (An earlier version of this paper appeared as “Psychology and Peace” in M. Pilisuk, & M.N. Nagler, Eds. (2011). *Peace movements worldwide, 1*, 52–67.)

Pilisuk, M., Roundtree, J. A., & Pellegrini, G. (2008). Playing the imperial game: The mindset behind the attack on Iraq. *Peace Research, 40*(2), 39–59.

Pilisuk, M. & Zazzi, J. (2006). Toward A Psychosocial Theory of Military and Economic Violence in the Era of Globalization. *Journal of Social Issues 62*(1), 41–62.]

**Reyes.** Julie [Levitt] was an attendee at a conference I organized that was on international collaboration in disaster mental health [sponsored by]. . . the Disaster Mental Health Institute. She [Julie Levitt] was representing herself, but she mentioned to me that she was involved with Psychologist for Social Responsibility [PsySR] and she really liked the conference that we were doing. She wondered if I would like to help inform her about how Psychologist for Social Responsibility might do their own version thereof. And the focus would be different, it [would be] on humanitarian ethics, but it was still going to be an international crowd. In fact, she ended up inviting quite a number of the people who were involved in that conference—the one that I had organized—to be a part of this second one because there was lot of crossover. I joined their conference committee for that and that drew me into Psychologist for Social Responsibility. I joined the steering committee coming off that conference, and then stayed with that for several years.

We (PsySR and Division 48) would share hospitality suites at the APA convention. We were like cousins—we had affinity with each other, but we came from different families. PsySR people were much more activist . . . . The PsySR people were more aggressive, whereas the Division 48 people were more passive, and there were people who went back-and-forth between the two. And so I don't want to be too clever with this distinction because it's only a distinction to make a point that there were times when they just needed to go their separate ways, and stopped doing their suite together. In fact, PsySR just started backing away from the APA Convention as a venue and saying “Why don't we just do our own conference, be independent. We're not part of APA. We don't like the way APA has handled themselves with the war on terror and Division 48 continues to be an APA division.” The folks (just the same way in our lunch meeting today), were talking about APA being so in bed with the military-industrial complex that they can't live without the money and influence. So, too, Division 48 has been so in bed with APA that they can't live without that influence either. They want to be able to go to the Council of Representatives and be seen as very reasonable, clear-headed people who

are not dividing the world up into “us and them.” PsySR has a tendency to do that—to divide the world up. I’m not saying either one of them is entirely right, but it was very difficult to be a part of both.

**Diaz.** [A]s soon as I became aware that there was a place that I could potentially call my professional home, it’s the Peace Psychology Division that later on became the Society for the Study of Peace, Conflict and Violence.

I started engaging and found them to be just really interesting people. I was also fascinated by the fact that many of them had involvement with Psychologists for Social Responsibility (PsySR). I followed with quick steps and became part of the Steering Committee of PsySR in the late '90s. I would follow things on both sides of the Peace Psychology world because I always perceived PsySR as the activist arm.

Division 48 folks were the ones willing to work within the APA system. There were outside reform efforts from the PsySR side. I became fascinated with the international work of psychologists like Mike Wessells, all of them. Some were trying to work in Africa. They were trying to serve those typically not served by psychologists. I’m still very much interested in the broadest psychology, much more than North American psychology. As a consequence of now being in a position where I could be my own boss, I started getting more involved in actual division work. This is post-1996. I did a couple of presentations here and there. I did a workshop at APA on the Alternative to Violence Project (AVP). Back in 1994, my wife and I had helped start the Alternatives to Violence Project work in South Florida.

After serving a term on the PsySR Steering Committee, someone suggested that I should run for this or run for that. Somebody talked me into running for office, I can't remember who, and I did. I was somewhat surprised that people were actually voting for me. It was not ever, I guess, a big ambition for me to be—to take on a leadership role. When I started the work in Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement, I recognized that there was a need to provide that field with as much psychological input as I could generate. So I became happily involved in that organization, the National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement (NACOLE). It was created about 1995, after the start of the Peace Psychology Division. I assumed the job of Executive Director of the Independent Review Panel in 1996. My first leadership role at a national level occurred within that organization. I became a member of that board a couple of years after I started in Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement. Eventually, by 2008, I became President of the National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement. I apparently discovered that I had some ability to talk to people, or to listen to people, or help things move along.

I became open to the idea of doing something in Peace Psychology, and somebody talked me into running and I ran. I became President of Division 48 in 2009.

## Appendix H

### Reflections on the Applicability of Depth Psychology to Peace Psychology

**Olson.** Yes, most definitely. Most definitely . . . I think a lot of the social psychology work, even though they don't call it that—I mean, all of the implicit prejudice tests are really unconscious processes. And do I see enough of that work? I probably—I see it more in the activism than I see it in the research, unfortunately. I'd love to see more research on it. But I do think there are a lot of good people in PsySR, some of the people who are working with the Racial Justice Group—Gordon Lee who worked with Mary Watkins at Pacifica where they have a depth psychology program. I know he uses a lot of depth psychology in his thinking.

So in a lot of ways, I do think it's undercurrents in activism and probably in research, but I just really haven't dealt in that specific area of the research. But then eventually, it's really only probably in the last five years that Erich Fromm—Erich Fromm for me can do no wrong. There's nothing he says that I disagree with. I think all of his adjustments of Freud's work are right on and they just helped me in a super way to understand what's happening. It's a little dry reading, but all of his thinking has been so influential to me. And he's really my favorite. So, yes, to the extent that we call that depth psychology it's not the Jungian type, but certainly.

*Do you think that peace psychology research includes unconscious factors in what you've been reading in the field?*

I think that would be a really nice angle to take. I think a lot of the social psychology work, even though they don't call it that—I mean, all of the implicit prejudice tests are really unconscious processes. And do I see enough of that work? I probably—I see it more in the activism than I see it in the research, unfortunately. I'd love to see more research on it. But I do think there are a lot of good people in PsySR, some of the people who are working with the Racial Justice Group—Gordon Lee who worked with Mary Watkins at Pacifica where they have a depth psychology program. I know he uses a lot of depth psychology in his thinking. So in a lot of ways, I do think it's undercurrents in activism and probably in research, but I just really haven't dealt in that specific area of the research.

**Reyes.** Yes and no. I don't want to exaggerate the yes . . . . During that period of time I was also reading quite a bit about Native American belief systems and other aboriginal belief systems. I think that's where Carl Jung and I could get along. I found those much more compelling, much more affective. It was their truly primitive nature—that they weren't dressed up in quite as much knick-knackery, quite as neat costumes—not that they're not colorful. So I guess that's a long way around of saying that I'm always looking for the essence, and I really want to separate the “wheat from the chaff” and say, “Well, you know, that's all part of it but that's artifactual, and what's really at the heart of it is this?” Not that I'll ever find “it,” that but that's what I'm looking for.

