CHAPTER 30

PSYCHOLOGISTS MAKING A DIFFERENCE IN THE PUBLIC ARENA: BUILDING CULTURES OF PEACE

Michael Wessells, Milton Schwebel, and Anne Anderson

Inevitably, analyses of peace and social justice raise practical questions about what can be done. Left unanswered, these questions invite hopelessness and feelings of futility about changing a world grown accustomed to a culture of war. In this chapter, we offer a framework for action and identify four specific venues for action on a wide basis: sensitization, consultation, activism, and policy work. We also attempt to situate our ideas in historic context and to raise critical consciousness about work in the public arena. Through ongoing critical review of their work, peace psychologists help to ensure that their actions in the public arena embody the values they seek to nourish in the world.

Throughout the twentieth century, psychologists of many different orientations have worked in the public arena for peace. Early on, William James (1910/1995), the philosopher-psychologist, advocated that since war meets human needs for heroism, sacrifice, and excitement, those who seek peace must construct nonviolent, morally acceptable outlets for those needs. In 1945, near the end of World War II, psychologists such as Gordon Allport and E. C.

1

Tolman distributed publicly a statement on human nature that underscored the preventability of war (Jacobs, 1989). During the Cold War, psychologists such as Ralph White, Herbert Kelman, Morton Deutsch, and Brewster Smith suggested psychologically informed policies for reducing superpower tensions and the threat of nuclear war. Charles Osgood's (1962) suggestion of GRIT (Graduated Reciprocal Initiatives in Tension Reduction) may even have encouraged President Kennedy to unilaterally propose a ban on atmospheric nuclear testing in 1963 (Jacobs, 1989).

Although some have viewed work for peace as something to be done "after hours" and as citizens, others have made cogent arguments that work to advance human well-being in the public arena is a matter of *professional responsibility*. Alfred Adler, for example, saw social responsibility as "fundamental to the practice of psychology" (Rudmin & Ansbacher, 1989, p. 8), saying, in 1935 that

> The honest psychologist cannot shut his [sic] eyes to social conditions which
>
> prevent the child from becoming part of the community and from feeling at home
>
> in the world, and which allow him to grow up as though he lived in enemy coun-
>
> try. Thus psychologists must work against nationalism when it is so poorly under-
>
> stood that it harms mankind as a whole; against wars of conquest, revenge, and
>
> prestige, against unemployment which plunges people into hopelessness; and
>
> against all other obstacles which interfere with the spreading of social interest in
>
> the family, the school, and society at large. (Adler, 1935/1956, p. 454)

These brief examples provide an historical context for considering the evolving challenges and opportunities that peace psychologists encounter in their work in the public arena. In the past, particularly during the Cold War, peace researchers and practitioners have frequently re-

acted to problems such as the nuclear threat, environmental destruction, or whichever current war happened to be most devastating. Reactive approaches, although often necessary, can neither address effectively the root causes of war nor transform the war system into a peace system. Building peace requires prevention and long-term, proactive work (Christie, 1997; Wagner, de Rivera, & Watkins, 1988) for changing cultures of violence into cultures of peace (Adams, 1995; Galtung, 1996). Even short-term reactive responses to particular crisis situations can prove to be more effective if they have been chosen within the framework of building positive peace.

THE CULTURES OF PEACE FRAMEWORK

A useful description for positive peace has been adopted by the U.N. General Assembly. Recognizing the long term nature of the work, the U.N. General Assembly (Resolution 52/15) declared the year 2000 as the International Year for the Culture of Peace. Broadly, *cultures of peace* include seven core elements that vary in form across cultures, yet are universals of positive peace. These elements may be envisioned as spokes of a wheel, a weakness in any one of which may produce systemic weakness or collapse. The elements are:

- *Social justice:* institutionalized equity in distribution and access to material, social, and political resources; truth-telling, reparations, and penalties for infractions; full participation and power-sharing by different groups; gender justice and full participation by women;

- *Human rights:* rule of law and adherence to human rights standards;

- *Nonviolence:* institutionalized arrangements for nonviolent conflict resolution and reconciliation; values and attitudes of civility; norms and processes that promote human security, cooperation, interdependence, and harmonious relationships at all levels;

- *Inclusiveness:* respect for difference; participation by different groups; meeting identity needs; cultural sensitivity;

- *Civil society:* strength and diversity of civic groups in sectors such as health, business, religion, and education; community action, support, and hope through these venues; full citizen participation in government;

- *Peace education:* formal and informal, experiential education for peace at all levels; socialization of values, attitudes, and behaviors conducive to peace and social justice.

