
Peace Psychology Book Series

Series Editor
Daniel J. Christie

For further volumes:
www.springer.com/series/7298

Kathleen Malley-Morrison
Andrea Mercurio • Gabriel Twose
Editors

International Handbook of Peace and Reconciliation

 Springer

Editors

Kathleen Malley-Morrison
Department of Psychology
Boston University
Boston, MA, USA

Andrea Mercurio
Department of Psychology
Boston University
Boston, MA, USA

Gabriel Twose
Public Interest Directorate
American Psychological Association
Washington, DC, USA

ISBN 978-1-4614-5932-3 ISBN 978-1-4614-5933-0 (eBook)
DOI 10.1007/978-1-4614-5933-0
Springer New York Heidelberg Dordrecht London

Library of Congress Control Number: 2012955506

© Springer Science+Business Media New York 2013

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed. Exempted from this legal reservation are brief excerpts in connection with reviews or scholarly analysis or material supplied specifically for the purpose of being entered and executed on a computer system, for exclusive use by the purchaser of the work. Duplication of this publication or parts thereof is permitted only under the provisions of the Copyright Law of the Publisher's location, in its current version, and permission for use must always be obtained from Springer. Permissions for use may be obtained through RightsLink at the Copyright Clearance Center. Violations are liable to prosecution under the respective Copyright Law.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

While the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication, neither the authors nor the editors nor the publisher can accept any legal responsibility for any errors or omissions that may be made. The publisher makes no warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein.

Printed on acid-free paper

Springer is part of Springer Science+Business Media (www.springer.com)

Contents

1 Introduction to International Handbook on Peace and Reconciliation for Springer Publishing	1
Kathleen Malley-Morrison	
Part I Definitions of Peace and Reconciliation	
2 Definitions of Peace and Reconciliation	11
Elizabeth Claggett-Borne	
3 Definitions of Peace and Reconciliation in Western Europe	23
Mathilde Salmberg, Kathryn O’Keefe, Sarah An, Carla Machado, Silja Bara Omarsdottir, Michael Corgan, Mariana Barbosa, Julia König, Elizabeth Leembruggen-Kallberg, and Christine Roland-Levy	
4 Definitions of Peace and Reconciliation in Great Britain, Northern Ireland, Canada, the United States, and Australia	35
James Page, Sarah An, Michael Whitely, Doe West, John Davis, and Carol Davis	
5 Definitions of Peace and Reconciliation in Russia and the Balkans	51
Vlado Miheljak, Marko Polič, Chelsea Cogan, Heather Lane, Natalia Parnyuk, Alev Yalcinkaya, Sherri McCarthy, Anna Medvedeva, Nebojsa Petrovic, and Charikleia Tsatsaroni	
6 Definition of Peace and Reconciliation in the Middle East	63
Glyn Secker, Patrick Hanlin, Gabriella Gricius, Majed Ashy, Abdul Kareem Al-Obaidi, Heyam Mohammed, Raja Tayeh, Irene Colthurst, Lane Smith, Dalit Yassour-Boroschowitz, Helena Syna Desivilya, Kamala Smith, Linda Jeffrey, William Tastle, Feryal Turan, Alev Yalcinkaya, and Rouba Youssef	

7	Definitions of Peace and Reconciliation in Africa	81
	Mahlon Dalley, Jennifer Heinecke, Jacqueline Akhurst, Abdelkader Abdelali, Natoschia Scruggs, Raquel DeBartolo, Adeniyi Famose, Helena Castanheira, Eduardo Correia, and William Tastle	
8	Definitions of Peace and Reconciliation in Latin America	99
	Eros DeSouza, Tristyn Campbell, Rodrigo Barahona, Luciana Karine de Souza, Sherri McCarthy, Michael Stevens, Amanda Clinton, Eddy Carillo, and Ricardo Angelino	
9	Definitions of Peace and Reconciliation in South and Southeast Asia	107
	Janice Jones, E.E. Diehnelt, Anoushka Shahane, Ellora Puri, Darshini Shah, Ma. Regina E. Estuar, Sherri McCarthy, Meghan Reif, Haslina Muhammad, Nisha Raj, and Jas Jafaar	
10	Definition of Peace and Reconciliation in China, Japan, and Korea	117
	Alice Murata, Michelle Murata, Anoushka Shahane, Andrea Jones-Rooy, and Hillary Mi-Sung Kim	
11	Peace in Our Time? Reflections on Comparative Data About Peace and Reconciliation from All Regions of the World	131
	Sherri McCarthy and Raquel DeBartolo	
 Part II Perspectives on Protest		
12	Perspectives on Protest: Introduction	143
	Tristyn Campbell	
13	Perspectives on Protest in Western Europe	155
	Michael Corgan, Bailey Pescatore, Mariana Barbosa, Daniela Miranola, Silja Bara Omarsdottir, Julia König, Mathilde Salmberg, Carla Machado, Elizabeth Leembruggen-Kallberg, and Christine Roland-Levy	
14	Perspectives on Protest in Great Britain, Northern Ireland, Canada, the United States and Australia	169
	Andrea Mercurio, James Page, Alyssa Mendlein, Emily Bales, John Davis, Carol Davis, Michael Whitely, and Doe West	
15	Perspectives on Protest in Russia and the Balkan Peninsula	183
	Charikleia Tsatsaroni, Sherri McCarthy, Nebojsa Petrovic, Vlado Miheljak, Marko Polič, Anna Medvedeva, and Alev Yalcinkaya	