**Christie.** Well, my greatest familiarity with depth psychology comes from work on subtle forms of racism that we see in everyday life, and this kind of racism is very

difficult of course to document, but you can get at it in the laboratory pretty easily through the implicit association test. But I think we see manifestations of that all the time . . . it takes terribly subtle forms nowadays that are difficult to confront or to change.

I think I might have mentioned that I was more influenced by Piaget than Freudian notions. Piaget always said he was more concerned with the workings of the tricks of consciousness over the unconscious or something like that. But I think both the unconscious and conscious are important.

Early in the development of peace psychology, there are a lot of folks who spoke and wrote about depth psychology. When the nuclear war issue was around, there were a number of folks who were putting a depth psychology analysis to it. John Mack at Harvard was among those, and [Robert Jay] Lifton, also a nuclear depth psychology founder. So there was a lot of that and after that Vamik Volkan introduced *The Need to have Enemies and Allies* and “chosen traumas” those sorts of things. And even before that there was research on authoritarian personality was thought to be mainly due to harsh parenting that somehow winds up being internalized and finds expression in things like the endorsement of capital punishment. So it’s been a little rocky though, at times, because people in politics resist it. (Laughter). I understand that and when [Harold D.] Lasswell in the 30s wrote *Psychopathology and Politics*, I don’t think a politicians’ read it, “I don’t want to hear that! It’s not me!”

I can't tell you how many studies have been done on [Terror Management Theory] of late. Just looking at what happens when you put somebody in a situation that threatens their worldview. I want to pull a book out if I can find it, because it was one of the first ones to address many features of terror management theory under one cover. Here it is: *In the Wake of 9/11 - The Psychology of Terror*. It's written by Thomas Pyszczynski, Sheldon Solomon and Jeff Greenberg. Solomon wrote a summary for the encyclopedia [Encyclopedia of Peace Psychology] on terror management theory. It's a fascinating theory, and it does begin with the assumptions of the unconscious. Essentially, the authors and others have conducted experiments in which participants are reminded of their own mortality, their own death, and it creates all kinds of defenses including this notion of in-group cohesion. The theory was not elevated very much until 9/11. And then all of a sudden all of the reactions the US was having to 9/11—challenge to its cultural worldview and arming, and starting a war in Iraq, all these sorts of things were more easily understood through the lens of terror management theory. 9/11 raised mortality salience among Americans and a chain of reactions that were in some ways very maladaptive . . . . And whenever that gets challenged, when your mortality becomes salient then all hell breaks loose.

[In trauma research] you would find a lot of folks would be helpful in fleshing out unconscious kinds of issues that are present in the intergenerational transmission of trauma, and that kind of work.

*Is there are a lot in what you've read in the literature, and you're far more versed than I am, a lot of consideration given to the unconscious in peace psychology research, or does the research shy away from it?*

I guess it depends on how broadly you cast the net in what you call peace psychology. Just recently we were looking for sites to hold the next symposium of the Committee for the Psychological Study of Peace. “Where should we go next?” And

someone said, “We haven’t been to Europe for a long while.” Someone else remarked, “That’s a pretty peaceful place what are you talking about?” And then as the conversation ensued it was pointed out that, “Every European country has an immigration issue.” And that’s true of course in the US, Australia, Canada, and a lot of other countries with an influx of immigrants. And then it went from there to a discussion of stereotypes and prejudice, and a host of areas of psychology that have been studied for both their explicit as well as implicit properties. I thought at that point that we were going to get a groundswell of interest to have one of the upcoming meetings focus on that topic. This is still a possibility and if the thrust of the next symposium focuses on immigration, then I expect a great deal of the discussion will center on the role of peace psychology in dealing with the unconscious as people look at social identity, racism and immigration issues, more broadly. There are a lot of people in Europe who are very, I would say, deeply into the study of implicit kinds of prejudice, and I think you would find a lot of the work in Europe on that particular topic would be focusing on practical concerns like immigration .

**Wessells.** It’s hard to answer because I would trace so much in psychology back—and human functioning—back to depth psychology. But I would say without getting too Jungian or Freudian about it that the very core idea that there is a lot in human motivation that is at least opaque if not inaccessible to human consciousness, is a view that I think is profound and accurate.

In countless ways, we are motivated to do things by forces, both individual and social that we are unable to articulate or are only dimly aware of yet they shape us in myriad ways. One of those forces is culture. We can’t articulate our culture because we swim in it. It’s sort of like being a fish and trying to describe the ocean. How could you describe the ocean as a fish? You’re in it. You could talk about it and know its existence, but you couldn’t describe it in the way that a land animal could. We’re in a similar situation. I would say that there—that that is an enduring situation and understanding that ought to inspire more than a little humility. Because it means that a lot of the things that affect our behavior are not the things that we’re conscious of and so we ought to be humble about what we think are the motives of our behavior and what in fact are the real motives for our behavior. When you look at that, it invites you and even moves you into a space where you become more deeply self-aware. Without self-awareness, we all susceptible to carrying and reproducing vestiges of racism, militarism, materialism, and destructive competitiveness. Because these are our ocean; we swim in those waters.

When we interrogate our motives, we become critical. The capacity for self-criticism. I also should have also put on that list of what it takes to be a peace psychologist, I hope it was tacit, but it is centrally important. After all, how good would we be as peace psychologists be if our conscious motive was wanting to build a world of peace, but our real motive was wanting to become famous, wanting to publish lots of papers, wanting to win the Nobel Prize? It’s not that these motives are inherently tainted, yet they often encourage people to engage in exploitative, self-absorbed behavior. None of us is free of having an ego or of wanting some attention and wanting to have an impact. Without the capacity to recognize the unconscious, and the ways in which unconscious—the ways in which we’re not fully conscious of all the influences on our behavior, I think we get caught up in hypocrisies, superficialities, and become complicit

in a whole variety of things that we should not want to be complicit in from the standpoint of peace.

*Do you think in peace psychology research as you have been involved with it that the unconscious comes into play in research?*

It's usually not written about in that way, but I would argue that it's always there. As a simple example, if you grow up as a—I work a lot with children who've been recruited in the armed forces so-called child soldiers. If you've grown up in a violent society, violence may come to seem as normal as breathing. If you're recruited into an armed group (or in our country, into a gang) and you're given a gun and told to kill a member of your family or your village or you're going to be shot, and so you do that. Without knowing it, killing becomes easy. Violence becomes normal. Many different factors—external and internal—compel this. However it happens, it's an unconscious process.

