

# 9

## A HISTORY OF DIVISION 48 (PEACE PSYCHOLOGY)

MICHAEL G. WESSELLS

Wessells, M. G. (1996). A history of Division 48 (Peace Psychology). In D. Dewsbury (Ed.), *Unification through division: Histories of Divisions of the American Psychological Association* (pp. 265 - 298). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

The history of Division 48 (Peace Psychology) is the story of American psychology changing in response to changes in the nation and the global arena. It is also the story of psychologists who were concerned about peace and who worked to make a difference in the world and to encourage social responsibility in their profession. Although Division 48 has existed for slightly more than 5 years, its roots extend back to early in the century. Furthermore, its history illuminates what it takes to form a new division of the American Psychological Association (APA) as well as the growing pains that any new organization must undergo.

---

I want to thank the many dedicated people who participated in the construction of Division 48. Special thanks go to Alan Nelson, who launched the effort to establish the division and who provided much vision and energy in petitioning for the division. In preparing this history, I drew extensively on recorded minutes of the Division 48 executive committee and other key documents, which I currently store in the Division 48 archive. In addition, I sought the advice and historical recollections of many people who participated in the formation and start-up of the division as well as its actual operation. I want to thank Anne Anderson, Daniel Christie, Morton Deutsch, Paul Kimmel, Susan McKay, Bianca Murphy, Alan Nelson, Linden Nelson, Marc Pilisuk, Janet Schofield, Milton Schwebel, Gregory Sims, M. Brewster Smith, Richard Wagner, and Deborah Winter for their very helpful comments and recollections. I also want to thank Rodney Baker and Donald Dewsbury for their useful reviews of the manuscript. Of course, the responsibility for any errors in this history is mine.

Readers who are unfamiliar with peace psychology will benefit from a definition of the field. Because peace psychology is relatively new, however, it is best to offer only a working definition of the field, along with the caveat that it is important to avoid excessively narrow definitions that will limit future growth and evolution. *Peace psychology* may be defined as the use of psychological concepts, tools, and perspectives for the construction of peace and for the understanding, management, and prevention of destructive conflict at all levels, from the family to the international. *Peace* refers not only to the absence of organized violence but also to the presence of equity and social justice, tolerance and respect for human rights, reconciliation, and sustainable development. Among the many people who call themselves peace psychologists are scholars who study the origins and psychological effects of wars such as those in Vietnam and Bosnia, clinicians who seek to heal the psychological wounds of war and urban violence, educators who teach for peace and develop school-based mediation programs, and professionals who work on prevention-oriented intercultural understanding, nonviolent conflict resolution, gender equity, cooperation, and ecological health.

As Smith (1986) noted, American psychology reflects the dominant values, themes, and currents at work in the society. Although the United States has a long history of action for peace and nonviolence, the nation has pursued military preparations and engagements in armed conflict on a much larger scale. Reflecting this fact, American psychology has had much greater involvement in war and war preparations than in war prevention and the construction of peace. It was APA's participation in World War I that put the association on the map through the construction of widely used, if culturally biased, tests for selecting military personnel (Cattell, cited in Samelson, 1979, p. 106), and American psychology also made significant contributions to the U.S. military in World War II and the following decades (Capshew & Hilgard, 1992). Among the first divisions of the APA was the Division of Military Psychology (Division 19), established in 1945 and 1946. Yet it was not until 1990 that the APA established a Division of Peace Psychology. Because Division 48 is the product of social forces outside psychology and has been shaped by events that long antedated its existence, this chapter will focus equally on the context surrounding the establishment of the division and on its first 5 years.

## HISTORIC CONTEXT

A significant historical question is, what changes enabled the formation of the Division of Peace Psychology? No doubt an important factor was the growth of a respectable body of psychological research and analysis (Jacobs, 1989). Early in this century, William James (1910–1995) published

an insightful essay on "The Moral Equivalent of War," which continues to have relevance to contemporary problems (Deutsch, 1995; Smith, 1992). In subsequent decades prominent social psychologists such as Urie Bronfenbrenner (1961), Morton Deutsch (1973, 1983), Herbert Kelman (1965), Otto Klineberg (1956, 1984), Thomas Milburn (1961), Charles Osgood (1962), and Ralph White (1970, 1984, 1986) made significant scholarly contributions to the study of war and peace. The Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues (APA Division 9, or SPSSI) was particularly active early on, as in 1945 when it published Gardner Murphy's *Human Nature and Enduring Peace*. SPSSI established a Committee on International Relations and a Committee on Arms Control and Disarmament, and SPSSI members were active in publishing on issues such as deterrence (Deutsch, 1961), the military-industrial complex (Pilisuk & Hayden, 1965), and public opinion and foreign policy (Kelman, 1954). In 1961 SPSSI devoted an entire issue of its *Journal of Social Issues* to policies regarding nuclear war, and in 1962 it published a special issue of its newsletter entitled "Psychologists and Peace."

### **Expanding the Research Base**

In the 1960s clinical and developmental psychologists had begun investigating the developmental and mental health implications of young people's fears of nuclear war (Escalona, 1963; Schwebel, 1963, 1965), and in the 1970s social psychologists such as Kelman (1972) had begun doing applied work in protracted international conflict. Psychiatrists such as Frank (1967) and Lifton (1967) analyzed the psychological origins and consequences of nuclear war. In the early 1980s there was an expanding literature on psychological analysis of international issues and events, and the International Society of Political Psychology launched its multidisciplinary journal, *Political Psychology*. Furthermore, some of the most distinguished psychologists, most notably Carl Rogers and B. F. Skinner, did much public speaking on peace. Most of these pioneers in peace psychology recognized that psychological factors played a rather small part in international conflict, which by its nature required the insights of many different disciplines. Nevertheless, it was apparent that psychologists had important things to say about issues of peace.