16	Perspectives of Protest in the Middle East	199
	Natoschia Scruggs, Jessica Cox, Majed Ashy, Heyam Mohammed, Helena Syna Desivilya, Raja Tayeh, Abdul Kareem Al-Obaidi, Lane Smith, Dalit Yassour-Boroschowitz, Kamala Smith, Linda Jeffrey, William Tastle, Feryal Turan, Alev Yalcinkaya, and Rouba Youssef	
17	African Perspectives on Peaceful Social Protests	217
	Grace Kibanja, Laura Johnson, Mahlon Dalley, Natoschia Scruggs, Jacqueline Akhurst, Adeniyi Famose, Helena Castanheira, Eduardo Correia, and William Tastle	
18	Perspectives on Protest in Latin America	237
	Jorge Luna Torres, Adriana Munte, Patrick Hanlin, Michael Stevens, Amanda Clinton, Sherri McCarthy, Rodrigo Barahona, Ricardo Angelino, Eddy Carillo, Eros DeSouza, and Luciana Karine de Souza	
19	Perspectives on Protest in South and Southeast Asia	247
	Ma. Regina E. Estuar, Nico Canoy, Divya Japa, Janice Jones, Sherri McCarthy, Ellora Puri, Megan Reif, Darshini Shah, Haslina Muhammad, Nisha Raj, and Jas Jafaar	
20	Perspectives on Protest in East Asia	263
	Hillary Mi-Sung Kim, Matthew Schauer, Alyssa Mendlein, Alice Murata, Michelle Murata, and Andrea Jones-Rooy	
21	International Perspectives on Engagement and Disengagement in Support and Suppression of Antiwar Protests	279
	Alfred McAlister and Tristyn Campbell	
Part III Apology and Reconciliation		
22	Methods for Coding Perspectives on Apology and Reconciliation	291
	Jennie Davidow	
23	Apology and Reconciliation in Western Europe	301
	Kristina Hellqvist, Elizabeth Leembruggen-Kallberg, Julia König, Mathilde Salmberg, Carla Machado, Michael Corgan, Silja Bara Omarsdottir, Mariana Barbosa, and Christine Roland-Levy	
24	Apology and Reconciliation in Great Britain, Northern Ireland, Canada, the United States, and Australia	317
	John Davis, Carol Davis, Ariel Stone, James Page, Michael Whitely, and Doe West	

25 Perspectives on Apology and Reconciliation in Russia and the Balkan States	331
Vlado Miheljak, Marko Polič, Alexandra Plassaras, Charikleia Tsatsaroni, Sherri McCarthy, Nebojsa Petrovic, Anna Medvedeva, and Alev Yalcinkaya	
26 Perspectives on Apology and Reconciliation in the Middle East	343
Majed Ashy, Marian Lewin, Lane Smith, Rouba Youssef, Helena Syna Desivilya, Abdul Kareem Al-Obaidi, Raja Tayeh, Dalit Yassour-Boroschowitz, Heyam Mohammed, Kamala Smith, Linda Jeffrey, William Tastle, Feryal Turan, and Alev Yalcinkaya	
27 Perspectives on Transnational Apology and Reconciliation in Africa	357
Megan Reif, Abdelkader Abdelali, Ariel Stone, Adeniyi Famose, Jacqueline Akhurst, Helena Castanheira, Eduardo Correia, Mahlon Dalley, Natoschia Scruggs, and William Tastle	
28 Perspectives on Apology in Latin America	379
Amanda Clinton, Jose Anazagsty, Marian Lewin, Sherri McCarthy, Michael Stevens, Rodrigo Barahona, Eddy Carillo, Ricardo Angelino, Eros DeSouza, and Luciana Karine de Souza	
29 Perspectives on Apology and Reconciliation in South and Southeast Asia	395
Leakhena Nou, Julia Rashid, William Dubbs, Haslina Muhammad, Ma. Regina E. Estuar, Janice Jones, Megan Reif, Sherri McCarthy, Jas Jafaar, Darshini Shah, Nisha Raj, and Ellora Puri	
30 Apology, Forgiveness, and Reconciliation in East Asia	411
Etsuko Hoshino Browne, Jenna H. Zhu, Alexandra Plassaras, Hillary Mi-Sung Kim, Alice Murata, Michelle Murata, and Andrea Jones-Rooy	
31 Integrative Summary on Apology and Forgiveness	431
Kimberly A. Rapoza and Marineh Lalikian	
Part IV Perspectives on Achieving Peace	
32 Perspectives on Achieving Peace: Introduction	449
Tristyn Campbell	
33 Western European Perspectives on Peace and Reconciliation	463
Eric Fischer, Julia König, Ariel Stone, Gina Major, Mathilde Salmberg, Carla Machado, Silja Bara Omarsdottir, Michael Corgan, Mariana Barbosa, Elizabeth Leembruggen-Kallberg, and Christine Roland-Levy	

34 UK/Anglo Perspectives on the Achievability of Peace	483
Mathilde Salmberg, Kathryn O’Keefe, Jenna Davis, John Davis, James Page, Michael Whitely, Carol Davis, and Doe West	
35 Achieving World Peace: Views from Russia, Serbia, Slovenia, and Greece	499
Nebojsa Petrovic, Olja Jovanovic, Erin Murtagh, Sherri McCarthy, Vlado Miheljak, Marko Polič, Charikleia Tsatsaroni, Anna Medvedeva, and Alev Yalcinkaya	
36 Middle East Perspectives on the Achievability of Peace	521
Lane Smith, Tristyn Campbell, Raja Tayeh, Heyam Mohammed, Rouba Youssef, Feryal Turan, Irene Colthurst, Alev Yalcinkaya, William Tastle, Majed Ashy, Abdul Kareem Al-Obaidi, Dalit Yassour-Boroschowitz, Helena Syna Desivilya, Kamala Smith, and Linda Jeffrey	
37 African Perspectives on the Achievability of Peace	541
Gabriel Twose, Mahlon Dalley, Jacqueline Akhurst, Adeniyi Famose, Natoschia Scruggs, Abdelkader Abdelali, Helena Castanheira, Eduardo Correia, and William Tastle	
38 Latin American Perspectives on Peace and Reconciliation	561
Michael Stevens, Amanda Clinton, Sherri McCarthy, Luciana Karine de Souza, Rodrigo Barahona, Eddy Carillo, Eros DeSouza, and Ricardo Angelino	
39 Perspectives on Achieving Peace in South and Southeast Asia	581
Maggie Campbell, Janice Jones, Ma. Regina E. Estuar, Sherri McCarthy, Ellora Puri, Megan Reif, Darshini Shah, Haslina Muhammad, Nisha Raj, and Jas Jafaar	
40 Achieving Peace and Reconciliation in East Asia	605
Etsuko Hoshino Browne, Leia Saltzman, Sarah An, Alice Murata, Hillary Mi-Sung Kim, Michelle Murata, and Andrea Jones-Rooy	
41 Achieving Peace: An Integration	631
Abram Trosky and Tristyn Campbell	
42 Afterword: A Living Tapestry of Peace and Reconciliation	651
Alan O’Hare	
43 Perspectives on Peace and Reconciliation: A Final Integration	655
Kathleen Malley-Morrison, Chelsea Cogan, Lauren St. Germain, and Andrew Potter	
Index	667