One of the main factors is the unwritten rules or social norms. These and the regularity of our experience lead us to think certain things are normal, and to even define the calculus of risks and drawbacks in ways that are culturally scripted. For example, a cultural script in this country tells men that it is a man's place to dominate, and that it is a man's responsibility to command authority and obedience in his own home. So he may not just think or want to take power over this person. Many men may not articulate the situation in that way but hold the view in an unconscious form. Unfortunately, such unconscious or seldom articulated views may contribute to violence against women. To the perpetrator, the violence may seem to be “doing the right thing” or “doing what men do.” This in no way excuses the violent behavior but calls attention to the importance of becoming aware of unconscious motives and norms and resisting the ones that are contrary to peace.

Sometimes when we do articulate them, the narratives we construct are constructed along cultural lines and lines of masculinity and roles. It's very hard for us to go deeper. Cultural psychology, community psychology, and gender psychology all feed into peace psychology and help us to begin to unpack where those narratives come from, what they mean, why they're there, whose interests they represent, and what's wrong with the dominant narratives that most of us accept. It doesn't look and act like traditional depth psychology, but in a funny way I think it's a descendant of it.

**MacNair.** The thing about post-traumatic stress disorder is that you can get it long after the event and not necessarily associated with the event. And it would take some digging to find out, and this is particularly true if you don't know that something can traumatize you and also true if you don't even know what trauma symptoms are. I have all kinds of times when people—I've just explained my expertise in some group for some reason and veterans, combat veterans, will come up to me afterwards and grill me on it because—and I could see in their eyes what they're doing is checking that the symptoms that they have are actually normal. They are not aware, because they haven't talked about it to anybody. Nobody's talked about it to them, and actually—just the knowledge that it's normal is very helpful to them. But then of course the question becomes, well, if it's several years later, how do you know that it was PTSD and not just something else? Sometimes it takes some digging and sometimes it's the dreams. The dreams have the advantage of having content. Dreams and flashbacks.

**Diaz.** Yes, but I chose to not become a psychoanalyst. I'll tell you why just so you are clear. I don't know a lot of poor people that have access to a psychoanalyst. And it's always been my interest to be a psychologist that provides services to those that can't otherwise afford it. So there was no way possible that I could earn a living doing psychology, or for that matter doing psychotherapy, because most of the people that have access to psychotherapy are not without means, they are but a subset of those who need psychological services in our community. That's not where my interests are. I'm much more interested in long-term historical events and in institutional reforms so that all in need would have access to treatment.

*You said you were more Jungian than Freudian?*

Yes, I would say that. That's because I've always viewed Jung to be more open to spiritual issues than Freud.

*And do you think unconscious factors are considered much in the peace psychology research that you read?*

No, no, I think very little. I hardly ever see evidence that it is being taken into consideration significantly.

*And should it be?*

Yes. But I don't—again, I think that very few psychologists that are involved in peace psychology, that I am aware of, spend a lot of times even mentioning the unconscious. Yet, I think most of what is available to know we still haven't accessed.

*It sounded like you studied it early on with your dream work.*

Absolutely. But in that dream work, I didn't just study dream work based on psychoanalysis. I also studied dream work based on cultural anthropology, groups that had no idea what science was. So, it's like I am very much aware that we're created to spend a lot of time in a state where we don't appear to be conscious. But, from all the work I've ever studied on dreams, the brain never totally sleeps. There are periods of times where arousal shifts occur in different parts, and then they switch levels of activity. But, there is stuff going on all that time! When I would wake people up from sleep, regardless of the stage they were awakened from, I would find that some kind of mentation was going on. Available dream content was, in part, a function of time sensitive arousal mechanisms that allow easier access to memories, and to organizational aspects of other involved parts of the brain. We were created to go through these ultradian cycles of brain component activity. The organization of a dream report depends on how quickly one part of the brain can access what is going on in another part of the brain. We weren't biologically prepared to have recollections about those states—that is not part of the evolutionary design. So, I learned a long time ago that what people felt as a consequence of waking up, as to what was going on, was not always associated with what was actually going on. Let me give you an example of that. When I was running the sleep lab, I had people routinely going through four, five cycles of sleep stages—where they go through the different stages of sleep several times a night. A few times, when I would wake somebody up at the end of the night and I ask them a simple question like “How did you sleep?” I would hear them say, “I slept great” but the polygraph evidence indicated they had barely slept at all. Other times, when people said, “I slept horribly,” I could show them on multiple pieces of polygraph paper, four or five different complete cycles of sleep they had gone through. They had no memory of falling sleep, of

deep sleep or of having had REM dream episodes several times. Yet, these people are waking up with a sense that they haven't slept at all.

So, how we construct our reality is, to me, a fascinating thing. It's always been very clear to me that we are only constructing that reality based on what we have access to. And, that there is a lot of stuff that's going on inside our heads that we don't have easy access to. But that's another whole conversation.



## Appendix I

### Participant Thoughts on Personal Peacefulness

Participant responses to “Does your analysis of what needs to be done to combat massive violence and destruction include what you yourself need to do?”

**Olson.** I think it's always a constant struggle and one of my favorite quotes from Gandhi is that “the separation between truth and love”—so the absolute honest cognitive truths and love—emotion and empathy and care, they're like walking on the edge of the sword that it's always difficult, difficult balancing act. That we need to walk a very straight line and don't do a very good job, it's a very difficult task. So I certainly wouldn't say that I've always succeeded. But I think I have a sense of what I want to do even though I'm often falling off that sword when I get angry. Yeah, that's too easy to do. So I try to cut back on the sarcasm. I think the Coalition also does a great job calling each other on, “okay, this is too sarcastic.”

**Diaz.** Oh, yes. See, to be perfectly honest with you, I am trying my hardest to be as good a peace psychologist as I possibly can, it is what I try to demonstrate in my relationships with everybody I interact with in the field of psychology or not. It may be with my grandchildren, with my faith community, or the Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement community. I moderated a panel in Kansas City after the Ferguson incident a few weeks ago and I was able to bring some peace psychology to that community. I thought engaging with that panel was fruitful. I thought it was helpful because I helped some people understand why it is that the other—how it is that the other functions and why. And, anyway, to make a long story short—I keep on saying “a long story short” because there's lots of long stories to tell. I'm still happily involved in the Quaker world, trying to address differences that keep people apart. So, as I told you, even in my retirement I'm working just as hard as I ever did.

One of the things that I try to do, anytime that I get a chance to, I try to at least model what I consider a minimal level of civility. This is to help us to address our differences in a manner that maximizes the probability that community can be built. I'm one of those that really believe that it is possible to live with people that don't think like I do. And, to not even live with them but actually work with them to accomplish some things we have as common goals though you may not be in the same political party. I think that's a living challenge. Peace Psychology has taught me how little is known about how to live with people of difference.