If World Wars I and II had activated large numbers of psychologists concerning war, it was the nuclear threat that activated large numbers of psychologists for peace (Jacobs, 1989; Morawski & Goldstein, 1985; Smith, 1986). The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in 1979 slammed the door on détente and ignited new Cold War passions. Fears of U.S. military weakness, stirred by the Iranian hostage crisis and the failed rescue attempt in the mid-1970s helped to usher in a highly conservative Reagan administration dedicated to increasing U.S. military strength. With superpower

tensions increasing and both the United States and the Soviet Union building and deploying new generations of nuclear weapons, including those having significant first-strike capabilities, public concerns about nuclear war reached unprecedented levels. By 1982 nearly 75% of the U.S. public supported a freeze on the development, production, and deployment of nuclear weapons (Yankelovich & Doble, 1986).

With professional organizations such as Physicians for Social Responsibility making connections between health and nuclear war, growing numbers of psychologists began to make connections between mental health and the nuclear threat. Psychologists increasingly questioned whether they had a responsibility to work as professionals and as citizens to prevent nuclear war, and the APA Council of Representatives voted to support a nuclear freeze in 1982 (Jacobs, 1989), the same year in which it voted to support the establishment of a United States Institute of Peace. By 1983 momentum was building for the establishment of a United States Institute for Peace (USIP), and the APA board of directors voted in 1985 to support the USIP legislation (Kimmel, 1985). As in the earlier part of the century, many psychologists assisted the military, but this group was now increasingly balanced by the growing numbers of psychologists who worked to develop nonmilitary options for handling conflict.

### **Organizing for Peace**

In the cauldron of concerns about nuclear war prevention, new psychological organizations were forged, extending the organizational work of previous decades (see Jacobs, 1989). By 1982 Doris Miller and Bernice Zahm had established state chapters of Psychologists for Social Responsibility in New York and California, respectively. Independently, in 1982 Alex Redmountain was establishing in Washington, D.C., a national, non-profit organization that would have a national representation of prominent psychologists. These three groups joined forces to form the national Psychologists for Social Responsibility (PsySR, pronounced "sigh-ess-are"). Through the energies of people such as Anne Anderson, Carmi Harari, Helen Mehr, Doris Miller, Robert Moyer, M. Brewster Smith, Brett Silverstein, Ralph White, and Neil Wollman, PsySR followed George Miller's advice on "giving psychology away" by launching public education programs on the psychology of nuclear war and war prevention, enemy imaging and misperceptions, nonviolent conflict resolution, and peace education. The members of PsySR formed a National Steering Committee of prominent psychologists representing diverse constituencies and areas of expertise. They also created local chapters that served as vehicles for activating psychologists around the country.

Present in the nation's capital and independent of the APA, PsySR developed a rapid response capability for applying the best psychological

insight on key peace issues and for making its voice heard in the public arena. From its inception, PsySR was an activist organization, yet its action was informed by scholarship and by extensive dialogue among diverse constituencies about what the role of psychologists should be and about what psychologists could legitimately say, based on their professional expertise, regarding particular issues. PsySR members encouraged scholarship on issues of peace, giving an annual Research Award for outstanding research on peace and conflict resolution. In addition, PsySR membership played a leading role in organizing panels, discussions, and other events on peace for the annual APA convention. It not only assisted in organizing events on the official APA program but also created beginning in the mid-1980s its own program in the PsySR hospitality suite, which became the convention "home" for many psychologists who worked on issues of peace and conflict resolution. These programs often featured well-known psychologists and drew overflow audiences in cities such as New York, making it clear that peace had an audience at the APA convention.

Within and outside of the APA, diverse organizations worked alongside PsySR on issues of peace during the 1980s. Division 9, SPSSI, had a long and distinguished history of involvement in peace (Jacobs, 1989) and had worked with APA groups such as the Board for Social and Ethical Responsibility in Psychology (BSERP) to formulate policy analyses and resolutions regarding war. In 1982 SPSSI formed a Task Force on Peace, which, under the leadership of Theodore Landsman, Richard Wagner, Robert Moyer, and Daniel Mayton, organized symposia and peace-related events for the APA convention and helped to produce a special issue of the *Journal of Social Issues* on positive approaches to peace (Wagner, de Rivera, & Watkins, 1988). In the same way, the Association for Humanistic Psychology published a special peace issue of its *Journal of Humanistic Psychology* in the summer of 1984 (Greening, 1984). In affiliation with the Harvard Medical School, in 1982 John Mack founded the Nuclear Psychology Program (which in 1985 was renamed the Center for the Psychological Studies in the Nuclear Age), which organized scholarly symposia and produced a variety of publications on peace.

These organizations were as much a product of the times as was Division 48, and they cannot be credited with having established the division. The combined impact of these organizations and their activities, however, should not be underestimated. These organizations built credibility and legitimacy, they promoted the exchange of ideas, advanced research, education, and practice, gave peace psychology a voice in the wider professional and public arenas, and supported the work of individuals who might otherwise have felt isolated and marginalized. These organizations carried forward the work begun much earlier of transforming psychology in directions of peace and social justice, and they constituted part of the foundation on which the Division of Peace Psychology was built.