Contributors

Abdelkader Abdelali Department of Political Science, University of Tahar Moulay, Saida, Algeria

Jacqueline Akhurst Department of Psychology, York St John University, England

Abdul Kareem Al-Obaidi Institute of International Education, New York, NY, USA

Sarah An Department of Psychology, Boston University, Boston, MA, USA

Jose Anazagsty University of Puerto Rico, Mayagüez, Puerto Rico, USA

Ricardo Angelino School of Medical Sciences, National University of La Plata, La Plata, Argentina

Majed Ashy Psychology Department, Bay State College, Boston, MA, USA

Emily Bales Psychology Department, Boston University, Boston, MA, USA

Rodrigo Barahona Counselor, Brookline, MA, USA

Mariana Barbosa Universidade Catolica Portuguesa, Lisbon, Portugal

Tristyn Campbell Psychology Department, Boston University, Boston, MA, USA

Maggie Campbell Clark University, Worcester, MA, USA

Nico Canoy Psychology Department, Ateneo de Manila University, Quezon City, Philippines

Eddy Carillo Universidad Independiente & Director of the Center for Psychoanalytic Studies of the Association for Socio-Critical Psychoanalysis, San Jose, Costa Rica

Helena Castanheira Psychology Department, New School for Social Research, New York, NY, USA

Elizabeth Claggett-Borne Alternatives to Violence Project, Friends Meeting, Cambridge, MA, USA

Amanda Clinton University of Puerto Rico, Mayagüez, Puerto Rico, USA

Chelsea Cogan Department of Psychology, Boston University, Boston, MA, USA

Irene Colthurst Department of International Relations, San Diego University, San Diego, USA

Michael Corgan Department of International Relations, Boston University, Boston, MA, USA

Eduardo Correia ISCTE Business School in Lisbon, Lisbon, Portugal

Jessica Cox Department of Psychology, Boston University, Boston, MA, USA

Mahlon Dalley Psychology Department, Eastern Washington University, Cheney, WA, USA

Jennie Davidow New York Medical College, Valhalla, New York, NY, USA

Carol Davis English Department, Texas State University at San Marcos, Texas, USA

Jenna Davis Department of Psychology, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA, USA

John Davis Department of Psychology, Texas State University, San Marcos, TX, USA

Raquel DeBartolo Department of Psychology, Boston University, Boston, MA, USA

William Dubbs Department of Psychology, Boston University, MA, USA

Helena Syna Desivilya Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Yezreel Valley College, Emek Yezreel, Israel

Eros Desouza Department of Psychology, Illinois State University, Normal, IL, USA

E.E. Diehnelt University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, WI, USA

Ma. Regina E. Estuar Department of Information Systems and Computer Science, Ateneo de Manila University, Quezon City, Philippines

Adeniyi Famose Joavic's Foundation, Nigeria

Eric Fischer Department of Sociology, Universität Bielefeld, Bielefeld, Germany

Gabriella Gricius International Relations and Linguistics, Boston University, Boston, USA

Lauren St. Germain Department of Psychology, Boston University, Boston, MA, USA

Patrick Hanlin Department of Psychology, Boston University, Boston, MA, USA

Kristina Hellqvist Refugee Affairs, Church of Sweden, Stockholm, Sweden

Jennifer Heinecke Department of Psychology, Eastern Washington University, Spokane, Washington, USA

Etsuko Hoshino Browne Department of Psychology, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, PA, USA

Jas Jafaar Department of Anthropology and Sociology, Faculty of Arts and Sciences, University of Malaysia, Malaysia

Divya Japa Department of Psychology, Boston University, Boston, MA, USA

Linda Jeffrey College of Education, Rowan University, Glassboro, NJ, USA

Laura Johnson Croft Institute of International Studies, University of Mississippi, Oxford, MS, USA

Janice Jones Doctoral Leadership Studies Department, Cardinal Stritch University, Milwaukee, WI, USA

Andrea Jones-Rooy Department of Political Science, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, USA

Olja Jovanovic Department of Psychology, Faculty of Philosophy, Belgrade, Serbia

Grace Kibanja Department of Educational, Organizational & Social Psychology, Makerere University, Kampala, Uganda

Hillary Mi-Sung Kim School of Social Work, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ, USA

Julia König Lehrstuhl für Klinische Psychologie und Psychotherapie, Munchen, Germany

Marineh Lalikian Department of Psychology, Boston University, Boston, MA, USA

Heather Lane Department of Psychology, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA, USA

Elizabeth Leembruggen-Kallberg Webster University, Leiden, Netherlands

Marian Lewin Department of Psychology, Boston University, Boston, MA, USA

Jorge Luna Torres Corporacion Educativa B. F. Skinner, Lima, Peru

Carla Machado Department of Psychology, Minho University, Braga, Portugal (Deceased)

Gina Major Department of Psychology, Boston University, Boston, MA, USA

Kathleen Malley-Morrison Department of Psychology, Boston University, Boston, MA, USA

Alfred McAlister Behavioral Sciences, School of Public Health, University of Texas, Austin, TX, USA

Sherri McCarthy Educational Psychology, Counseling and Human Relations, Northern Arizona University, Yuma, AZ, USA

Anna Medvedeva University of Finland, Helsinki, Finland

Alyssa Mendlein Department of Psychology, Boston University, Boston, MA, USA

Andrea Mercurio Department of Psychology, Boston University, Boston, MA, USA

Vlado Miheljak University of Ljubljana, Ljubljana, Slovenia

Daniela Miranola Department of Psychology, Boston University, Boston, MA, USA

Heyam Mohammed Department of Curriculum and Instruction, College of Education, Kuwait University, Kuwait

Adriana Munte Markham College Early Years, Lima, Peru

Haslina Muhammad Monash University, Melbourne, Australia

Alice Murata Department of Counselor Education, Northeastern Illinois University, Chicago, IL, USA