**Reyes.** That's where I resonate with that conversation we were having today about personal peace. Because part of me says, how can you ever really effectively achieve peace if you're at war inside yourself? If you're filled with conflicts? If you're carrying hostilities and resentments? We all suffered wounds of one kind or another from very early on. The things that I was most sensitive to were child abuse and bullying. But my professors also taught me concepts like narcissistic wounds—not being the favorite in the family, not getting what you wanted, not making the team, not winning the spelling bee, not getting the girl that you wanted to go to the prom with you, whatever it might have

been. And I think we carry these wounds with us a lot longer than we like to admit. If we can develop that inner peace or what they're calling personal peace, then we're going to do less to feed the cycle. That said, you can take guns and bullets away from 98% of the human race, and the other 2% will kick our ass. The problem with the way Gregory [Simms] and others think about this personal peace thing, feels a little magical to me. That somehow if we'll just spread that enough there will be some tipping point, some hundredth monkey effect where the rest will all just give in, and we'll all be lotus eaters on some island somewhere. It's just more complicated than that. But that doesn't mean it's not valuable. I'm working on it myself, and I think I'm going to work on it my whole life, and I don't think it will get finished.

**Christie.** Yes. That's a tough one because I feel like everything I'm doing—I kind of had the luxury of working around those issues my whole life.

*I can see that. I can tell. It seems innate in you, almost like breathing.*

It is quite seamless. I mean, for example, I was thinking what do I feel like I am doing? Right now I'm getting this symposium together in South Africa and that works towards all these ends, and then I was thinking I was revising a paper and doing work with a colleague in Malaysia and it's looking at humanizing the other. And the underlying dynamic here is dehumanization, and I think it's hard to work on harmony and equity when you dehumanize the other. So I think to me that's a key underlying issue to work with. But I'm also looking for that in everything I'm reading daily like the newspaper and Twitter, and elsewhere, and trying to familiarize myself and also monitor myself in the process.

This is why I'm enjoying reading some of the research looking at differences between Republicans and Democrats, because now I'm starting to be able to say, wait a minute we're just operating out of a different worldview. So let's understand this better. So it's all linked in my mind to how you live your life. To try in your own personal relationships to make things harmonious and equitable, but also more broadly to look at relations you have with folks around the world in the same way. Kind of does start with yourself, I guess. I don't know where else to start from.

*You wouldn't be able to with the life you've lived. That's what has made you such a contributor to the field and personally as well.*

This kind of work gives life some purpose too; otherwise life is pretty bland.

**Wessells.** Yes, I cannot own stock in companies that traffic in building munitions and weapons of mass destruction just because it helps to pay the bills and then on the other hand say that I'll offset that by working for peace. Now, if one is going to work for peace, you've got to take a look at yourself, and you have to take a critical look at your life, and ask about the way that I am in the world, am I breeding destructive competition? Am I stepping on other people and using them? Am I instrumentalizing them? Am I using power dynamics to gain my own position or benefit my own standing? Because if I am, then maybe I'm doing things even within the peace division that actually undermine peace.

If I discriminate against women if I don't like people of Chinese origin so I don't invite them in or if I try to keep them out, I would thereby engage in discrimination. There are so many ways that one can subtly be discriminatory, and without knowing it,

people often engage in a discriminatory manner. If we trample other people, if we denigrate other people, if we escalate conflicts, if we unquestioningly support things like the Iraq invasion, there is just no way that I can legitimately consider myself a peace psychologist. But these are issues of debate. I reviewed a paper for a journal that was written by some very, very intelligent people and it basically made an argument for why peace through strength is peace psychology, which I wholeheartedly disagree with.

A key point is that one can't model violence—beat your son, beat your wife and treat people badly—and be a peace psychologist. It has to start with the person, but it also can't end with the person. And I also feel passionately about this. We had significant debates when the peace division was formed about how central that ought to be in the program of peace psychology. People like me argued that, yes, it is highly important but it's not more important than preventing a war and stopping weapons of mass destruction, creating a livable world. It's an essential central part of it. So for me personal peace is an essential piece. It's necessary, but it's not sufficient. So it's one of those pillars. For me right now it's very interesting and fulfilling to watch the idea of a personal and interpersonal peace make a comeback. It is being articulated in a very constructive way that makes good sense...

On a wider level, we have to be active educating people about the psychological aftermath and horrors of mass violence, engage in activism, teaching and advocacy opposing it and its horrific “allies”—things like torture, human rights violations, structural violence and oppression, and extremist ideologies and demonic images that enable mass killing.

**MacNair:** The basic thing is that when any group is hypocritical, it is less effective. This has been noted for millennia. I mean, Jews and Christians and Muslims and Buddhists and Hindus have all noted that there is a strong correlation between practitioners being hypocritical and being ineffective. And part of what happens is that when we do that it's like, institutions that have been around for a couple thousand years have not managed to avoid people coming in and being belligerent even though it's against the principles of the institution. So why would it be surprising that we have trouble with that as well? But, nevertheless, we know it is counterproductive.

## Appendix J

### Today's Priorities for Peace Psychology

*Today, what do you consider the priorities for peace psychology?*

**Wessells.** First of all, be persistent. None of us will ever get where we're going without being persistent. Sometimes the challenges that we face get the better of us and we start asking, "Are we really getting there?" But I'd say be persistent. Another is, "Find good role models and emulate them. Be like people like Mort Deutsch, Marc Pilisuk, Dorothy Ciarlo, and Anne Anderson. Practice forgiveness. Don't just speak it. When we disagree and some person or subgroup within the division gets under our collar, find a way to not get too angry and to deal with it in a constructive way. To me it's natural within any group of human beings no matter how loving, no matter how well-intentioned that will be disagreements. The impact of them comes down to how we are in the midst of the disagreements. Are we true to our values of peace? Or, are we allowing ourselves to become in a way of that—on our better days, we might look and say, that's not how I ought to be. (Laughter)

We need to have a practice of peace that enables us to feel, see, think and imagine in peaceful ways, and then enables us to be in it for the long haul. A high priority is to create a group ethos in which we take care of each other. Without always articulating in that way, that's how it was in the group that I had the privilege of working with at the time the division formed; I think that's what we did with and for each other. There were times when we disagreed vigorously, yet we talked it through and remembered our sense of teamwork and the collective good. Sometimes as individuals we may be reassessed priorities and workloads, but we found a way to work for the division, and we'd supported each other as we went. That's good living, and it's an important way of living. (Laughter) For me it was just a huge privilege to be part of the process. As I look back, I see that it was an amazing group of people.

**Christie.** We still have some barriers, I guess, in terms of some concerns about people referring to themselves as peace psychologist. I mean I'm happy to hear that there is a growing number of people who are comfortable saying that's their field is peace psychology. But I think we have barriers there in terms how peace is looked at: peace is viewed as soft, not amenable to scientific scrutiny, and all those issues. So I think we still have challenges just with the brand in that sense, and making it acceptable for young scholars and activists to be able to embrace peace as something that has legitimacy. Peace has far more currency now than it did 20 years ago. I just did, not long ago, a look at how many times the word "peace" is cited in the PsychINFO database. It's just extraordinary how seldom it was cited before '95 and then it starts moving up. And it isn't because of the journal, because I factored that out. But it shows exponential growth.