- *Sustainability:* preservation of global resources; meeting the needs of the current generation without compromising the ability to meet the needs of future generations.

Psychologists may contribute to the construction of cultures of peace through work at many levels. Therapists who help to reduce family violence and to build equitable, nonviolent relationships in families contribute to cultures of peace. Educators who teach skills of nonviolent conflict resolution or work for social justice at the community level also contribute to the construction of cultures of peace. Ultimately, however, large-scale, systemic social change is needed to build cultures of peace. To be maximally effective, psychologists may take their work into the public arena, reaching larger numbers of people, constructing social policies that help institutionalize social justice and end oppression, and enlarging the potential scale on which they can make a difference in effecting peace and social justice.

Although many peace psychologists recognize the potential benefits and importance of work in the public arena, numerous concerns limit their involvement. Many feel overwhelmed by the vast number of issues and the complexity involved in producing large-scale change. Many feel

helpless and uncertain about how one can make a difference. In addition, multifaceted issues of peace and social justice require multidisciplinary work, which exceeds the specialized training of many psychologists. Further, psychologists may worry that by working in the public arena on political issues, they may politicize the discipline and damage its credibility, fall prey to role confusion, or go beyond what is known or what can legitimately be said on scientific grounds (Suedfeld & Tetlock, 1992).

Although complex, these questions should neither block action nor lead one to forget that inaction itself is a choice that has profound implications. Nowhere is this more apparent than in regard to issues of science and the practice of psychology.

SCIENCE, VALUES, AND ACTION

Science and Values

Although science has often been portrayed as an objective, value-neutral enterprise, it is suffused with the values of a dominant order that has institutionalized war and injustice. For researchers to raise questions about the adverse effects of the nuclear arms race during the height of the Cold War was to risk being labeled "unpatriotic." The neutrality myth fails to consider that it is people and social agencies who set the research agendas, which are socially constructed and inherently value-laden. Which questions seem most important to ask and which problems one chooses to address reflect societal values. Further, science often tracks funding, and in the United States following World War II, over half the funding for scientific research came from defense-related sources (Melman, 1985). Resource allocation for scientific research is guided by societal values, in this case a dominant social order that institutionalized war, drained resources away from

peaceful activities designed to meet basic human needs, and caused much pollution and environmental damage (McKenzie-Mohr & Winter, 1992). It is not a question, then, whether values will influence psychological research but rather which values and whose values.

Consistent with the cultures of peace framework outlined above, peace psychology embraces values associated with nonviolence, human rights, and social justice. However, peace psychology is not inherently more value-laden than other areas of psychology, though it may appear to be so by virtue of its explicit emphasis on peace and its opposition to the values of the dominant war system. Nor is peace psychology inherently pacifist. Some peace psychologists believe that a commitment to building a nonviolent world does not preclude the use of force when circumstances afford no other realistic options. Indeed, many prominent peace psychologists have records of distinguished military service. In addition, peace psychology is not monolithic and includes people who hold disparate assumptions and views about how to cope with tyrants like Saddam Hussein as well as the misguided leaders in their own respective countries. Both the values of peace psychology and their relationship to science and action are topics of ongoing dialogue and reflection, as is appropriate to any field, especially a nascent one.