Michelle Murata Department of Psychology, American University, Washington, DC, USA

Erin Murtagh Psychology Department, Boston University, Boston, MA, USA

Leakhena Nou Department of Sociology, California State University, Long Beach, USA

Alan O'Hare Expressive Therapy Program, Lesley College, Cambridge, MA, USA

Kathryn O'Keefe Friendship Charter School, Washington, DC, USA

Silja Bara Omarsdottir Institute of International Affairs and Center for Small State Studies, University of Iceland, Vesturbær, Reykjavik, Iceland

James Page Department of Peace Studies, School of Humanities, University of New England, Armidale, NSW, Australia

Natalia Parnyuk Department of Psychology, St. Petersburg Railway College, St. Petersburg, Russia

Bailey Pescatore Boston University, Boston, MA, USA

Nebojsa Petrovic Faculty of Psychology, University of Belgrade, Belgrade, Serbia

Alexandra Plassaras International Relations Department, Boston University, Boston, MA, USA

Marko Polič Department of Psychology, University of Ljubljana, Ljubljana, Slovenia

Andrew Potter School Psychology Program, UC, Berkeley, USA

Ellora Puri Department of Political Science, University of Jammu, Jammu, India

Nisha Raj Emory University, Atlanta, GA, USA

Kimberly A. Rapoza Mercy College, Dobbs Ferry, NY, USA

Julia Rashid Department of Psychology, Boston University, Boston, MA, USA

Megan Reif Political Science and International Studies, University of Colorado Denver, Denver, CO, USA

Christine Roland-Levy Université de Reims Champagne-Ardenne, Paris, France

Mathilde Salmberg Clinical Psychologist, Washington, DC, USA

Leia Saltzman Graduate School of Social Work, Boston College, Boston, MA, USA

Matthew Schauer International Security and Conflict Resolution, San Diego, USA

Natoschia Scruggs Asylum Division, U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Arlington, VA, USA

Glyn Secker Board of Directors and Executive Committee member, Jews For Justice For Palestinians, London, UK

Darshini Shah Health Education Library for People, Mumbai, India

Anoushka Shahane Tufts University, Medford, MA, USA

Lane Smith Senior Research Scholar (Retired), University of Maryland, College Park, MD, USA

Kamala Smith Behavioral Health Analyst, Abt Associates, Cambridge, MA, USA

Luciana Karine de Souza Department of Psychology, Federal University of Minas Gerais, Belo Horizonte, Minas Gerais, Brazil

Michael Stevens Department of Psychology, Illinois State University, Normal, IL, USA

Ariel Stone Department of Psychology, Boston University, Boston, MA, USA

William Tastle Ithaca College of Business, New York, USA

Raja Tayeh Director of Institutional Research, Doane College, Crete, NE, USA

Abram Trosky Department of Political Science, Boston University, Boston, MA, USA

Charikleia Tsatsaroni Psychology Department, Boston University, Boston, MA, USA

Feryal Turan Department of Sociology, Ankara University, Ankara, Turkey

Gabriel Twose Public Interest Directorate, American Psychological Association, Washington, DC, USA

Doe West Quinsigamond Community College, Worcester, MA, USA

Michael Whitely Educational Psychologist, Kent State University, Kent, OH, USA

Alev Yalcinkaya Department of Psychology, Yeditepe, Istanbul, Turkey

Dalit Yassour-Boroschowitz Department of Human Services, Emek Yezreel College, Israel

Rouba Youssef Psychology, University of Rhode Island, Kingston, RI, USA

Jenna H. Zhu Department of Psychology Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA, USA

Introduction to International Handbook on Peace and Reconciliation for Springer Publishing

1

Kathleen Malley-Morrison

Peace and Reconciliation

Many people believe that war has always existed and will always exist, that humans are inherently aggressive and self-centered, and that the only way to protect the interests and the security of oneself and one's country is to be stronger and better armed than the other guys. Yet, historically, not all groups of people have been equally warlike, and even in today's world, some groups and some nations are much more peaceful than others. Moreover, despite all the violence that has characterized many regions for centuries, there have also been many major peace treaties that have changed the face of the world and in some cases led to lasting peace between warring groups. We begin this chapter with some historical context regarding peace treaties and then describe the current project.

Most people in today's world are aware of the armed conflicts taking place in various parts of the world in 2011 – for example, in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Syria.

People tend to be less aware of the number of peacekeeping missions in operation; however, as of October 2011, the United Nations was involved in 15 peacekeeping operations – for example, in Western Sahara, Haiti, Darfur (along with the

African Union), Cyprus, Lebanon, South Sudan, Kosovo, Liberia, and India and Pakistan, to name some of the more familiar arenas. Moreover, they often lose sight of the fact that the majority of countries in the world are free from armed conflicts on their soil and live in peace.

The GIPGAP Research Program

GIPGAP: The Core Group

The core members of the Group on International Perspectives on Governmental Aggression and Peace (GIPGAP) are located at Boston University and consist primarily of psychology faculty and students but also include some members of the International Relations Department. This research team evolved following the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, particularly in response to the United States government's invasion of Iraq. In the next few years after 9/11, international representation in GIPGAP grew; a pilot survey was developed, tested, and modified, and the current project was launched. The core GIPGAP team (otherwise known as the Core Group) consists of a faculty advisor (Malley-Morrison), several postdocs, and international graduate and undergraduate students concerned with issues of violence. Although membership varies somewhat from year to year as some students graduate and move ahead with their careers and other students from various regions join, international students

K. Malley-Morrison (✉)
Department of Psychology, Boston University,
Boston, MA, USA
e-mail: kkmalley@comcast.net

and colleagues participating in the Core Group have come from countries as diverse as Portugal, Germany, Italy, Greece, Turkey, Russia, Israel, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, the Philippines, India, Indonesia, South Korea, Japan, China, Colombia, and Peru. Thus, we had a broad range of perspectives on which to draw in developing both the survey and the coding manuals.