I think the study of peace is more acceptable, but I think there's still a major barrier. In part because of positivism, and the sort of defensiveness that's built into psychology. Most intro books start with, "We are a science and here's why." But it isn't just that. It's that "peace" is associated with passivism, rather than social justice. In many parts for the world "peace" has terrible connotations because it's associated with being passive under authoritarian rule. And so, outside the United States, we have that

issue to deal with. It's a big one. What we mean is peace with social justice. Well, it's better called "just peace." We have yet to make it clear that we are talking not just about living harmoniously, but we are talking about living with equity in relationships.

Somehow that's a tough one, but it needs to be more widely understood that we were talking about harmony and equity in relations not just between people, but between and among networks of people, globally. It has to be somehow made more visible. So from the Western perspective, peace doesn't have the trappings of a scientific construct the way it ought to. And then internationally it has this connotation of passivism. So when you move out of the West you start to deal with the pacifism issue. There are other conceptual barriers as well.

On the more operational side, I think there's really a wonderful movement worldwide to elevate relationships among people who share common interest in peace, in peace psychology in particular. But still, what you often find is that most parts of the world are concerned with applied problems that psychologists should be dealing with from their perspective. So even though, for instance, when I worked in Pakistan they're very interested in peace psychology. They think, "Oh, this thing is wonderful." They really want to know about applied psychology in much narrower ways—in a way that would say, "Here is how we can create job satisfaction, more jobs, and here's what applied psychologists measure, that sort of thing. Especially in developing parts of the world there is interest in the application of psychology in ways that it promote productivity, development, full employment—those sorts of things, very practical kind of things.

When issues have to do with war and peace, the view is that psychology doesn't play a role. Even though, in many of the countries of the world, the biggest problem is of course intrastate violence, and it's about living in harmony and equity with others who are different. Peace psychology is not seen as terribly relevant in that regard. I don't think we always have the answers, because very often answers involve multiple levels. But I think we have pretty good diagnostic tools so that we can say, "Look, here is the problem. Here are the kinds of attributions that are being made that make it impossible for you to resolve issues. Or that the complexity of the problem-solving efforts isn't where they ought to be given what we know about the complexity of humans. Or as we've seen many times it's an enemy image that makes problem solving difficult." We just haven't made inroads in that way. But we have had some modest impacts on policy, interestingly enough.

Herbert Kelman years ago talked about how the kind of unofficial diplomacy work he was doing created the conditions that made the Oslo Accord possible. The Accord hasn't been sustainable, of course, in Israeli and Palestinian relations. But he did feel like those inputs did make a difference at that point in time. And then you have, of course, some real obvious policy impacts on structural issues, like testimonies psychologists gave for the problem of separate but equal, and integrating schools in the US. A lot of that was based on psychologically-informed research and testimony by psychologists. So, there was a role there. A major one in South Africa was that the Truth and Reconciliation Commission that was going to take place behind closed doors until political groups organized and changed the law so that many testimonies were made public. These changes were a result of political actions by Khulumani groups that were actually formed by psychologists for people who were going to testify, and the notion

was that we'll need to provide support for victims prior to, during, and after their testimony. And these groups became politically empowered and active and changed the articles that described how the truth and reconciliation commission would work. Not all, but a lot of the testimony was broadcast publicly. So that change in policy was in part due to the role of psychologists who were there providing support to Khulumani groups.

It was psychologists who testified at The Hague that women who experienced rape during the Bosnian War needed more support in order to come forward, and that made a difference. So there are places where psychologists have made a difference. It's just that we don't often explore these things carefully enough. I think a lot of times it's a matter of reverse engineering things: Here's the policy, now let's back up and see how this happened, what were the inputs early on. That's how I don't despair personally. I start thinking well, the profession has had a big input and a lot of times it's been negative, admittedly in matters of war, but we've also had inputs in matters of peace. So I think the biggest struggle we have is making it clear what we have to offer, and applying that carefully, of course, not overreaching, but also not being shy about it.

And somehow we will need to get to the millennials, I think. That's where the hope lies. It's not so much the folks who are around now, but the millennials bring changes. Somehow we ought to demonstrate why peace matters. We're at a disadvantageous position to do that now. Millennials are not facing the Vietnam War, for instance. And when we go to war, sacrifices aren't shared anymore. They're not shared broadly. Somehow we have to make it clear how we have a vested interest there as well as making it clear how all the areas of psychology have something to contribute.

**MacNair.** I just—I have to say everything. We need research. We need practice. We need activism. We need theory. We need to cover every topic we can think of covering because it is all connected and it all gets around. I like the way Daniel Barragan put it. He said we know that all these kinds of violence are connected and there's just this web of connections to violence, but that also means that whenever you effectively counter one kind of violence, you're not only countering that one kind—it gets around to all the other kinds too.

If you say we are not dehumanizing in this situation, other situations will have more problem with dehumanizing as well. If we don't have school bullies then people grow up without having been bullies or having been bullied, then there's going to be less support for war because the theoretical underpinnings are sabotaged. Every place that you work to stop violence you're stopping one kind of violence, you're helping to stop all kinds of violence.

And we need to spread.

We need to have education go in with the activism and the research and all that. Education is in on that list. And we need to have people knowing more about these things. One of the reasons it needs to be all topics is the connections and the spreading around but another reason is that simply brings more people in. Because people have different concerns based on their own life experience, and this is the Quaker in me speaking. People act on their own concerns. That's what people should do. It's not ideal to say to people, "Drunk driving is terrible, you really need to work on drunk driving." And I say "I'm not really motivated. I'm really motivated on prison reform." Okay. Well, somebody whose kid died in a drunken driving accident is going to be really, really

into the drunk driving, and they should be and go for it and more power to them. And somebody whose brother is in prison is going to be more interested in prison reform, and they should be, and more power to them. And somebody who got a job working in schools is going to be more interested in the bullying and/or perhaps in teaching conflict resolution skills to children. This is, I mean, that also is crucial to school. I mean, I keep talking about the bullying but actually its basic conflict resolutions skills. If children know basic conflict resolution skills then when they see the adults not doing it there will be more pressure for the adults to do it. When they become adults because to them it will be second nature. And when it's second nature to them, then that spreads. So basically everybody should select that part of peace that most speaks to them as their concern and work on it, and work on it hard.