## THE FORMATION OF THE DIVISION

The formation of any APA division requires the existence of a favorable *Zeitgeist*, appropriate levels of credibility, a demonstrated need for a division, and a constituency willing to make its voice heard. Although necessary, these factors are not sufficient. In the case of peace psychology, the other key factors were leadership, persistence, and political savvy (see Wagner, 1992, for a useful discussion of the formation of the division).

Much of the initial leadership came from Alan Nelson, who coined the term *peace psychology*. Following a SPSSI-sponsored symposium chaired by Nora Weckler at the 1981 APA convention, Nelson initiated the plan to establish a Division of Peace Psychology (A. Nelson, personal communication, January 30, 1996). Working with Nora Weckler, Nelson spoke widely on the importance of having an APA division of peace psychology, convinced distinguished psychologists such as Carl Rogers to support the division's formation, and collected more than 200 petitions (proposals to establish a new APA division must be supported by signed petitions from 1% of the APA membership). Soon, other participants entered the effort to form the division. Helen Mehr and Gregory Sims, working through the California State Psychological Association and Northern California PsySR, organized symposia on psychology and nuclear war and generated enthusiasm for having the APA work on nuclear war prevention. Mehr, a skillful networker, sparked the interest of prominent psychologists such as M. Brewster Smith in working on issues of peace. The APA-related work of Mehr and Sims was influenced by Mehr's association with Alan Nelson since late 1981 (A. Nelson, personal communication, January 30, 1996). Mehr initially had been concerned that an APA division might weaken existing organizations such as SPSSI or PsySR (Sims, 1995). But at a 1983 meeting of Northern California PsySR convened by Sims and moderated by Mehr, there was considerable enthusiasm for an APA division of peace psychology, and Mehr and Sims soon joined in the petitioning effort (Sims, personal communication, December 19, 1995).

### The Petitioning Process

By 1985 several hundred valid petitions had been collected, but the APA membership was increasing, elevating the bar to be crossed ever higher (eventually to the point of requiring more than 600 signatures). When Alan Nelson suffered a debilitating back injury at the 1985 APA convention, a brief hiatus occurred in the petitioning effort, leading Gregory Sims to turn the task over to James Polyson and Michael Wessells. This expanding team, which called itself the Steering Committee to Form an APA Division of Peace Psychology and which was aided by many dedicated peace psychologists, collected petitions by writing letters, making

telephone calls, and requesting signatures at state, regional, and national psychological meetings.

Although many divisions have grown out of existing organizations or elected formative committees, the founders of the Division of Peace Psychology eschewed formal structure and organization. In keeping with values present in the wider community of peace activists outside psychology, the steering committee operated in a consensual, participative, informal mode. Discomfort over adopting formal roles such as “chair” led Polyson and Wessells to define their roles as “co-coordinators,” although more formal terminology was to be adopted later in an attempt to match the more traditional APA structure.

The steering committee members encountered numerous obstacles such as lack of funding available for mailings and travel expenses, sharply diminishing returns from mass mailings, and a chicken-egg problem (i.e., many of the petitioners’ signatures were invalid because the signers did not belong to the APA, yet they had avoided the APA precisely because of its relative inactivity on issues of peace). But the greater obstacles were psychological. The early and mid-1980s were times of intense Cold War fears, and U.S. society was saturated with concerns that well-intentioned peace activities would inadvertently weaken the position of the United States. Numerous members of the APA council expressed concern that a peace division might politicize psychology or create a forum in which psychologists spoke out inappropriately on issues that were not specifically psychological or said things in public that would damage the APA’s credibility. Many mainstream psychologists wondered what peace psychology was and doubted whether it was “real” psychology. In short, peace psychology was marginalized. This situation sparked minor disagreements within the peace community about the name of the proposed division, as some believed that the name Division of Peace and Conflict Resolution would widen the appeal of the division and diminish some of the concerns associated with the word *peace*.

No orderly process existed for addressing these concerns, and because they were emotional as well as intellectual, they could not be settled through scholarship and public debate. What turned the tide in favor of the petitioners was a cumulative process of education, both personal and professional, in a context of progressive relaxation of Cold War tensions. Throughout the period during which petitions were collected, most peace psychologists did what good psychologists do—they conducted research, taught, and practiced, applying their methods to real-world problems and educating their colleagues about peace as they went. In talks with colleagues, petitioners pointed out the many points of intersection between psychology and peace, noting areas such as posttraumatic stress among Vietnam veterans, the psychology of conflict resolution in levels ranging from the family to the international system, war and the abuse of women, ag-

gression, and enemy imaging, among many others. Furthermore, the organizers did not look or act in ways that embarrassed traditional psychologists. Within the budding community of peace psychologists, there was agreement on the importance of respect and civility, for it seemed unfair to ask the world to move toward peace if the group behaved in intolerant, belligerent ways toward its critics. Although peace psychologists did not always adhere to these lofty ideals, they created a sustainable, constructive dialogue internally and externally, taking the edge off many of the doubts that had been expressed. As distinguished elders such as Skinner and Rogers expressed support for forming the division, the relevance of psychology to peace and the acceptability of working on peace increased.

These gains notwithstanding, in August 1987 the APA Council of Representatives rejected the first official petition by the steering committee to establish a division of peace psychology. This failure taught valuable if painful lessons on the importance of learning to work within the APA political process. Put simply, most of the steering committee members were young psychologists who had not been very active within the APA and did not know how to move motions through the council effectively. In 1987 there had been no systematic education and dialogue with council members in advance, and there had been no designated leader on the council floor to answer criticisms and move the petition ahead.