GIPGAP: International Contributors

The international GIPGAP team (known as the International Group) consists of faculty and graduate students from a range of academic departments, including psychology, sociology, and international relations, in more than 40 countries. These international contributors were recruited through a number of different approaches: networking by Core Group members, notices in *Announcements from the APA Division of International Psychology*, notices in *International Psychology Bulletin*, and invitations during presentations at international psychology conferences. With approval from the appropriate institutional authorities, these contributors administered the Personal and Individual Rights to Aggression and Peace Survey (PAIRTAPS) to ordinary people from multiple countries in every major region of the world: Western Europe (Iceland, France, Portugal, Spain, Germany, and Sweden); Russia and the Balkan Peninsula states (Greece, Slovenia, Serbia); the Middle East including the Persian Gulf (Turkey, Afghanistan, Israel, Lebanon, Iraq, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Bahrain, Kuwait, Oman, and Qatar); Africa (Egypt, Algeria, Nigeria, Angola, Ghana, Botswana, Zambia, and South Africa); Central and South America (Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Brazil, Colombia, Peru, and Argentina); South and Southeast Asia (Pakistan, India, Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, Australia, and the Philippines); the Far East (China, Japan, and Korea); and a region we identified as a UK/Anglo “cultural region,” which included Great Britain, Northern Ireland, the United States, Canada, and Australia.

Although today Great Britain and Northern Ireland are both legally parts of the United

Kingdom (of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), we, for the most part, treat them separately in this book because Northern Ireland, for much of its history, was a subject of British rule, as were Australia, Canada, and the United States. It was the Great Britain part of the current United Kingdom that colonized what is now the United States, Australia, and Canada (and many other regions); it was not Northern Ireland that engaged in imperialistic expansion. Thus, in this and other chapters in this book, we report on findings from separate Great Britain and Northern Ireland samples.

All researchers contributing to this project adhered to human subjects ethical guidelines. The survey responses were collected between 2005 and 2008. In some cases, shortened versions of the survey were administered because the respondents were unfamiliar with taking surveys; moreover, in some cases, items that seemed particularly sensitive within the context of that country were deleted (e.g., “If your country is currently involved in armed conflict with another country, please respond to the following item: My country’s involvement in armed conflict is morally defensible.”). The survey could be completed either online over the Internet at a secure site or as a paper-and-pencil measure. Individual chapter authors made the decision as to which procedure best protected their participants’ rights and safety. In many of the Western countries, both procedures were used, although the bulk of the responses were submitted over the Internet. Most surveys were filled out individually; however, in one of the African countries, most of the participants completed the survey within the context of focus groups.

Participants were recruited through a variety of different strategies, varying based on local circumstances. In the majority of countries, participants were recruited through networking and snowballing techniques; however, in a few countries, substantial portions of the sample were recruited through university classrooms. Other methods included passing out the survey to passengers on a long train trip, inviting people in cafes to fill out the survey, and using the survey as a basis for interviewing refugees from armed conflict currently living in several different countries.

Many of the participants came from countries where they suffered terribly during past armed conflicts; some of them live in countries where armed conflict is still a daily threat. For some, it was an act of bravery to fill out the survey even under conditions of anonymity. Moreover, many of the contributors of chapters to this book are themselves survivors of armed conflict and some continue to work on the ground for peace and justice.

The PAIRTAPS

The Personal and Institutional Rights to Aggression and Peace Survey (PAIRTAPS) has six sections: (a) judgments concerning the extent to which governments have the right to perform such acts of aggression as torturing prisoners during times of war; (b) judgments concerning the rights of individuals to grow up and live in a world of peace and to demonstrate against war and in favor of peace; (c) conservative values and views on the role of apology in achieving reconciliation following armed conflict; (d) projected emotional responses that might be experienced following direct or indirect exposure to acts of governmental aggression, including attacks on protestors; (e) definitions of war, torture, terrorism, peace, reconciliation, and rights; and (f) views on the achievability of peace.

Several of the items in the first two sections are direct expressions of human rights guarantees (e.g., right to assembly) established in United Nations agreements. For Sections 1, 2, 3, and 6, respondents indicated on a scale from 1 (total disagreement) to 7 (total agreement) the extent to which they agreed with each item (e.g., “All human beings have a basic right to peace”). Then, in their own words, they provided an explanation of the reasoning behind their rating on the item. Sections 4 and 5 call only for open-ended qualitative responses – for example, examples of emotions that would be felt in the face of governmental aggression, and definitions of terms.

For the purposes of this current volume, chapter authors were asked to focus only on qualitative responses to the following selected items:

(a) definitions of peace and reconciliation; (b) “Individuals have the right to stage protests against war and in favor of peace”; (c) “If one country has in the past invaded, colonized, or exercised control over the governmental affairs of another country, an apology by the invading/colonizing/controlling country can improve the chances for reconciliation between the countries”; (d) “What steps or factors are necessary to make an apology successful in achieving reconciliation between the countries?”; (e) “I believe that world peace can be achieved”; and (f) “The best way to achieve world peace is: ...”

Also analyzed were participants’ responses to one of the emotional response scenarios from Section 4. The instructions for the scenario were (a) “Assume that you have very direct and dramatic exposure to each of the situations below – that is, either you witness them directly or you see them happening live on a TV show or documentary that exposes you to the event in the *most immediate and dramatic* way. Please indicate first how you would feel in the situation and then what you would want to do.” The first item stated that “Police are beating peaceful anti-war demonstrators. *What would you feel? What would you want to do?*” For the purposes of this book, it was only the responses to the “What would you want to do item that were analyzed, because we were interested for theoretical reasons in themes of intended agency.”

All researchers contributing to this project adhered to human subjects ethical guidelines. The anonymous survey responses were collected between 2005 and 2008. In some cases (e.g., Nigeria), shortened versions of the survey were administered because the respondents were unfamiliar with taking surveys. The survey could be completed either online on a secure website or as a paper-and-pencil measure. Individual chapter authors made the decision as to which procedure best protected their participants’ rights and safety. In many of the Western countries, both procedures were used, although the bulk of the responses were submitted over the Internet.

Although most chapter authors analyzed responses to most, if not all, of these items, some items had been omitted from some surveys.

Despite such relatively minor differences in coverage of survey items, each section of this volume ends with an integrative chapter summarizing similarities and differences found across regions in the themes that emerged.