From the standpoint of peace psychology, the values of inclusiveness, diversity, and equity are important in regard to research and practice (Kimmel, 1995; Wessells, 1992). If research in peace psychology were dominated by Western approaches, the result would be not only culturally biased concepts and tools but also social injustice within the field of peace psychology that would likely be reflected in the marginalization of local voices, the privileging of Western approaches as more "scientific" or prestigious, and in inequitable distribution of resources such as publication space and funding. This power asymmetry represents a form of neo-colonialism

(Wessells, 1992) or cultural imperialism (Dawes, 1997). Although the asymmetry exists de facto by virtue of the wider economic and political privileging of Western countries, psychologists in the Western world can take systematic steps to include the voices and perspectives of psychologists from different countries, thereby enriching the field, enhancing cultural relevance of psychological theory and method, and building equity within the house of psychological science.

Science and Action

Traditionalists, who view science as truth-seeking and as independent of the arena of political discourse and action, have eschewed speaking out in the public arena or taking positions on controversial issues (Suedfeld & Tetlock, 1992). In this view, scientists should stick strictly to science. The problem, however, is that although one can conduct relatively "pure" research without any interest in application or action, knowledge is a social commodity, and others may use the knowledge in objectionable ways. The inadequacy of the view that scientists have no responsibility for what they develop through research is apparent to anyone who has studied Nazi science, which was thoroughly state-controlled and the results of which were used for purposes of genocide. Further, inaction on the part of scientists serves as a warrant for the perpetuation of the status quo, an objectionable situation in a socially unjust system. To have conducted pure research on psychophysics during the Nazi regime, for example, would have been tantamount to complicity in genocide through one's silence.

A more appropriate view for peace psychology is that science is inevitably an extension of socially constructed political agendas, often left unstated. In addition, scientists bear responsibility for their discoveries and tools and how they are used. In this sense, peace research is intimately connected with action for social justice. The questions asked should address issues of

peace and social justice, and what is learned from the research should inform actions in the public arena. Of course, difficult questions remain about when it is appropriate to speak out, what can legitimately be said, and how scientific results will be used. These issues are examined further in the sections below.

VENUES FOR ACTION

Sensitization

In work on *sensitization* or consciousness-raising, psychologists may contribute to public dialogue through agenda-setting. Not infrequently, the public agenda is set by people trained in disciplines such as law and political science who may not recognize or have the expertise to handle psychological dimensions of social justice issues. For example, an essential part of peacebuilding in the former Yugoslavia is the conduct of war crimes tribunals, including those for perpetrators of gender-specific war crimes such as rape. Initial plans of procedures for women to give testimony, however, did not adequately consider the profound psychological implications of the very act of giving testimony about one's experience of being raped nor provide appropriate witness support and protection. Through the efforts of an international group of mental health professionals, including Anne Anderson of Psychologists for Social Responsibility, working through the Coordination of Women's Advocacy, procedures were changed and psychological supports were improved (Anderson & Richter-Lyonette, 1997). Similarly, in work on issues such as discrimination, psychologists have been instrumental in calling attention to the psychological damage resulting from discrimination even as long ago as the 1940's, when Kenneth and Mimi Clarke's (1947) study demonstrated the effects of racism on the self-concept of young black children.

A key part of work on sensitization is the dissemination of psychological knowledge and tools. This can be particularly important in addressing issues of human nature or in correcting misuse of psychological knowledge. As Doris Miller (1972) has noted, the public discourse contains many presumed psychological "truths" that psychologists ought to examine critically:

> Economists, politicians, physicists, editorialists, munitions manufacturers and "philosophers" have not hesitated to advise society on problems of social motivation, the inevitability of war as "inherent in human nature" and the like. What psychologists have come forth to substantiate or refute these "psychological" laws? These are important psychological questions per se; that their answers may have important implications does not make them less so and should not frighten us away from them. (p. 221)

In this spirit, psychologists and scholars from other disciplines wrote the widely disseminated Seville Statement on Violence (1987), which challenged the view of war as genetically determined. The publication of the statement elicited a new round of research and discussion on the causes of war which continues today.