### **Gaining the Approval of the APA Council of Representatives**

Following the 1987 setback, the steering committee members learned and adjusted their tactics accordingly. Seeking additional wisdom and more gender and age balance, the steering committee membership invited Janet Schofield and Milton Schwebel, both well-known scholars, to join the committee, and Schofield agreed to serve as one of three co-chairs (with Polyson and Wessells). By telephone, members of the steering committee contacted many APA council members not only to lobby for the division but also to hear the main reservations and sources of resistance. Whereas the peace advocates were accustomed to analyzing concerns about the nuclear threat and the Soviets, they now had to learn to talk about concerns over the proliferation of divisions within the APA and about whether psychologists should get involved on issues of public policy and national security. This enlargement of the dialogue over whether to form a peace psychology division created an environment in which members of the peace community could voice doubts about the desirability of having a division dedicated to peace. Some within the peace community were concerned about the possible negative impact a division of peace psychology might have with regard to membership, convention program hours, and resources on other APA divisions such as SPSSI and on non-APA organizations such as PsySR.

Because the APA council had imposed a 1988 moratorium on the formation of new divisions, in order to consider issues of reorganization, members of the steering committee had 2 years to prepare their next formal application for divisional status. This afforded much needed time for dialogue and education. There was increasing agreement internally that an APA division of peace psychology should have a scholarly rather than an activist emphasis, thereby creating an appropriate division of labor with PsySR, the activist arm of psychology. In addition, comfort grew around the idea that the proposed peace division would complement SPSSI, with the proposed division focusing directly on peace and SPSSI addressing a very broad spectrum of social issues and helping to establish the wider connections between peace and social justice. Beyond the peace community, supporters argued that the proposed division could help the APA meet its stated goal of advancing human well-being and could act for peace in the same way that leading professional organizations outside psychology had done (for example, Physicians for Social Responsibility). Advocates also argued that the proposed division would provide a home within the APA for psychologists who might otherwise hold the APA at arm's length.

With these dialogues in progress, profound and unforeseen events—the Gorbachev reforms, the Reagan–Gorbachev summits, nuclear arms reduction treaties welcomed by both East and West, and the dismantling of the Berlin Wall—reshaped the international arena and melted the ice of the Cold War. Suddenly, work on peace no longer seemed idealistic or inimical to U.S. security interests. More than any other single factor, the winding down of the Cold War created an environment conducive to the establishment of a division of peace psychology.

In August 1989 the steering committee members submitted their second petition to the APA council. The petition had been revised to address directly the concerns that had been heard from various corners and to reflect the increased scholarship in the field. In hopes of continuing the educational process and building credibility, it listed references from many prominent psychologists. This time around, the committee members had recruited M. Brewster Smith—a distinguished social psychologist, former APA president, and someone often referred to as the conscience of the APA—to serve as captain on the floor of the APA council meeting in New Orleans. Providing just the right mixture of force of argument, leadership, and humor, Smith defused the concern over the proliferation of APA divisions by pointing out that a peace division would not even constitute a noticeable difference in an Association that already had 45 active divisions. On August 13, 1989, The APA council members approved the motion to establish the division, thereby giving peace psychology an entry into the central house of the profession. Continuing the numbering practice already begun, the Division of Peace Psychology was designated as Division 48.

## MAKING THE TRANSITION

Under APA rules, a new division is not officially established until it conducts an official business meeting at which at least 10% of the petitioners, approximately 70 people in the case of Division 48, are present. Because it would have been counterproductive to schedule this meeting on the spur of the moment following the council's decision in 1989, the steering committee members decided to hold the inaugural business meeting in 1990 as part of the APA convention in Boston. Following the suggestion of numerous senior peace psychologists and seeing few alternatives, the steering committee membership decided that it should continue on an interim basis until the division's first officers and executive committee members had been elected and installed. The steering committee members, however, were acutely aware of being in an ambiguous, if not precarious position. Although they were not elected officials, they were nevertheless charged with acting on behalf of the division, and they knew that the steps they took and the process they created would set precedents. In addition, they had proposed bylaws that took into account APA requirements and that used the bylaws of several extant divisions as models. But these bylaws had never been reviewed and approved by the petitioners. Under the circumstances, the committee members agreed that no small part of their work would be to build participation, to work as openly as possible, and to seek advice widely and from diverse constituencies.

### **Work of the Steering Committee**

With the aid of Sarah Jordan of the APA Division Services Office, the steering committee members worked to get the division up and running for the inaugural business meeting. Because the division had received 8 hours of program time for the 1990 convention, the steering committee members designated Polyson as program chair and decided that the program should emphasize invited symposia and events because no mechanisms existed for handling and reviewing large numbers of proposals. There was also a need to elect the first set of officers for the division. Although the proposed bylaws had not been officially approved, it seemed important to elect official leaders of the division who could then guide the events at the first business meeting. The steering committee accordingly created an interim elections committee (with Wessells as chair). Because the steering committee had no funds available, money was also needed to cover the costs of mailings.

Having obtained support via the APA Division Services Office, the steering committee members arranged a fall mailing to everyone who had petitioned for the division. This initial mailing (dated October 1, 1989)

notified supporters of the APA council's action, reiterated the complementarity of the new division with PsySR and SPSSI, urged attendance at the inaugural business meeting, invited suggestions regarding the 1990 convention program, and requested nominations for officers as well as contributions to support the transition effort. The mailing succeeded in stimulating many nominations, program ideas, and discussions about the directions of the new division. Early on, the spirit of participation was visible. Following the fall mailing, the steering committee members learned the good news that, as a result of the APA apportionment ballot from the fall of 1989, the division had won a seat on the APA Council of Representatives. From the outset, the division would have a voice on the central policy-making body of the association.