And then get plenty of joy, take plenty of breaks, and don't get burned out because we're all in this for the long haul. I mean, it is one of the most definite things. I made a big point of it in my intro psych textbook. Everybody needs to know about burnout. We need to be really familiar with that. We are in this for the long haul. There is this story about this woman goes down for six weeks to a Latin American country and she's working hard ,and then the locals there have a dance. And she says, "How can you have a dance? There is this emergency going on." And they say to her "You're leaving in 6 weeks. You can handle six weeks of emergency. We live here. This is the rest of our lives. We need some joy."

**Pilisuk.** I was president at the time when the division was concerned primarily with the dangers of war, particularly nuclear war. While most psychologists did not see a relationship of that issue to their own areas of knowledge or work. I worked on trying to preserve that concern (which is still significantly more dangerous than is publicly acknowledged) while at the same time opening the door to involvement on other issues, e.g., disproportionate victimization of minorities, dealing with trauma, the methods of conflict resolution, and the military-industrial complex. I recall taking time from our very busy meetings to ask whether we were sufficiently addressing the needs of minorities and of women. Now I and some of my colleagues deal with restorative justice, military sexual abuse, US Government assisted narc-trafficking, exploitation of overseas workers, corporate displacement of local communities causing massive numbers of refugees and slave trafficking that is condoned by major corporate entities.

Peace education and practices of inner peace—I am happy to see the door opened. I also fear that the division has lost some of its excitement by losing its focus on disarmament and the dangers of nuclear war, and by failing to confront APA's strong involvement with the defense agencies and its contractors, even to the extent of working with agencies conducting torture.

**Diaz.** I think we have a world that is polarized and we have tons of different conflicts, some of which are militarized and some of which are not. We have a lot of research, but we don't have a—we don't have a peace party to belong to, one that has a message that is accepted by a large body of people. I feel that many of us are basically disengaged from the movement because we're so busy doing something else.

My feet are fairly firmly placed in the ground. I've been interacting with political systems and I know that they drive all of us to play a part. There's a very strong activist

part of me. But, there's also the part of me that respects the adversary or respects a colleague that may share some similar goals in most of our areas of interest yet may differ on a particular aspect of peace psychology. I can shake the hand of people I don't like.

However, I find that we in peace psychology are not very good at tolerating dissent. Sometimes we act like those within totalitarian systems that I've been exposed to in my life. I think that's very unfortunate. I don't think it attracts a lot of the new talent. I miss the leadership of our pioneers, who unfortunately are dying off. I think there is so much more to peace psychology than what's occurring inside of APA. I think what's occurring inside of APA, which seems to affect so much of our listserv traffic, is such a small part of what needs to be done. I'm looking forward to some leadership contributions from the younger folks and to see what happens in the future. I pray that somewhere along the line, we'd become known for something other than just trying to hold an organization accountable for the misdeeds of a few people . . . And the reason I say that is because my main interest, and it still remains my main interest, is to grow Peace Psychology. To have it become more of a household word in psychology departments, and to grow the movement. I do feel that there's a need to have a larger body, a large corporate effort of folks interested in finding out how to get along with people of difference.

**Olson.** I think we do need to be a bit of a counter force to military and corporate psychology. I think we need to do that in a non-violent way. I think we need to do it in a peaceful positive way. I think we need to use logic and persuasive arguments and make sure those get out there. And I think if we do that, we're going to achieve an incredible amount, but I do think that we need to stand up and be heard. But to do that in a very paradoxical way and a way that combines being critical, but also being positive—sort of Gandhi or Martin Luther King approach where there's not hatred in one's heart, but there is firm demand that this is what's right morally and ethically.

*The biggest issues as you see it from this division with military and corporate would be?*

Well, I feel like the American Psychological Association—I feel like psychology should be looking out for the most vulnerable. I think psychology should be looking out for those who are having the biggest psychological struggles. I think they should be working to change the macro structure to benefit those people. And I have the feeling that there's too much of a draw being in Washington, DC. There's too much of a draw for lobbyists and power and military influences that the American Psychological Association is saying “We want more and more power.” And they are sort of, in a lot of ways, going against what I and many others have entered psychology to do. So we sort of feel like the field, the American Psychological Association, is a current that's working against the ability of psychology to do good and help people who really need it. That the field of psychology, that APA in many ways represents, is too tempted by resources and power.

*And you're saying military has a lot of resources?*

Military has a lot of resources, particularly after 9/11. The Department of Defense gets a lot of money. The CIA, of course, has tons and tons of influence. The private organizations like HUMRO have enormous influence, millions and millions and millions



of dollars in contracts. And I think APA does a lot more to help HUMRO gain entry to Department of Defense Appropriations than they help the poor people who really need it. And so the disfranchised, I think, is being ignored. And I don't blame them as individuals, but those who are in a structural system of violence and profit are dominant.

*Earlier when we talked, you mentioned that you saw the need for peace psychology to break out of being in silos and to connect social psychology and peace psychology with other potential partners. What are the partners that we potentially have, but we don't quite see? That might synergistically overlap?*

**Reyes:** Peace psychologists—my mind goes to the problems because I think that we have problems that we have failed to confront, and until we do, I think we're not going to have the legitimacy that we seek . . . I prefer to think that there is a lot of variation, and that the best way to come to understand something is to look at it from a lot of different angles, a lot of different vantage points. I think that we've under sampled from a research perspective, we haven't looked at enough vantage points. We've looked where we wanted to look, and that's the navel-gazing problem.

We've also tended the sample from the people who are easy to sample from. Just like too many psychologists have based their studies on American sophomores and juniors, mostly juniors because they've declared a major, so now they are a psychology major and they are forced to participate in research as part of being in the major. So, what about all of those other kinds of folks? I'm not saying that it's that, I'm saying is that kind of thing. When I look at peace psychology studies, I think, "What about those other kinds of folks that you're not questioning, that you're not connecting with? What about those people who are in much more decisive positions?" If you're doing a study of business I wouldn't say that you ought not talk to the entry-level employees, but you're not going to understand upper decision-making just talking the entry-level employees. What about the people who wage war? What's their psychology? What about the people who have had to make the decisions whether or not to go to war, whether or not to fire missiles, whether or not to send combat soldiers into situations, where is that? And so I know access isn't easy, but that goes back to why we use those undergraduate slaves. I think that we've got a ways to go in developing better methodology and better access to really understand what's going on. Instead what we understand better is how people are affected by conflict and violence, and that's not going to help prevent anything. I think you can learn from those kinds of things, I thought of things like cancer and tooth decay. I mean, you can learn a little bit about how to prevent cancer by studying it downstream and tooth decay by studying decayed teeth, studying how they're affected. But at some point you have get up upstream, and understand where is that fork in the road that goes to cancer and not cancer? Where is that fork in the road that goes to war and not war? And how much of that is individual and how much of that is collective? And we can theorize all we want, but they're just theories until we have evidence for it.