A particularly useful sensitization strategy is to target policy leaders, enabling psychological information to enter policy dialogue. A salient example is the work of Ralph K. White in regard to the Middle East peace process. Following the wars of 1967 and 1973 and the entrenchment of U.S. policy to oppose the spread of communism in the Middle East, Arab-Israeli relations had become saturated with misperceptions, black and white thinking, and mutual lack of empathy. In 1977, White published a paper that pointed out the divergent historical realities of Israelis and Arabs, identified damaging, self-sustaining misperceptions, and emphasized the need to address

these misperceptions (White, 1977). This paper, circulated to approximately 100 U.S. embassies around the world, likely helped to establish a psychological climate favorable to peacemaking activities such as the 1978 Camp David process which built peace between Egypt and Israel. It is significant that White's paper did not call for particular policies. By raising awareness of the psychological dimensions, White helped to reframe problems that had been thought of mostly in historical, political, and economic terms. He also helped to redefine the peace agenda.

Reframing issues in light of psychological knowledge and situating issues in psychological perspective often helps to break out of conventional modes of thought, to challenge underlying assumptions, and to bring previously neglected dimensions into sharp relief. Even in the absence of hard data on particular policies, the reframing of issues constitutes one of the most valuable contributions peace psychologists make in the public arena (Smith, 1986). It was in this spirit that Herbert Kelman (1977) helped to mobilize in 1952 a small group of social scientists who established the Research Exchange on the Prevention of War. In turn, the Exchange led to the formation of the *Journal of Conflict Resolution,* which has included psychological and multidisciplinary issues related to conflict.

Since building cultures of peace is a global process and issues such as gender equity are global in scope, sensitization efforts often rely on tools such as networks and mass media. Through networking, one potentially creates multiple venues for carrying messages to a wide audience. The Internet and other tools make it possible to deliver messages more widely and immediately than ever before. Accordingly, the UNESCO Culture of Peace Programme has focused its work for the Year 2000 on the establishment of an Internet worldwide peace news network that helps to redefine what counts as "newsworthy" (Adams, 1998).

Mass media such as radio and television provide excellent venues for taking messages to a wide public audience. To establish social justice in countries in Africa, Search for Common Ground, a non-governmental organization (NGO) based in the United States, has developed a series of radio programs that feature drama and psychologically informed discussions to encourage tolerance and understanding across lines of conflict. Radio is still the most accessible medium in many areas of Africa. In developed nations such as the United States, television plays a central role in defining social reality, and television images are widely believed to have helped mobilize public support for particular policies.

Peace psychologists have only begun to use television for purposes of sensitization, in part because war is more sensational and the communications industry has reflected the priorities and values of the war system. Many psychologists are wary because they have had their material misused or have been uncomfortable reducing complex issues into "sound bites." Some harbor negative stereotypes of media they see as having helped to normalize violence and social inequities. Others struggle with ethical issues, fearing, for example, that interviews conducted on camera with victims in war zones may violate confidentiality or jeopardize the security or the community acceptance of interviewees.

Although these complexities warrant careful attention, they should not be allowed to exercise a chilling effect. Many of the problems can be addressed through careful preparation and by working with psychological organizations, subjecting ideas to be presented on camera to peer review. The transformation of public media is an essential part of building cultures of peace, and peace psychologists should do their part to criticize inappropriate media imagery and the misuse of psychological material, to get peace and social justice issues on the media agenda, and to en-

courage programming that encourages values, attitudes, and behaviors conducive to cultures of peace.

Consultation

Psychologists are often asked to provide expert advice at different social levels in addressing issues of social justice and peace. To improve race relations, communities may look to psychologists for help in analyzing problems, moderating dialogues, designing and conducting research, or developing and implementing strategies of intervention and prevention. Similarly, schools that want to improve gender equity or to address problems of violence may look to peace psychologists for advice. Not infrequently, psychologists are called upon to give expert legal testimony on issues such as the psychological damage inflicted by family and community violence, the community impacts of nuclear weapons development and testing, or the effects of gender discrimination in the workplace. Systematic work at different social levels, even if conducted with little public attention, is needed to build cultures of peace.

Since building peace is a global project and injustices within one country are frequently interconnected with injustices in other countries and regions, it is vital for peace psychologists to work internationally. In addition, many countries, ravaged by long histories of colonialism, poverty, and war, require external assistance. Global work on humanitarian assistance, peace, and sustainable development is often conducted by governmental organizations, NGOs, and United Nations (U.N.) agencies, which frequently receive financial support from donor governments and agencies such as the U.S. Agency for International Development.