In addition to responding to the PAIRTAPS items, participants completed a background information form asking for basic demographic information such as age, gender, ethnicity, nationality, and religion, as well as whether they or any family member had been in the military and whether they had participated in any protest activities. Participants typically responded to the survey in their native language, although in several of the countries, particularly the African countries (e.g., South Africa, Nigeria), the participants had been educated in English and responded in English. Translations of survey items from English to another language were either done independently by at least two native speakers of the other language who then compared translations and resolved differences in translations, often in consultation with members of the Core Group, or they were translated from English to the other language and then back-translated to identify problems in the translation. A similar process was followed for the translations of responses in other languages into English.

Sections A and B: Grounded Theory Coding of Definitions and Apology Items

The qualitative responses to the definitions of peace and reconciliation and to the two apology items were coded according to a grounded theory approach. That is, we did not start out with a particular theoretical framework and then strive to fit the responses into that framework. Instead, we followed the procedures recommended by Strauss and Corbin (1998), proceeding from open coding to axial coding, using a process of constant comparison. During the open coding phase, we divided the qualitative responses to the definitions and apology items into units of meaning (“codeable units”) that varied in length from one word

(e.g., “sincerity”) to phrases (e.g., “words are not enough”) and entire sentences (e.g., “Apology is necessary before two countries can reconcile.”).

At the axial level of coding, the relationships among the more fragmented, seldom-used categories initially identified were reviewed, and, where appropriate, these categories were organized into more inclusive categories. For example, in regard to qualitative responses to the definitions of peace, we combined two initially separate categories for *recognize/acknowledge* and *respect* into a more inclusive category called *recognize/acknowledge/respect*. Similarly, we combined two initially separate categories for *come to terms/agreement* and *compromise/negotiate* into the superordinate category called *come to terms/agreement/compromise/negotiate*.

In a grounded theory analysis, data collection, coding, conceptualizing, and theorizing take place simultaneously, and analyses of new responses are compared both with analyses of previous responses and with the concepts emerging from those analyses. A more detailed summary of the procedures followed and the categories derived for Section A (“Definitions of Peace and Reconciliation”) and Section C (“Perspectives on Apology”) can be found in the introductory chapters to each of those sections.

Sections C and D: Judgments on the Right to Protest and the Achievability of Peace

In Sections 2 and 4 of this volume, our focus is on understanding the forms of social cognition that individuals bring to their judgments concerning the right to protest (Section B) and the achievability of world peace (Section D). The coding systems for the protest and achievability items were developed using a modified form of *deductive qualitative analysis* (Gilgun, 2005), informed by the work of Albert Bandura on moral disengagement and personal agency.

Bandura (e.g., 1999, 2002) has identified several types of reasoning – which he calls mechanisms of moral disengagement – that provided a useful framework for the analysis of arguments

concerning the extent to which governments have the right to order invasions of other lands and torture prisoners during times of war. Based on his description of these forms of reasoning, the Core Group has identified a complementary series of sociocognitive mechanisms, which we loosely call mechanisms of moral engagement. Although we present a brief overview of Bandura's theory of moral disengagement and engagement here, our focus in our analyses was on the mechanisms (types of reasoning) rather than on the value-laden constructs of moral disengagement and engagement *per se*.

According to Bandura (1999), moral disengagement processes mediate between moral standards and actual behaviors; they allow individuals to behave immorally or tolerate immorality by others, even when these behaviors violate their own moral standards. Thus, moral disengagement theory shares assumptions with theories of cognitive dissonance and dissonance resolution (cf. Festinger, 1957; Matz & Wood, 2005), as well as with theories of escalation and self-justification (cf. O'Leary & Wolinsky, 2009; Wolff & Moser, 2008), all of which suggest that humans will go through a variety of psychological machinations to allow themselves to feel good about themselves and avoid feelings of guilt, despite various forms of misbehavior. In Bandura's view, these mechanisms of moral disengagement allow individuals to violate moral standards while continuing to maintain their self-image as caring human beings. More specifically, he suggests that when individuals commit injurious acts, they generally try to legitimize and excuse their behavior in order to avoid feeling guilt, regret, negative emotions, and/or other self-sanctions.

Although Bandura's (1999) theory was developed primarily to explain how individuals could excuse themselves for behaving in ways that violate universal moral codes, it is also applicable at group and state levels of behavior. For example, Bandura and his colleagues have applied the construct of moral disengagement to prisoner-guard relationships (Osofsky, Bandura, & Zimbardo, 2005), weapons manufacturers (Bandura, 1990), the tobacco industry (White, Bandura, & Bero, 2009),

group massacres (Bandura, 1999), and capital punishment (Osofsky, Bandura, & Zimbardo, 2005), as well as to everyday, nonviolent moral lapses in behavior, including in the corporate world (Bandura, Caprara & Zsolnai, 2000).

In addressing the problems of inhumane behavior, Bandura (1999) identified eight overlapping and interrelated mechanisms of moral disengagement, which he classified into four major groups: (1) mechanisms involving the cognitive reconstruction of harmful behavior; this group includes moral justifications, euphemistic labeling, and advantageous comparisons, all of which serve to psychologically reconstruct harmful behavior into something more benign; (2) mechanisms that misrepresent, minimize, and/or disregard the negative consequences of injurious behavior; (3) mechanisms that serve to remove or obscure personal accountability for harmful behavior (e.g., through displacing or diffusing responsibility for the misconduct); and (4) mechanisms that devalue the recipient of the harm through dehumanizing and/or blaming the victim or situation. Overall, these mechanisms of moral disengagement can operate independently and/or simultaneously in ways that allow individuals to be complicit in the perpetration of acts that are harmful toward others without feeling guilty or subjecting themselves to self-sanctions.

Considerable empirical support has been found for the role of moral disengagement in tolerance for governmental aggression. For example, McAlister (2001), an internationally prominent moral disengagement scholar, found that moral disengagement was related to individual support for military bombings of the former Yugoslavia and Iraq. Examining attitudes from over 21 nations, Grussendorf et al. (2002) found that moral disengagement was employed in accepting the use of deadly force in response to a threat. In addition to support for war, Aquino, Reed, Thau, and Feeman (2007) found that moral disengagement was linked to support for lethal punitive actions against perpetrators of the 9/11 attacks as well as detainee abuse in Iraq. Thus, Bandura's (1999) theory is particularly valuable for understanding individual agreement with and rationalizations for various forms of state

aggression, including invading countries and torturing individuals who are seen as some sort of threat.