Having no scheduled winter meeting but wanting to work in a collegial manner, the entire steering committee membership held a telephone conference February 10, 1990. This was the first meeting of the entire steering committee, which had previously conducted its business informally by mail or by a chain of individual telephone conversations, and it established important precedents for divisional operations. During the meeting, committee members decided that (a) the nominees for officers should be those who received the highest numbers of nominations and who expressed a willingness to serve if elected; (b) it was desirable for purposes of building credibility and legitimacy to have the first candidates for president be senior, highly distinguished peace psychologists, whereas younger, less well-known nominees might run for president-elect; (c) the officers' terms should begin when the election returns were in, whereas the terms of office would normally begin in August at an annual business meeting; (d) the nominees for president and president-elect would provide a written statement of their vision and main goals for the division; (e) nominees whose names did not appear on the ballot but who had received multiple nominations should be invited to run for the two positions of members-at-large on the executive committee; (f) the division should work to achieve gender balance on the executive committee and in all of its activities; and (g) everyone who petitioned for the formation of the division, whether an APA member or not, would be entitled to vote. In the conference call, the steering committee membership decided to nominate Milton Schwebel and Richard Wagner for the Division 48 seat on the APA council.

In discussing the planning for the 1990 convention, Polyson reported that Janet Schofield would chair an invited symposium on "Peace Psychology—Past, Present, and Future" and that he was working with Anne Anderson, the national coordinator of PsySR, on having PsySR and Division 48 share a hospitality suite. It was agreed that 2 hours of program time should be allocated for the inaugural business meeting, and Alan Nelson and Michael Wessells agreed to review the proposed bylaws in preparation for the meeting. The ideas of starting a division newsletter and

scholarly journal generated considerable enthusiasm, though it was recognized that these tasks must await the official constitution of the division and be guided by elected officers. This initial meeting, for which there are no official minutes, helped to set a tone of cooperation and participation that would carry on through the first 5 years.

In April 1990, the steering committee membership conducted the first divisional elections. Because several members of the steering committee were candidates and Helen Mehr was the only candidate identified for the office of secretary-treasurer, Mehr received and oversaw the counting of the ballots. These elections brought into office Morton Deutsch as president, Wessells as president-elect, and Mehr as secretary-treasurer (see Table 36). Because the election was not conducted using the Hare system, in which voters rank the nominees and the cumulative rankings are used to decide the outcome of ties in—for example, the number of “1” votes—there was a three-way among Joan Gildemeister, Marc Pilisuk, and James Polyson for the two positions of executive committee members-at-large. On the view that a greater number and diversity of voices is better, the incoming officers decided that all three should serve. In the vote for the APA council representative (conducted by the APA because only APA members and fellows were eligible to vote in it), a tie had also occurred, and a decision was made to invite Wagner and Schwebel to share the term. Division 48 now had its first elected leadership team, one that bridged the generations of active peace psychologists, and it gained stature by having as its first president a senior peace psychologist whose work was well known and highly respected internationally, who blended skills of scholarship and practice, and who had exercised leadership within the APA and in other organizations for decades. For purposes of continuity and the construction of norms of cooperation, it was decided that the executive committee should work with the members of the soon-to-dissolve steering committee in planning the inaugural business meeting.

### **The First Meeting of the Executive Committee**

The executive committee held its first meeting August 10, 1990, in Boston as part of the annual APA convention. That the meeting took place in a hospitality suite shared equally by the division and PsySR indicated the spirit of partnership between these two organizations. In an atmosphere of informality and participation, the executive committee affirmed the importance of increasing division membership, building diversity, and defining peace psychology in a broad manner that would enhance the development of the field.

Among the main agenda items was the bylaws, the evolution of which provided significant insights about how peace psychologists defined their nascent field and the directions that would be most appropriate for the

TABLE 36  
Officers and Executive Committee of Division 48

Year	Officers	Members-at-Large	APA Council Representative
1990–1991	Morton Deutsch (President) Michael Wessells (Pres. Elect) Helen Mehr (Sec.–Treas.)	Joan Gildemeister Marc Pilisuk James Polyson	Richard V. Wagner (1991)
1991–1992	Michael Wessells (President) Richard V. Wagner (Pres. Elect) Morton Deutsch (Past Pres.) Dorothy Ciarlo (Sec.–Treas.)	Joan Gildemeister Marc Pilisuk James Polyson	Milton Schwebel (1992)
1992–1993	Richard V. Wagner (President) Paul Kimmel (Pres. Elect) Michael Wessells (Past Pres.) Dorothy Ciarlo (Sec.–Treas.)	Susan McKay Linden Nelson	Janet Schofield (1993)
1993–1994	Paul Kimmel (President) Susan McKay (Pres. Elect) Richard V. Wagner (Past Pres.) Petra Hesse (Sec.–Treas.)	Leila Dane Linden Nelson	Janet Schofield (1994)
1994–1995	Susan McKay (President) Daniel Christie (Pres. Elect) Paul Kimmel (Past Pres.) Petra Hesse (Sec.–Treas.)	Hector Betancourt Thomas Milburn	Janet Schofield (1995)
1995–1996	Daniel Christie (President) Marc Pilisuk (Pres. Elect) Susan McKay (Past Pres.) Margaret Houlihan (Secretary) Petra Hesse (Treasurer)	Hector Betancourt Thomas Milburn	Deborah Winter (1996)

new division. The bylaws that had accompanied the petition to form the division had been concise but rather general:

The purposes of this Division shall be: (a) to encourage scholarly psychological research on issues concerning peace and conflict resolution; (b) to provide an organization that fosters communication among researchers, teachers and practitioners who are working on these issues; and (c) to apply the knowledge and the methods of psychology in the cause of peace and nonviolent conflict resolution. (Petition for an APA Division of Peace Psychology, 3)

In spring of 1990 Alan Nelson had suggested revising the proposed goals to emphasize *nonviolent* conflict resolution and also processes of reconciliation. At the executive committee meeting, additional changes seemed necessary because Morton Deutsch and others expressed concern that the field would be narrowed prematurely by focusing on war rather than on destructive conflict at all levels. Following the distinction between positive and negative peace (Galtung, 1969), peace researchers recognized the prob-

lems of defining peace as the absence of war when international tensions continued to run high or when strong racial hatreds and conflict continued.