Consultation within the U.N./NGO system constitutes an increasingly important venue for

peace psychologists working to make a difference in the public arena. Indeed, significant numbers of psychologists serve as consultants to international and local NGOs on projects such as addressing war trauma, making women more central in development projects, providing psychosocial support and care for refugee and internally displaced peoples, and reconstructing communities for peace, to name only a few. On the ground, psychologists often provide consultation and services via training, education, program design, evaluation, and human rights monitoring. Psychologists also advise via NGO committees to the United Nations and by working directly with particular U.N. agencies. Here psychologists may help to develop appropriate standards, integrate psychosocial perspectives and establish comprehensive programs of development, and offer psychologically informed criticism of U.N. activities.

Significant risks centered around power and culture attend consultation efforts. Because of the dominance of Euro-American psychology, most consultants have Western training and have Ph.D. degrees, which carry significant prestige in the developing world. Typically, they enter difficult situations as consultants for international NGOs or U.N. agencies that provide money, food, health care, housing, and other resources. Because of extreme poverty and enormous human needs locally, a significant power asymmetry exists between local communities and the psychologists and the agencies for which they work (Wessells & Kostelny, 1996). In this context, local people may be excessively deferential to the external "experts" and may either embrace or give the appearance of embracing the methods and projects they suggest. Eager to avoid appearing backward, local people may not mention or may keep on the margins centuries-old practices that could contribute to psychosocial well-being in the community. This situation marginalizes local voices and continues the injustices of class, wealth, power, and ethnicity that are deeply

embedded in global North-South relations.

Thus, psychology can become a tool of cultural imperialism (Dawes, 1997; Wessells, 1998) that derogates local culture and undermines traditions that might provide a sense of continuity and support under difficult circumstances. The sad irony, of course, is that Western-derived concepts and tools, although useful in many settings, may not apply "off the shelf." Embodiments of Western cultural assumptions and values, these concepts and tools may not fit local beliefs, values, and practices, severely limiting both their efficacy and their sustainability. As one example, Giller (1998) tells of having been invited to Uganda in the late 1980s to set up a center for victims of torture. Although her Western background led to a focus on trauma, she soon realized that poverty was the larger problem, that "trauma" in that context correlated poorly with social function, and that individualized counseling approaches were culturally inappropriate. Wisely, she decided to learn from local people and to develop culturally grounded approaches.

Giller's example points out the importance of working self-critically in a collaborative spirit of dialogue and power sharing. Aware of the potential problems, Western consultants may temper the hierarchical role of "experts" who presumably hold solutions to difficult problems, opting instead for a role of partnership in addressing difficult issues. This role entails careful listening to local people, learning about local customs, regarding local people and traditions as resources, and encouragement of local leadership and ownership of programs. The emphasis is on building local capacity and culturally relevant interventions rather than on seeking external solutions to problems. Working in this partnership mode, consultation is a process of mutual dialogue and problem-solving. This approach is at the heart of community-based programs (see Wessells & Monteiro, this volume). It is also at the center of the Culture of Peace Programme (cf. Adams,

1995) of UNESCO (the U.N. Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization), which laid the foundation for the International Year of the Culture of Peace in 2000.

Activism

Activism is a process of mobilizing people for action, where the action may support a particular position (e.g., writing Congresspeople in support of a Comprehensive Test Ban) or may be non-positionally oriented (e.g., urging people to vote in the next U.S. presidential election). Activism is central to the project of social change since public mobilization is often needed to move leaders towards actions that help to build peace and social justice. Without public support, leaders may feel constrained politically from peace-promoting steps toward which they may be inclined personally.