Bandura (1999) and others (e.g., Grussendorf, McAlister, Sandstrom, Udd, & Morrison, 2002; McAlister, Ama, Barroso, Peters, & Kelder, 2000) recognize that not everyone acts in ways that violate their own and more general moral codes. In contrast to moral disengagement, moral engagement entails a conscious commitment to behave in ways that conform to one's moral standards, regardless of circumstances. Personalizing the victim, accepting responsibility, exercising personal agency, being sympathetic and empathetic, and recognizing the negative effects of inhumane behavior all contribute to moral engagement. Bandura further emphasizes the power of humanization, social obligation to helping others, and recognition of everyone's common humanity across differing political, ethnic, religious, and social groups. In his view, moral engagement and treating others with humanity are reflective primarily of empathy but also of perceived similarity and social or moral obligation.

Arguably, these characteristics of moral engagement may also be associated with support for humanitarian interventions, which Walzer (1977) argues are a justifiable response (in the context of "reasonable expectations of success") to acts that "shock the moral conscience of mankind" (p. 107). Moreover, Walzer indicates that he is referring specifically to "the moral convictions of ordinary men and women" (p. 107) – the same reference group of interest to our research group. In his view, "clear examples of what is called 'humanitarian intervention' are very rare" (p. 101). "Indeed," he says, "I have not found any, but only mixed cases where the humanitarian motive is one among many" (p. 101). Whether the rarity of cases of pure humanitarian intervention is linked to a lack of moral engagement in ordinary citizens concerning the well-being of people in other countries, the disinterest of states in committing resources for humanitarian purposes, some combination of these forces, and/or other factors is not clear; however, Bandura's (1999) argument that humanitarian justifications for inhumane behavior constitute forms of moral

disengagement is consistent with Walzer's arguments concerning the rarity of true humanitarian intervention.

Exercising moral agency has dual aspects—inhibitive and proactive. According to Bandura (2002), the inhibitive form of moral agency is the process that allows individuals to refrain from behaving inhumanely, whereas the proactive form expresses itself in the power to behave humanely. Bandura noted that individuals guided by proactive moral agency base "their sense of self-worth so strongly on human convictions and social obligations that they act against what they regard as unjust or immoral even though their actions may incur heavy personal costs" (p. 194). He also argued that when exercising proactive morality, people act in the name of humane principles even when experiencing pressure to engage in expedient and harmful behavior. When morally engaged people "disavow use of valued social ends to justify destructive means. They sacrifice their well-being for their convictions. They take personal responsibility for the consequences of their actions. They remain sensitive to the suffering of others" (Bandura, 1999 p. 203). Thorkildsen (2007) added that moral engagement "controls the regulation of humane behavior and the inhibition of inhumane behavior because it represents a vision of how the world ought to function" (p. 115). Although there has been less research on moral engagement than moral disengagement, McAlister (2001) found that students' attitudes regarding war changed in the direction of increased moral engagement when the students were exposed to information that countered the tendency toward moral disengagement; his findings indicate that not only do different social messages influence reasoning about moral issues but that moral engagement can indeed be promoted.

Informed by Bandura's theory, we developed a coding manual with guidelines for coding two items related to protest: (1) the right to protest item ("Individuals have the right to stage protests against war and in favor of peace") and (2) the related scenario item ("Police are beating peaceful anti-war demonstrators. *What would you want to do?*") Responses to the right to protest item

were organized first into two major types: *protest-tolerant* and *protest-intolerant*. Each of these major categories of response had several subcategories. The *protest-intolerant* subcategories included *general rejection* of the right to protest, *pseudo-moral justifications* for denying a right to protest, arguing in favor of *supporting troops or the government*, applying *negative labels* to protests and protestors, making *disadvantageous comparisons* of protest with presumably better behaviors such as obedience, *denying personal responsibility* for governmental aggression, *distorting the consequences* of protesting, and *dehumanizing* either the protestors or the targets of governmental aggression. There were also several *protest-tolerant* subcategories, including *social justification*, *moral responsibility*, and *humanization*. There were also two other coding categories for the protest items – *indeterminate status* and *perceived reality*. For a fuller description and examples of these coding categories, see the introductory chapter to the protest section of this book.

The coding categories for responses to the scenario in which police were attacking nonviolent protestors were designed to address as much as possible Bandura's emphasis on the role of agency in moral conduct while also reflecting the fact that some of the responses to the scenarios seemed to show agency in the service of disengagement. We first identified three types of responses: (a) *prosocial agency*, (b) *antisocial agency*, and (c) *lack of agency*. The *prosocial agency* category included the following subcategories: (a) *critical judgments of police*, (b) *personal initiative*, and (c) *institutional initiative*. Some responses could be coded only for *general personal disengagement*. The *antisocial agency* category included subcategories for (a) *support for police*, (b) *unlawful activism*, and (c) *actions against the demonstrators*. A much more extensive discussion, with examples, of all coding categories and subcategories for the right to protest and achieving peace items can be found in the introductory chapter in the section on perspectives on protest.

We also used concepts from Bandura's moral disengagement and engagement theory in

developing a coding manual for two items designed to assess thinking regarding the achievability of peace: (a) "I believe that world peace can be achieved" and "The best way to achieve world peace is:" For an extensive discussion, with examples, of all coding categories and subcategories for the achieving peace items, see the introductory chapter in the section on perspectives on the achievability of peace.

The Final Coding Process

As the Core Group developed these coding manuals on an ever-expanding international coding manual sample, it made the coding manuals available to the International Group. The International Group was invited to conduct their own deductive qualitative analysis (i.e., an analysis informed by Bandura's theory) or to use the Core Group's manuals for coding the data. We did not want to be restrictive in regard to any group member's coding, but rather to encourage them to use consistent category labels when discussing the same or similar types of arguments. The Core Group also offered to do the coding of the responses from any country, as long as they had been translated into English or could be translated by a member of the Core Group.