I think we do need to be a bit of a counter force to military and corporate psychology. I think we need to do that in a non-violent way. I think we need to do it in a peaceful positive way. I think we need to use logic and persuasive arguments and make sure those get out there. And I think if we do that, we're going to achieve an incredible amount, but I do think that we need to stand up and be heard. But to do that in a very paradoxically way and a way that combines being critical, but also being positive—sort

of Gandhi or Martin Luther King approach where there's not hatred in one's heart, but there is firm demand that this is what's right morally and ethically.

## Appendix K

### Verbatim Responses to Portion of Question 3: *What psychological insights have you further developed as a result of your work as a peace psychologist?*

**Olson:** I would say there are probably three main interests right now. Most of my work still comes from—even though I'm more of a community psychologist than social psychologist—a lot of it comes from my early personality in social psychology influences. But what I've tried to do is develop a theory of social action called the Temporal Model of Social Action that tries to break down what are the psychological elements that lead to effective activism. And so some of those components include—lot of this comes from Alinsky and Gandhi and Martin Luther King and many others. But essentially, it's the need for greater focus just like when someone is creating a research question for thesis or dissertation one really has to focus on one piece at a time. And there are all sorts of other peripheral elements that can be occurrences happening at the same time, but that too often we try to take on something so broad like war that we don't target it on one simple goal, like, changing one particular policy.

So there are elements of—What is the focus? What are the levers? What are the different tools that we use—whether it's a referendum or whether it's an open letter? What are the aspects about the self—sort of more self-purification issues? Why are we are doing this? Are we doing this for the right reason? Are we doing it for selfish reasons?

And dealing with those issues, there is the empowerment process that occurs working with others being one—just one other person working with others to achieve goals. There's dissemination not just having unidirectional dissemination, but actually having dialogues. So treating this whole cyclical process of a campaign as an education experience. That's sort of like taking a class in the real world and realizing that we may have our persuasive arguments. But if we're not open and listening to those other—the arguments from others, we're not going to be able to create the change. And there are certain issues where we know we're right. I mean, we can say that an issue like torture some of us believe that's absolutely wrong in every circumstance. But there are a million pieces around torture and around interrogation more broadly that we don't know everything and so the whole model is about this iterative process of moving forward, but learning at the same time, and just to continue going with it on and on and on until some progress is made. And that's what the Coalition for Ethical Psychology, I feel, has done more effectively than anyone else.

*Tell me about that.*

Sure. It started around 2005 or 2006 when the PENS Report came out and Physicians for Human Rights—a number of us, some people in psychoanalysis, I was chair of Division for Social Justice which 12 Divisions of APA which has fallen apart since then, but mostly because of the torture issue. But it's essentially Paul Rocklin from Physicians for Human Rights brought several of us together and it was Steven Reisner, Stephen Soldz, then Jean Maria Arrigo eventually joined us and then eventually Roy Eidelson and Trudy Bond. And we have been in constant contact. We're just really obsessed with the whole torture issue. And so phone calls and twenty emails a day for the last five years, we share all sorts of information and work on initiatives. Things have been slowing down, but

hopefully this week will be something that will be positive and bring us back together again. But we've made a lot of progress and we worked very effectively, non-hierarchically. We have our systems for writing our statements and passing them around to each other and we all sort of play different roles and it's been a great working experience.

So it's been great. But I've also been part of other groups. The group that worked on a referendum which was separate from the coalition, but essentially it's been the coalition who's been tightest and we're also part of PsySR; we're also part of Division 48. So, I mean, they are all peace psychologists, too. But we do take a little bit more of—there's that sort of personal peacefulness, state of mind which is—I think sometimes if I'm going to critique that—if we're just peaceful ourselves and demonstrate a model peace, change will happen. But I think if we just model peace, a lot of times we're just going to be invisible. And if we don't step up and point out that this or that is wrong, then we're not going to make any progress. So Gandhi hated the idea of passive resistance, passivity. He said he'd rather pick up guns than be passive. It's not passive. It's a very—it's non-violent, but it's also very forceful in a psychological way. And that in a lot of ways, I think our psychological training makes us a little too Rogerian and too positive. And I think we also need to be a little bit—not even violent in speech, but we need to speak the truth. And we need to speak it consistently and not be afraid to do that.

**Diaz:** [I]f you're asking me what in my work has been influenced by Peace Psychology, I can honestly tell you that what Peace Psychology has taught me is how little Peace Psychologists know about living in peace with other people. That doesn't mean I know how to live with other people, but I certainly am attempting to practice some of those lessons that I've learnt, primarily as a consequence of the interests that I was telling you about earlier. I see that there's a need for an interesting remarketing of Peace Psychology so that we can become a better known and heard voice in overall psychology.

One of the things that I try to do, anytime that I get a chance to, I try to at least model what I consider a minimal level of civility. This is to help us to address our differences in a manner that maximizes the probability that community can be built. I'm one of those that really believe that it is possible to live with people that don't think like I do. And, to not even live with them but actually work with them to accomplish some things we have as common goals though you may not be in the same political party. I think that's a living challenge. Peace Psychology has taught me how little is known about how to live with people of difference.

**Christie.** I think that's a tough question. I've reflected on it a lot, but I think over the years, I've come to appreciate more and more the social justice quality of peace psychology. When I was president of PsySR, I learned that the harmony and equity views don't fuse, sometimes, very well. It might have been partly the composition of the people in PsySR at the time. It seemed to me some of the folks were very much social justice oriented and they would say "We need to get justice by the end of the day no matter how we do it." I mean they could be downright violent about it. And then you mix them with the peace types who are cringing at it all, and it was just a real funny tension; not funny but it actually was upsetting. It took a toll on me as I tried to navigate these

various different approaches, but I think that persuaded me even more that you have to have peaceful means to reach the social and just ends. But at the same time, it was quite an education to realize those concepts are really, in many people's mind, quite different. Social justice is about pushing their point of view. You are going to have resistance from the status quo. You are going to just upset the apple cart. I resonate with upsetting the apple cart.

And, of course, the other side, the harmony emphasis can be problematic because the promotion of harmony without equity can lead one to be content with the way things are and put a gloss on too many things. Nonetheless, I came to embrace a non-violent orientation which was difficult to do early in my career because I was hanging out with national security guys. In a sense, my nonviolent orientation had to be kind of closeted for a while to learn from them.

So I began with the view: "Why can't we just get along?" To an appreciation for why we can't just get along . . . to a lifestyle where I've tried to integrate both, harmony and equity. And I've seen it pretty up-close and personally, because I do have a diverse family. I've got a couple of kids who were adopted and couple of foster kids, and a couple home grown kids. The foster kids were Vietnamese refugees. And the adopted kids are bi-racial, and identify themselves as African-American. They're all grown now with families. And I just remember many times being in the principal's office trying to be peaceful about it, but often times winding up banging on the desk. "You've got a problem here. Prejudice is an issue and racism is an issue, and it's right here under your nose and I don't see action." I remember having a number of years where felt like I had to be a strong advocate for those kinds of issues.