At the same time, it seemed important to include psychological work on the causes and consequences of war. To be proactive rather than reactive, the executive committee wanted to emphasize the prevention of war. For these reasons, the proposed bylaws were modified in July 1990 to read as follows:

The purposes of this Division shall be: (a) to encourage psychological research on issues concerning peace, nonviolent conflict resolution, and the causes, consequences and prevention of war and other forms of destructive conflict; (b) to provide an organization that fosters communication among researchers, teachers and practitioners who are working on these issues; and (c) to apply the knowledge and the methods of psychology in the advancement of peace, nonviolent conflict resolution, reconciliation, and the prevention of war and other forms of destructive conflict. (Revisions to the Proposed By-laws in the Petition for an APA Division of Peace Psychology, 3)

These were no small semantic changes—they embodied a proactive, systemic approach to peace that could accommodate under a single roof work on family violence, the causes of war, and international conflict resolution. Division leaders hoped that these changes would encourage psychologists of diverse stripes to conceptualize their work as part of peace psychology, thereby diversifying the field and increasing the division's membership.

The executive committee members also set about forming and activating the committees (membership, program, fellowship, and elections) called for by the provisional bylaws and that seemed necessary for the development of the division. In view of the importance of the convention program in defining the field and inviting participation, the executive committee members decided that the president-elect should serve as the program chair for the convention in the following year, thereby establishing a practice that continued throughout the first 5 years. Out of a lively discussion of how to encourage psychologists in traditional areas to see the connections between their work and issues of peace came the suggestion to establish a committee on interdivisional relations, to be chaired by Marc Pilisuk and James Polyson. Morton Deutsch also suggested the need for a committee on public relations to help peace psychologists work effectively with the media and for a finance committee to assist in raising funds. To encourage participation in the division, members agreed that the initial dues should be kept at the modest figure of \$15 annually. Amid the spirit of new beginnings, the meeting was punctuated with humor over the fact that the executive committee was meeting when it did not yet exist officially. All of the decisions that had been made were provisional and would be presented in the constitutional meeting the following day.

## THE INAUGURAL MEETING

The official birthdate of Division 48 was August 11, 1990, on the occasion of the inaugural business meeting, with Morton Deutsch presiding. It was, of course, a historic occasion because the division's existence signified the legitimacy of peace psychology and created a channel through which peace psychologists could move their work into the mainstream. The excitement associated with the meeting was tempered, however, by world events. Despite the end of the Cold War, everyone recognized that the war system remained deeply entrenched, and Saddam Hussein's forces had recently invaded Kuwait, causing war fever to rise swiftly in the United States. These events charged the atmosphere, added new urgency to work for peace, and raised questions right from the start about how the new division would define its role.

The meeting was historic also because it represented a coming together of diverse generations and constituencies. Approximately 75 people participated in the 2-hour meeting, although movement into and out of the room made it difficult to determine the exact number of participants. With little sense of hierarchy, young peace psychologists joined in dialogue with some of the senior, best-known people in the field. Significant numbers of women participated in the meeting, and their voices were welcomed, as were those of people who had long associations with PsySR and SPSSI. New faces also appeared, testifying to the interest in peace beyond the group of known peace psychologists and presenting the opportunity for new voices and leadership. In addition, several members of the APA staff were present, and the meeting opened with a warm expression of thanks to Sarah Jordan and the Divisional Services Office. Later in the meeting, Jacqueline Gentry invited Division 48 members to become active within the Public Interest Directorate and to comment on a proposal from the Board of Social and Ethical Responsibility regarding the APA's position on weapons of mass destruction. In a quiet manner, the meeting helped to build links between the division and the APA Central Office, allaying some of the lingering doubts in the peace community about working through the APA.

The president set a participatory tone for the meeting by announcing at the outset that the division was in need of input and help from as many members as possible. As he read the list of committees that needed leadership, several members suggested their willingness to help, strengthening the norm of participation.

The main agenda item—the bylaws—was not to be so easy and free of conflict. To appreciate the salience of this subject, it must be remembered that the Cold War had recently ended, and the immediate threat of nuclear war had subsided, even if the longer-term nuclear threat had not (Polyson, 1992; Wessells, 1992a, 1995). Unlike the Cold War era, there

was no central galvanizing issue. Moreover, the post-Cold War era provided the opportunity to address a much wider spectrum of interconnected issues—such as militarism, poverty, sexism—than could have been addressed effectively during the Cold War. Although there was a generally recognized need to enlarge the scope of peace psychology and to avoid premature narrowing of the field, it was no longer clear what peace psychologists should do. Perhaps more than at any other time since work had begun on forming the division, there was significant uncertainty about the definition and mission of peace psychology. Added complexity arose from the ambiguities surrounding the respective roles of Division 48 and of extant organizations such as PsySR. To complicate matters further, the executive committee had made the changes noted in the proposed bylaws, but because many of these changes had been made the day before, the membership was hearing the revised (proposed) bylaws for the first time.

