Editorial

Fathali M. Moghaddam
Georgetown University

The articles in this issue of are in four major groups, which deal with (a) basic psychological processes and conflict, (b) mental health and conflict, (c) psychology and conflict resolution, and (d) the relationship between psychology and the military.

The articles in the first group explore basic psychological processes associated with forgiveness and collective guilt (Leonard, Yung, & Cairns, 2015), perceived threat (Billies, 2015), stereotypes (Mozumder & Haque, 2015), and attributions (Sammut, Bezzina, & Sartawi, 2015). Leonard et al. (2015) found that in the context of Northern Ireland, those who experienced collective guilt were more likely to be positively disposed toward outgroups. This relationship was present across religious groups, although the study also replicated the expected trend of Catholics identifying more strongly with their religious ingroup than did Protestants. Billies (2015) used qualitative narrative analysis to explore surveillance threat, in the context of heightened national security concerns in the United States. This study illuminated the very subtle changes experienced by minorities who are the targets of widespread "stop and frisk" policies, as security concerns become an increasingly salient national priority. The study by Billies makes clear that surveillance threats have costs and consequences, particularly for targeted minorities. The brief research report by Mozumder and Haque (2015) illuminates the important role of stereotypes in intergroup relations, with a focus on two groups living in southeastern Bangladesh. With a similar focus on basic cognitive processes, the brief research report by Sammut et al. (2015) explores intergroup attributions in the context of Malta.

The second group of articles, which deal with mental health and conflict, begins with the timely examination by Suleiman and Agat-Galili (2015) of relationships between Israeli therapists and Arab patients. At the center of this relationship are issues of identity and identification, with macro intergroup conflicts and status inequalities seeping into interpersonal relationships in the therapy sessions. Individual therapists and mental health patients are not able to escape the larger conflicts pervading their societies, even when at the individual level they have the best of intentions to collaborate with one another. The second article in this group (Montiel, 2015) describes a personal 40-year journey by a highly insightful psychologist and prodemocracy activist living in the Philippines. Using the method of analytic autoethnography, the author examines the different layers of her experiences during the slow and painful transition out of dictatorship, moving toward a more open Philippine society. Like the discussion by Suleiman and Agat-Galili, Montiel's article highlights the complex relationship between macro and micro level psychological processes, and the challenges

FATHALI M. MOGHADDAM is a professor of psychology and director of the Conflict Resolution Program at Georgetown University. His most recent book is *The Psychology of Dictatorship* (APA Press, 2013), and his Web site is http://www.fathalimoghaddam.com

CORRESPONDENCE CONCERNING THIS ARTICLE should be addressed to Fathali M. Moghaddam, Department of Psychology, Georgetown University, White Gravenor Hall (3rd Floor), Washington, DC 20057. E-mail: moghaddf@georgetown.edu

faced by therapists who work in societies characterized by major intergroup conflicts.

Psychological science can and has made important contributions to the field of conflict resolution, a point highlighted by the third set of articles in this issue. Young, Rooze, and Holsappel (2015) examine what the research literature can offer practitioners searching for solutions to radicalization and terrorism. The three authors are particularly well positioned to address this question because they have been centrally active in designing and implementing a highly innovative European de-radicalization project. An outcome of this project is a toolkit designed for use by frontline workers, such as prison officers, teachers, and social workers, who directly interact with youth in danger of being influenced by Jihadi Internet propaganda. In the context of thousands of young Europeans continuing to travel to fight in conflicts in Syria and other parts of the Near and Middle East, Young et al., critically review a number of models and suggest future avenues for de-radicalization programs.

Radicalization and terrorism is one way in which events in the Third World have grabbed the attention of Western powers, leading the United States to spend trillions of dollars in wars in Iraq, Afghanistan, Yemen, and many other Third World societies. Pittinsky and Diamante (2015) examine a very different problem: Why do Western powers not intervene to provide more substantial humanitarian and national development aid to poor nations? The authors make a creative link between bystander nonintervention research and the failure of rich countries to provide significant aid to poor ones. They explicitly discuss how traditional bystander nonintervention research has focused on interpersonal processes, whereas the nonintervention of rich countries to substantially help poor ones could be interpreted as involving purely intergroup processes. However, they argue that a focus on individual decision-making in cross-nation nonintervention also has beneficial outcomes.

The intervention style of Western powers in Third World societies, which has often been military rather than for the purposes of aid or national development, seems "intractable." Kudish, Cohen-Chen, and Halperin (2015) also examine behavioral style that has proven very difficult to change, specifically in relations between Israel and Palestine. Again and again we have heard that "on paper" agreement can be reached, but in practice the conflict continues across generations. Kudish et al. report the results of three studies, demonstrating that the perception "our conflict is unique" contributes to a failure to resolve the conflict. Their research suggests that helping participants in a conflict to recognize commonalities across conflicts and that in fact their conflict is not necessarily unique, could facilitate conflict resolution. The study by David and Maoz (2015) also explores the Israel–Palestine conflict, with a focus on factors that prevent Jewish-Israeli adults from supporting compromises to make peace with Palestinians. As expected, the perceptions that Palestinians pose a threat reduced support for compromise. It is interesting to note that when Palestinians were perceived as having stereotypic feminine traits, support for compromise increased.