As previously noted, coding manuals were developed and refined by the local group and shared with the international team members. Each of the four sections of this book focuses on the responses to a particular set of items (definitions, protest, apology and reconciliation, and the achievability of peace); coding of the responses for each section was conducted by a team assigned to that section under the supervision of the team leader for that section. All coding was done by at least one team member and then reviewed by the team leader; in the case of the four countries for which responses to one set of questions were coded by an investigator from that country, a random sample of the coded responses was coded independently by the team leader for that section and feedback was provided until the international team member was completely reliable.

This Volume

The first chapter in each of the four sections of this volume (definitions of peace and reconciliation; perspectives on the right to protest, perspectives on apology and reconciliation, and beliefs concerning the achievability of peace) describes the coding system and variable formation process for all the chapters in that section. Each introductory methods chapter is followed by eight regional chapters and then a final integrative chapter for the section. The eight regions considered in each section of the book are: Western Europe, the UK/Anglo countries (Great Britain, Northern Ireland, the United States, Canada, and Australia), Russia and the Balkan Peninsula, the Middle East including the Gulf states, Africa, Latin America, South and Southeast Asia, and East Asia. In each regional chapter, the lead author provides a historical and political context for the survey findings presented in that chapter. The findings typically take the form of first a description of the distribution of responses across the major coding categories and then the results of some simple exploratory analyses (mostly nonparametric) designed to identify possible differences in response patterns based on demographic variables such as gender, participation in the military, religion, and nationality. Because we cannot assume that our samples are representative of the population in the regions studied for this book, it should not be assumed that our exploratory findings can be generalized to those populations. Our emphasis is always on the qualitative responses, as they provide the most direct access to the thoughts and feelings, the arguments and motivations, the fears and goals of our diverse sample of men and women from around the world.

Acknowledgments My deepest gratitude goes to the Provost's Office and the Department of Psychology at Boston University, which have provided support for this project for several years. My thanks also go to all the team members who have contributed to this book project by recruiting participants, translating responses, creating Excel and SPSS files, helping in the development of coding manuals, coding qualitative responses, and innumerable other tasks. Special thanks to Mary Blumenfeld, Shivali Viswanath, Regina Amarello, Lina Vadlamani, Aixa Rivera, Sarena Friedman, Jessica Lenocho, Holly Cohen, Shane O'Neil, Keshia Aridou, Aliza Sial, Barbara

Malley, Lauren Moss-Racusin, Laura Marcucci, and Caroline Stack for all of their work.

References

- Aquino, K., Reed, A., Thau, S., & Freeman, D. (2007). Mechanisms of moral engagement. *Journal of Experimental Psychology, 43*, 383–392.
- Bandura, A. (1990). Mechanisms of moral disengagement. In W. Reich (Ed.), *Origins of terrorism: Psychologies, ideologies, theologies, states of mind* (pp. 161–191). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bandura, A. (1999). Moral disengagement in the perpetration of inhumanities. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 3*, 193–209.
- Bandura, A. (2002). Selective moral disengagement in the exercise of moral agency. *Journal of Moral Education, 31*, 101–119.
- Bandura, A., Caprara, G. V., & Zsolnai, L. (2000). Corporate transgressions through moral disengagement. *Journal of Human Values, 6*, 57–63.
- Festinger, L. (1957). *A theory of cognitive dissonance*. Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson.
- Gilgun, J.F. (2005). Qualitative Research and Family Psychology. *Journal of Family Psychology, 19*(1), 40–50.
- Grussendorf, J., McAlister, A. L., Sandstrom, P., Udd, L., & Morrison, T. (2002). Resisting moral disengagement in support for war. *Peace and Conflict Journal of Peace Psychology, 8*(1), 73–84.
- Matz, D. C., & Wood, W. (2005). Cognitive dissonance in groups: The consequences of disagreement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 88*, 22–37.
- McAlister, A. L. (2001). Moral disengagement: Measurement and modification. *Journal of Peace Research, 38*, 87–99.
- McAlister, A. L., Ama, E., Barroso, C., Peters, R. J., & Kelder, S. (2000). Promoting tolerance and moral engagement through peer modeling. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 6*(4), 363–373.
- O'Leary, A., & Wolinsky, R. J. (2009). Moral agency and the sexual transmission of HIV. *Psychological Bulletin, 135*, 478–494.
- Osofsky, M. J., Bandura, A., & Zimbardo, P. G. (2005). The role of moral disengagement in the execution process. *Law and Human Behavior, 29*(4), 371–393.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Thorkildsen, T. A. (2007). Adolescents' moral engagement in urban settings. *Theory into practice, 46*(2), 113–120.
- Walzer, M. (1977). *Just and unjust wars: A moral argument with historical illustrations*. New York: Basic Books.
- White, J., Bandura, A., & Bero, L. A. (2009). Moral disengagement in the corporate world. *Accountability in Research, 16*, 41–74.
- Wolff, H.-G., & Moser, K. (2008). Choice, accountability, and effortful processing in escalation situations. *Journal of Psychology, 216*(4), 235–243.

sample content of International Handbook of Peace and Reconciliation (Peace Psychology Book Series)

- [Endgame \(Sirantha Jax, Book 6\) here](#)
- [click City and Countryside in Late Medieval and Renaissance Italy: Essays Presented to Philip Jones](#)
- [Communion Town.pdf](#)
- [download online The Burglary: The Discovery of J. Edgar Hoover's Secret FBI here](#)
- [download online Les filles de Feu, Les Chimères et autres textes for free](#)

- <http://rodrigocaporal.com/library/Endgame--Sirantha-Jax--Book-6-.pdf>
- <http://xn--d1aboelcb1f.xn--p1ai/lib/City-and-Countryside-in-Late-Medieval-and-Renaissance-Italy--Essays-Presented-to-Philip-Jones.pdf>
- <http://fortune-touko.com/library/2-States--The-Story-of-My-Marriage.pdf>
- <http://junkrobots.com/ebooks/Swiped--How-to-Protect-Yourself-in-a-World-Full-of-Scammers--Phishers--and-Identity-Thieves.pdf>
- <http://bestarthritiscare.com/library/The-Birth-of-Europe.pdf>