Peace psychology stands to contribute much to projects of activism to build cultures of peace. Psychologists have a wealth of relevant tools and concepts pertaining to attitude change, motivation, nonviolent options, and organization, among many others, that can be used to assist the work of peace organizations (Wollman, 1985). Psychologists are in a position to build understanding of activism, of how to empower people and keep them involved in the face of adversity, and of what leads to activism within the system or outside of it (Schwebel, 1993). In addition, peace psychologists may offer key insights that help to mobilize people on particular issues. For example, the work of White (1984), Deutsch (1983), Bronfenbrenner (1961), Keen (1986), Silverstein (1989) and others suggested that processes of excessive fear, enemy imaging, and related problems of misperception and judgmental biases made the policy of nuclear deterrence imperfect and dangerous. Via networks with peace organizations and the Enemy Images Project of Psychologists for Social Responsibility (PsySR), which produced the manual *Dismantling the*

Mask of Enmity, these insights entered public dialogue. The psychological critique of nuclear deterrence was not universally accepted, but it did contribute to public discourse, an important form of action without which leaders are potentially at liberty to engage in folly (Tuchman, 1984). Similarly, during the Cold War, psychologists worked to mobilize people in discussing the nuclear threat and its implications for families (e.g., Greenwald & Zeitlin, 1987), communities (Albee, 1992; Pilisuk & Parks, 1986), and for nations and civilizations (Jacobs, 1989; Mack, 1982; White, 1984). This strategy of stimulating critical discourse at multiple levels is essential for enabling large-scale social change.

An important form of activism by peace psychologists is the construction of effective psychological organizations. These organizations mobilize their own discipline for peace with regard to structure and activities such as research, training, education, and practice. Historically, activist psychology organizations in the United States included the Committee on Psychology in National and International Affairs, the SPSSI Committee on Arms Control and Disarmament, and American Psychologists for Social Action (Jacobs, 1989). The work of the Society for the Study of Peace, Conflict, and Violence: Peace Psychology Division of the American Psychological Association (Division 48) helps to build social justice within the world's largest psychological association and also encourages psychologists to do their share in building peace both locally and globally. Related peace psychology organizations exist in many different countries, and one of the key tasks of activating psychology for peace is to build effective networks among these organizations (Harari, 1992; Wessells, 1992). To assist in building these networks, the Committee for the Psychological Study of Peace, which works under the auspices of the International Union of Psychological Science, convenes biennially an International Symposium on the Contributions

of Psychology to Peace.

In guiding action in the wider public arena, activist organizations are significant in defining the issues, deciding what to say, whom to target, etc. For the past 15 years, PsySR, facilitated by its national coordinator, Anne Anderson, has been the activist arm of psychology in the United States. Although PsySR works extensively on peacebuilding and prevention (e.g., its current main project is Building Cultures of Peace), it has also served as a rapid-response network that attempts to bring forward the best psychological knowledge in times of crisis. When a hot issue such as the Gulf Crisis of 1991 arises, PsySR begins an inclusive dialogue within its national Steering Committee and Advisory Board, which includes distinguished psychologists possessing diverse orientations. It also launches an intensive search through its international networks for issue-relevant expertise. This process targets key issues, identifies what is known and what is not, and often leads to a position that takes into account diverse viewpoints and the collective wisdom of many professionals. In this manner, PsySR speaks for many psychologists and potentially has an impact beyond that achievable by individuals acting alone.

Education for peace, which is not an armchair endeavor but a process of education and mobilizing people for peace (Brocke-Utne, 1989), is of central importance in activism. Peace education in schools is valuable and draws significantly on psychological concepts and tools (Coleman & Deutsch, this volume). But education for peace also includes informal education, including learning by doing and social action. Psychologists stand to contribute significantly to this multilevel work through activities such as conducting community-based training to oppose racism (as in the PsySR "US & THEM: The Challenge of Diversity" project), developing effective facilitated processes that improve communication about controversial subjects, encouraging parents'

groups to speak out on the quantity and graphic nature of violence on television (Hesse, 1989; Carlsson-Paige & Levin, 1990), and mobilizing to improve the status of women, such as participating in the follow-up to the fourth U.N. Conference on Women to implement the National Action Agenda (Stanley Foundation, 1997).