The extremely important but highly controversial relationship between psychology and the military is the focus of debate in articles by Staal and Greene (2015a) and Arrigo, Eidelson, and Rockwood (2015a). The publication of "back-and-forth" articles by these authors in the same issue requires some explanation. Soon after becoming editor, I received a well-written manuscript, submitted by Staal and Green, critically addressing issues raised by Arrigo, Eidelson, and Bennet (2012) in an earlier article published in this journal. The issues raised in these articles seemed to me to be highly important for both research and

practicing psychologists. After some deliberation, it was decided that those involved in the debate should have an opportunity to publish their views in the same issue of the journal so that readers would be better able to critically assess the pros and cons of the different positions (Arrigo, Eidelson, & Rockwood 2015b; Staal & Greene 2015b). I want to thank the authors for their well-reasoned contributions to this debate and for accepting the strict space and time limitations set for their contributions.

The final contribution to this issue is by Kashtan (2015), who presents a review of a highly timely and ambitious edited book, *Toward a Socially Responsible Psychology for a Global Era* (Mustakova-Possardt, Lyubansky, Basseches, & Oxenberg, 2014). This collection urges psychologists to rethink their traditional research methods and practices and to develop new ones that help achieve a more just and sustainable world. Of course, traditional psychology has often been criticized from within, with several major waves of criticism since the 1960s. Critics contend that traditional psychological research has given us a vast amount of information about how middle-class students from Western societies behave as isolated individuals in laboratory conditions. What this new edited collection suggests is that more psychologists are going down alternative paths of research and practice, exploring nontraditional approaches to psychological science. Such developments can only benefit the discipline of psychology and the larger world we serve.

References

Arrigo, J. M., Eidelson, R. J., & Bennett, R. (2012). Psychology under fire: Adversarial operational psychology and psychological ethics. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology, 18*, 384–400. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0030323

Arrigo, J. M., Eidelson, R. J., & Rockwood, L. P. (2015a). Adversarial operational psychology: Returning to the foundational issues. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology, 21*, 282–284. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/pac0000109

Arrigo, J. M., Eidelson, R. J., & Rockwood, L. P. (2015b). Adversarial operational psychology is unethical psychology: A Reply to Staal and Greene (2015). *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology, 21*, 269–278. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/pac0000108

Billies, M. (2015). Surveillance threat as embodied psychological dilemma. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology, 21*, 168–186. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/pac0000070

David, Y., & Maoz, I. (2015). Gender perceptions and support for compromise in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology, 21*, 295–298. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/pac0000092

Kashtan, M. (2015). Risking everything for the common good: A review of *Toward a Socially Responsible Psychology for a Global Era*. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology, 21*, 299–302. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/pac0000069

Kudish, S., Cohen-Chen, S., & Halperin, E. (2015). Increasing support for concession-making in intractable conflicts: The role of conflict uniqueness. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology, 21*, 248–263. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/pac0000074

Leonard, M. A., Yung, S. M., & Cairns, E. (2015). Predicting intergroup forgiveness from in-group identification and collective guilt in adolescent and adult affiliates of a Northern Irish cross-community organization. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology, 21*, 155–167. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/pac0000055

Montiel, C. J. (2015). Multilayered trauma during democratic transition: A woman's first-person narrative. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology, 21*, 197–211. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/pac0000075

Mozumder, M. K., & Haque, S. (2015). Stereotypical thoughts and perceptions among Chakma and settler Bengalis in southeastern Bangladesh. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology, 21*, 285–288. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/pac0000091

Mustakova-Possardt, E., Lyubansky, M., Basseches, M., & Oxenberg, J. (Eds.). (2014). Toward a socially responsible psychology for a global era. New York, NY: Springer. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-7391-6

Pittinsky, T. L., & Diamante, N. (2015). Global bystander nonintervention. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology, 21,* 226–247. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/pac0000076

Sammut, G., Bezzina, F., & Sartawi, M. (2015). The spiral of conflict: Naïve realism and the black sheep effect in attributions of knowledge and ignorance. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology, 21,* 289–294. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/pac0000098

Staal, M. A., & Greene, C. H., III. (2015a). An examination of "adversarial" operational psychology. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology, 21,* 264–268. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/pac0000095

Staal, M. A., & Greene, C. H., III. (2015b). Operational psychology: An ethical practice—A reply to Arrigo, Eidelson, and Rockwood (2015). *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology, 21,* 279–281. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/pac0000097

Suleiman, R., & Agat-Galili, Y. (2015). Sleeping on the enemy's couch: Psychotherapy across ethnic boundaries in Israel. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology, 21,* 187–196. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/pac0000072

Young, H. F., Rooze, M., & Holsappel, J. (2015). Translating conceptualizations into practical suggestions: What the literature on radicalization can offer to practitioners. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology, 21,* 212–225. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/pac0000065