In this climate, there was need of extensive dialogue about the purposes of the new division. Much of the initial discussion examined whether to expand peace psychology to include environmental issues. It was well understood that the Cold War had masked a host of environmental problems, many of which stemmed from military preparations and armed conflict (McKenzie-Mohr & Winter, 1992; Sivard, 1991), and that resource scarcity was a major source of war and destructive conflict. But there were concerns that peace psychology might be weakened by making environmental issues central. The ranks of peace organizations nationally were shrinking significantly as the environmental movement gathered steam. Several members pointed out that the APA already had a division (34, Population and Environmental Psychology) that worked on environmental issues, that the phrase “causes and consequences of war” in the bylaws created an umbrella for work on environmental issues as they intersected with peace, and that it would be unwise to make the stated purposes of the division so specific as to appear noninclusive. No real agreement was reached on how centrally environmental issues ought to be situated within peace psychology, making it a topic for future work by the division.

The need to expand the stated purposes also became apparent in regard to a question as to whether interpersonal conflict was within the division’s scope of work. The general sentiment of those present was that the division should work on conflict at all levels, making connections with wider, macrosocial issues. Having noted that the stated purpose placed too strong an emphasis on research, particularly when psychological work for peace already encompassed education and training in areas such as conflict resolution and cultural sensitivity, Paul Kimmel suggested that part of the purpose was “to encourage psychological research, education, and training on issues concerning peace.” By general agreement, this phrase replaced the phrase “to encourage scholarly psychological research on issues concerning peace” in item (a) regarding purposes. With this modification, the

members present accepted the expanded statement of purpose crafted by the executive committee. In this manner, the members enlarged the scope of peace psychology, avoided specific definitions of a field that was evolving rapidly, and strived to create a broad umbrella that would accommodate diverse orientations and kinds of work for peace. It was revealing that there had been no powerful impetus for orienting the new division toward activism. The membership generally agreed that PsySR, being independent of the APA, was in a better position to pursue activist work. Most division members implicitly appreciated that it would take time for the division to formulate its goals and strategies in regard to work in the policy arena.

Animated discussion arose over the requirements for amending the bylaws. The proposed bylaws allowed amendment only if two thirds of the members who voted in a mail ballot approved. Numerous members stated that this requirement was too stringent and had the effect of enshrining the bylaws at a time when the field was young and in need of openness to change, particularly in regard to the purposes of the division. Linden Nelson suggested and Milton Schwebel formally proposed that amendments to the bylaws be made by a majority vote, but others maintained that the bylaws ought to have the support of more than a simple majority. Marc Pilisuk proposed that the bylaws could be amended by a majority vote during the first 2 years and by a two thirds vote thereafter. With the discussion becoming labored and with no consensus in sight, Schwebel withdrew his motion, and the group voted to accept the Pilisuk compromise. In addition to approving the first set of divisional bylaws, the business meeting achieved its unstated purpose, that of Division 48 becoming a group not on paper but in human process. This process, characterized by norms of dialogue, inclusiveness, and informality, was instrumental in enabling the division to take on its major tasks and issues of the first 5 years.

## MEMBERSHIP

New divisions have a fragile existence, making membership recruitment and retention high priorities. Recognizing that communications is a key element in attracting and retaining members, Morton Deutsch approached the cochairs of the publications committee, Alan Nelson and Gregory Sims, regarding the publication of a division newsletter, and Sims agreed to serve as the interim editor. Despite the lack of precedent, established format, or logo, Sims managed to produce two issues of the *Division 48 Newsletter* from 1990 to 1991. They contained presidential columns, reports on the executive committee and business meetings, a call for proposals for the 1991 Division 48 convention program, and perspective pieces on issues such as the Persian Gulf crisis. When Daniel Jordan became

newsletter editor in the fall of 1991, the newsletter title changed to *The Peace Psychology Newsletter*, it took on a more professional appearance, and tripled in length to 18 pages. Its content expanded to include reports from committees and newly established task forces, as well as reports and announcements regarding meetings well beyond the circle of the division. These improvements owed much to the hard work of Daniel Jordan and Julie Carvalho (associate newsletter editor) from 1991 to 1994 and also to their successors, Sheldon Levy (editor), Phyllis Turner and J. Carvalho (assistant editors). Renamed *The Peace Psychology Bulletin* in April 1992, and *Peace Psychology Newsletter* in 1995, the newsletter has become the communications lifeline for the division.

In addition, the executive committee members developed early on the practice of making regular mailings to the membership, particularly each fall, for purposes of soliciting input on key issues, inviting participation in divisional activities and elections, and announcing important events. This practice reflected a strategic decision to use more personal means of communication (i.e., letters) than a newsletter could provide.

The task of attracting new members required significant leadership, and the division turned first to Linden Nelson (1990–1992) and then to Daniel Mayton (1992–1994, with Deborah Winter as cochair in 1992–1993) to serve as chair of its membership committee. Nelson cleaned up a mailing list that was far from accurate, having evolved over 8 years without careful maintenance, and he also developed regular procedures for contacting members regarding renewal, handling inquiries about membership, conducting recruitment drives, and so forth. Nelson collaborated extensively with a highly efficient secretary–treasurer, Dorothy Ciarlo, to create accurate records of dues-paying and APA dues-exempt members, of which affiliates had paid dues, and of who was remiss in payment.