Influencing Policy

Peace psychologists have a number of important roles to play in regard to public policy. As researchers, they may conduct policy-relevant research that helps to inform policy decisions (Suedfeld & Tetlock, 1992; Tetlock, 1986). In the role of the local opposition and using the cultures of peace elements outlined above as a compass, they may offer psychologically informed critiques of existing policies, discuss problems of current policies with policy leaders, or help to *mobilize public opposition* to psychologically damaging policies (DeLeon, O'Keefe, VandenBos, & Kraut, 1996).

Psychologists may also serve as monitors, reporting on social injustice and human rights abuses that they see in their field work and that stem from particular policies. This monitoring role is particularly important in regard to the *abuse of psychological knowledge and tools.* For example, repeated field reports and recently declassified documents suggest that Latin American military personnel, trained in the United States at the School of the Americas in Fort Benning, Georgia, had committed numerous atrocities and had also used psychological methods for purposes of interrogation and torture. Although peace psychologists diverge in their views on the necessity for and utility of covert operations, wide agreement exists that it is unethical to use psychological tools for purposes of torture. Ethical issues of this nature outstrip the guild codes of ethics of most professional associations such as the American Psychological Association. In

this context, it is vital for peace psychologists to monitor and report publicly on abuses observed, to educate policy makers about the damage inflicted by psychological torture, and to work within the discipline to oppose the development of psychological instruments of torture and to encourage psychologists to be vigilant in regard to how their methods are actually used (Psychologists for Social Responsibility, 1997). Psychologists' responsibilities do not end with the development of psychological tools.

Policy advocacy is an essential element of work toward cultures of peace. In some cases, peace psychologists can advocate policies that are based upon established psychological knowledge. For example, to assist Angolan children who had been separated from parents or who were "orphans," the Angolan government had developed by 1994, a practice of placing unaccompanied children in institutions or orphanages, which operated under extreme conditions of poverty, overcrowding, and understaffing. An extensive psychological literature attests to the ill effects of rearing children in such institutions, where inattention and lack of stimulation are prevalent (Bowlby, 1979). Accordingly, the Angolan psychological staff of Christian Children's Fund advocated publicly in meetings with Angolan government officials on behalf of scaling back on institutionalizing children while using precious funds for purposes of documentation, tracing, and family reunification. In Angola, extended family is nearly always available for assisting children, and families are in the best position to provide an environment conducive to children's healthy psychosocial development. Fortunately, the Angolan government had a genuine interest in children's well-being, and this advocacy contributed to a national deemphasis on institutionalization of children.

Policy advocacy within the United States is of special importance since the U.S. government

has powerful influence worldwide and has resources that can make a difference in many regions. Arguably, U.S. government policies have contributed strongly to war and injustice in many parts of the world as well as to social injustice within U.S. borders. During the Cold War, for example, the U.S. military expenditures were approximately $300 billion annually, and such vast defense spending drained scarce resources away from meeting widespread needs for health care, housing, and employment (Sivard, 1986). In fact, the United States has spent more on nuclear weapons since 1940 than on all other budget categories besides Social Security and nonnuclear defense, according to a Brookings Institution report. Total cost since 1940 in nuclear weapons and infra-structure is $5.5 trillion (as of 1996, adjusted for inflation; see Schwartz, 1998).

To strengthen emphasis on peace, psychologists such as Paul Kimmel, the first APA Public Policy Fellow, advocated on behalf of the establishment of a U.S. Institute of Peace (USIP), which could enhance national security through the development and application of concepts and tools of nonviolent conflict resolution. Kimmel "has attributed the concepts formulated by Jerome Frank, Charles Osgood, Morton Deutsch, and Ralph K. White in the sixties as those which laid the foundation of the Peace Academy Campaign" (Jacobs, 1989, p. 80) that culminated in the establishment of the USIP. The expertise of distinguished psychologists such as Herbert Kelman (1996) is now prominent in USIP-sponsored books, conferences, and policy dialogues.