My kids ended up in Malaysia too where I was part of a huge affirmative action program that I was assigned to for two years to work with the people who are on the lowest rung in Malaysian society, the indigenous folks. And walk with them through the first couple of years of college, and helped them get to a point where they could transfer to English-speaking universities in different countries, to complete their degree requirements. So the kids often had that kind of exposure. A sort of, okay, we have these struggles domestically when we're home and now we are seeing—overseas they're having these troubles too. In the sense, on a larger scale because we are looking at a whole society, about one-third of the whole society, that was on the bottom of society. And so those experiences shaped me a lot, of course, just dealing with home-like issues and then trying to integrate them with professional interest.

**Reyes.** Back before I was a psychologist, I was interested in understanding what I shudder to call the spiritual side of life, because I'm not a religious person, but it was very clear to me that there's something going on with us as a species, that we need each other and we need to believe that there's something that's greater than our material self. We're dissatisfied with just being one of the smarter animals on the only planet we know of that supports life. It's kind of grandiose when you think of it that way, but it's not grandiose enough not for us! I read a lot on various spiritual traditions. The one thing that really resonated for me (because a lot of the detail stuff to me it's just artifactual—every belief system's going to come up with some window dressing, some knick-knacks that work for it, and that's fine), the overarching concept is that we are all connected at some level.

Being involved with peace psychology has heightened my awareness, it hasn't created or initiated that awareness, of how connected we all are, how much it's all one environment. And we do everything we can to defy that. We look around at this edifice we're in right now, and what these architects and builders have sought to do is to create an enclosed space in which we have a finite environment. There's a beginning and an end to this hotel. But just outside these panes of glass, we're in the global environment.

You asked clinically, and I guess where my mind went with it is that I understand people clinically differently now. I understand people as organisms in an ecology. They are affected by every little thing. We're resilient, but not invulnerable. We're affected by what's in our air, what's in our water, what's in our food. We're affected by what's in our minds. We are affected by what people say to us, and what we think about it. It creates an internal drama, it creates a world that only exists inside, a world that is that unique, a world where all the demons are real, and a world—a world that must have hope. I think that a lot of what—what we're about whether we're as clinical psychologist or we're as peace psychologist, we're about keeping hope alive. And we just cannot stand the idea of letting hope die. We can suffer a lot of other losses; but that one is more than we can psychologically bear. I've been involved in situations where colleagues and I have said, "Why do we keep this up? Let's just throw in the towel. Forget it! Now let's go do something else." And we didn't. Now I like to think of myself as a grown up, and I say to myself "Is that's the best you've got? Keeping hope alive?" But it is the best I've got.

**MacNair.** Well, of course, PITS is the biggie. I have the schools of thought concept that I've developed more. *Religion and non-violence* is my fifth book with Praeger and I also did *Working for Peace—A Handbook of Psychology and Other Tools* which was actually a second edition that somebody else had done a first edition of with Impact Publishers. And by the way, the acquisitions editor and I agreed that this [new book] was a follow-up book on PITS rather than a second edition because as soon as I bring other people in to write chapters that means it's not really a second edition, which I'm happy with.

Now, development of concepts of creativity. The concept of the creativity of the foreclosed option. You never heard of that before, have you? It's in my book. The idea is that when you say there's an option that you won't take, in theory you have fewer options, but in actuality you have more. Because you engage in divergent thinking when you have fewer options. So, for example, the diet of the average vegetarian has more variety to it than the diet of the average American does. That's in the literature and I had already noticed it. I was delighted to find it in the literature. And part of that is, I mean, you would think, "okay no meat means fewer options," but in actuality once you are thinking in terms of "okay, no meat," you have a creativity that flows in, in order to figure out how to not do the meat.

In the same way, pacifists are the people who have developed conflict resolution. Well, now you would think if you say no war, then you have one fewer option for dealing with conflicts. But, in fact, we're the ones that have come up with all the methods of—all the non-violent methods of doing it which the military wasn't thinking of because they were going to—because they were stuck in their one option.

**Diaz.** If you're asking me what in my work has been influenced by Peace Psychology, I can honestly tell you that what Peace Psychology has taught me is how little Peace Psychologists know about living in peace with other people. That doesn't mean I know how to live with other people, but I certainly am attempting to practice some of those lessons that I've learnt, primarily as a consequence of the interests that I was telling you about earlier. I see that there's a need for an interesting remarketing of Peace Psychology so that we can become a better known and heard voice in overall psychology.

One of the things that I try to do, anytime that I get a chance to, I try to at least model what I consider a minimal level of civility. This is to help us to address our differences in a manner that maximizes the probability that community can be built. I'm one of those that really believe that it is possible to live with people that don't think like I do. And, to not even live with them but actually work with them to accomplish some things we have as common goals though you may not be in the same political party. I think that's a living challenge. Peace Psychology has taught me how little is known about how to live with people of difference.

[Wessells was not specifically asked the question during his interview. But offered the following during his interview which relates to psychological insights]

**Wessells.** The specialized training almost beats [destroys] the natural holistic approach, the common sense approach. And I think it takes someone with some common sense and also some commitment to the whole person—to realize that person doesn't exist apart from the social milieu and the environment. A social ecological approach to human development is one of the traditions that I work with—and it just makes sense. If you're not thinking materially, physically, socially, cognitively, emotionally, and spiritually—if you're not putting all those together and looking at human relationships within the social system, you get a really skewed understanding. You start seeing this person who may have these skills and propensities, but also has these problems—perhaps got involved in something and ended up with PTSD and now they need treatment. It's like you have this very narrow—you don't even have an understanding of the individual.

I work in so many war zones where people tell you that, “It's not the past violence that is my problem. It's the fact that I'm a young mom and I can't feed my baby,” or “I'm a widow and I have no rights, no land rights, so how can I support my family?” Or, “I'm a former child soldier and I'm now badly stigmatized.” So US clinicians will focus on the trauma, when, from the local standpoint, it's almost always the stigma and the aftermath and the complexities with the current situation. Former child soldiers say things like “People call me a rebel child. They taught me, or they come after me because I was a soldier who attacked the village and now they want revenge.” In the post-conflict environment, gender based violence and sexual exploitation are often rampant. Again, it is not the violence of the armed conflict itself that may have the greatest effect. In post-conflict settings, the list of stressors is so long that they are difficult to enumerate fully. To me, ideally the way you would address the basic needs would be in a manner that builds social cohesion. It needs collaboration to do that and starts right from the ground up.