Work on public policy faces difficult issues of how to make a difference, what can be said, which issues to focus on, etc. As discussed above in connection with activism, one may address these issues by working through socially responsible organizations that have credibility and provide peer review and inclusive dialogue. A persistent problem in this work is the focus on crises, which are omnipresent. Although perhaps too much has been made of the "CNN effect," it is true

that public attention and the work of peace psychology organizations has tended to track the hottest crises. As one example, work on nuclear weapons policies within peace psychology and the wider peace community diminished following the end of the Cold War. But the 1998 nuclear testing and tensions between India and Pakistan put these policies back in the spotlight. The problem, one that peace psychologists ought to attend to, is that nuclear policies and threats are long-term and are associated with related issues of weapons development, cultural, political, and economic militarization, and problems of conversion and unemployment, to name only a few. If policy work is to be an effective means of prevention, this work itself must have a long-term, systems orientation toward analysis and change.

Issues of culture and power also pose significant challenges. For example, who determines what constitutes human rights? As recognized in the Universal Declaration on Human Rights, it is vital to have global standards for protection. In practice, however, Western nations have led the dialogue on "human rights," leading to collisions between Western values and those of local people in non-Western cultures. The world's most widely endorsed human rights instrument—the *UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC)*—prohibits the military recruitment of youth under 15 years of age, and most signatories of the CRC support an Optional Protocol to boost the minimum age to 18 years. Intended to prohibit the exploitation of children through soldiering, this limit embodies Western definitions of childhood. In many Bantu cultures in Africa, a young male of twelve or 13 years is regarded as an adult following passage through the culturally scripted rites of manhood (Wessells, 1998). This case and many others raise issues about who defines childhood and whether it is appropriate to impose universal standards on local peoples.

Although these issues admit no easy answers, two points are particularly noteworthy. First,

against concerns about cultural imperialism, one must weigh the need for moral accountability and the importance of avoiding extreme *cultural relativism,* which can create an "anything goes" mentality. For example, some local practices such as female infanticide are unacceptable to the vast majority of peoples and need to change. Second, full participation and ongoing dialogue are essential in the construction of policy standards. Social injustice arises when any small group of nations sets the human rights agenda or limits participation in the construction of policies. Standards and policies are dynamic, and full participation helps to ensure that they will evolve in ways that advance social justice and peace. Thus psychologists have a responsibility to advance this inclusive, participatory dialogue in their own work in the policy arena.

TOWARD THE FUTURE

A glimpse at the past shows great promise for peace in the future and considerable need for the services of psychologists in nurturing cultures of peace. The twentieth century has no equal in the blood that has been spilt and in a record of being the most inhumane in history, with a trail of warfare directed at civilian targets, atrocities against women and children, extreme racism, and ethnic slaughter and genocide.

Alongside that lurid history is another, its diametric opposite, a record that reveals a steadily rising trajectory toward the peaceful resolution of conflict, culminating in its last decade in the drive to transform a culture of war to a culture of peace. The century has witnessed the establishment of the first international organizations aimed at the maintenance of world peace, the League of Nations and the United Nations. The latter has endured many trials, outlasted predictions of its early demise, and appears, now at the dawn of the twenty-first century, to be a permanent feature of global life.

Most strikingly has been the change in the consciousness of people and in their collective actions. The helplessness of adults has been displaced by the power of people all over the world who insisted on their independence, as in India and former colonies throughout Africa. In much of the world, as in the United States, oppressed people, including women, have demanded equality, and many have won a share of it. And worldwide, most people have rejected, and demonstrated and voted against, the nuclear arms race. That is why the concept of "cultures of peace" has such wide appeal.

Not surprisingly, during the half century that has seen the rapid rise of the peace trajectory, psychologists have increasingly participated in efforts to introduce peaceful means of conflict resolution in family and community life, in organizations and institutions, and in national and international affairs. There is increasing appreciation that peace is systemic and that the construction of peace requires efforts at various levels such as marital counseling, community dispute resolution, interethnic mediation, and international diplomacy.

What is called for now, all the more, is the creative genius of psychology to generate new approaches to propel the transformation to cultures of peace. There is, at the same time, the need for psychologists in virtually all of its many fields—e.g., developmental, cognitive, clinical, counseling, educational, organizational—to situate their theory, research and practice in such a culture.