To build membership, the executive committee members worked to keep the annual dues at a modest level. The dues for Division 48 members and affiliates started at \$15 annually, climbed to \$17 in 1992, and increased to \$20 in 1994. In 1995, with the publication of the divisional journal, dues for members and affiliates rose to \$25. To attract student members as the next generation of peace psychologists, the executive committee set the dues for student members at \$5 per year, and this level continued through 1995.

A key task in building membership was to provide a point of entry and a home for people doing diverse kinds of work on peace. To invite the participation of all members and enlarge the scope of peace psychology, then-President Wessells proposed the creation of various task forces, called working groups beginning in 1994. The executive committee leadership established six task forces: Children, Families, and War; Ethnicity and Peace; Feminism and Peace; Peace and Education; Peace and Sustainable Development; and Public Policy and Action. During the next several years

this list expanded. In 1993 the executive committee added a working group on international alliances and ventures and one on militarism, disarmament and conversion to replace an inactive task force on the continuing nuclear threat. In 1994 it added a working group on conflict resolution. The chairs of these groups have participated regularly in dialogues with the executive committee. Moreover, these groups have organized convention programs, written newsletter articles, reviewed new books and work in their areas, assisted in long-range planning for the division, and undertaken projects such as encouraging the inclusion of material on peace in psychology texts.

As a result of these efforts, the division had approximately 850 members (including affiliates and student members) by July 1992. It is a positive sign that membership continues at a level near this figure today, for during the early 1990s, peace organizations nationwide experienced membership declines of approximately 40%. By 1992, the division had attracted 25 international members, most from developed nations. This small number was troubling for a division that had strong international aspirations, that wanted to nurture the growth of peace psychology worldwide, and that wanted to include people with many different backgrounds and value systems (Wessells, 1992b). To address this problem, in 1994 the division established an International Affiliates program that provided sponsored membership in the division for approximately 20 psychologists working in developing areas around the world.

An early problem encountered in building membership was accurate record keeping, a task made difficult by the fact that petitions had been collected for years, and many of the petitioners had been kept on the division mailing list even if they had dropped out of sight. This problem was corrected on June 30, 1992, when those who had not paid dues at least once in 1991 or 1992 were removed from the list. Further, nearly 20% of Division 48 members were affiliates (including students) who do not belong to the APA and therefore did not show up in APA membership records. It made little sense to have APA offices keep membership records for the division, particularly because the division needed a directly accessible database for purposes of membership research and communication. Keeping the membership database was too much for a membership chair already immersed in frequent correspondence and membership drives. A third difficulty was that membership chair is, by design, a rotating position. Some members feared that transferring the Division 48 membership database would create problems of computer incompatibility and long response times while learning a new system. To address these problems, the executive committee members decided in August 1993 to contract the maintenance of the membership database to the PsySR office, giving the database a stable home. Recognizing that the job of treasurer had become quite time intensive, the executive committee members proposed to split the office of

secretary–treasurer into two parts, with the secretary overseeing all membership functions and serving as chair of the membership committee. This proposal required a bylaws revision, which the Division 48 membership approved in a mail ballot in spring 1995. That spring, the division membership elected Margaret Houlihan as its first secretary, and Petra Hesse continued as treasurer.

## ONGOING ACTIVITIES

Despite increasingly widespread activity via electronic mail within the division, the annual APA convention remains the hub of interaction. Following its initial “grant” of 8 hours of program time in 1990, the division held its first full convention program of 26 hours in 1991, and comparable numbers of program hours have been maintained since then. This figure contrasts sharply with those of the 1980s, when it was considered a success to have even 10 hours of formal convention program time devoted to peace. Here, then, is a very tangible accomplishment of the founders of Division 48—the institutionalization of peace in the APA convention program. No longer are peace issues to be relegated to the convention sidelines.

### Convention Programs

Three trends are evident in the division’s convention programming. Perhaps the most important is the progression toward gender balance. From 1990 through 1992, there was a 2:1 ratio of men to women among presenters and discussants and a 3:1 ratio favoring men as session chairs. This situation has improved considerably through the efforts of the working group on feminism and peace. At the 1994 and 1995 conventions, Division 48 programs had no dominance of men as session chairs or as presenters and discussants (Boyer & Swain, 1995). The now established practice of ensuring gender balance among invited speakers has also supported movement toward gender balance on the division convention program.

Second, the convention program has become more diverse and wider in scope. Owing in part to the Gulf War and to the residual influence of the Cold War, international issues and war dominated the early programs, with few sessions on issues of ethnicity, community violence, or sustainable development. By 1994 and 1995 the latter themes had become much more visible, thereby enabling the division to fulfill its initial commitment to developing a systemic, multilevel approach to peace and to integrate issues of peace and social justice. This trend also owed to the third development, increased collaboration with other groups in the creation of cross-fertilizing programs. Particularly noteworthy have been productive programs jointly

constructed with SPSSI on the United Nations, programs on women's issues cosponsored with Division 35 (Psychology of Women), regular dialogues and joint events with Division 19 (Military Psychology), and an extensive array of events cosponsored with PsySR. In 1995, recognizing that the office of president-elect has too many responsibilities to carry the burdens of program chair, the executive committee members decided to appoint a talented person (Hector Betancourt) who held no office as program chair for the 1996 convention. By separating the jobs of president-elect and program chair, the division leadership has given the program chair additional latitude and time for constructing collaborative programs.

Even the best planned conventions, however, cannot possibly stay abreast of peace-related events in the world. The 1990 convention took place on the eve of the Gulf War, and participants in the 1991 convention were shaken by news that an attempted coup had occurred in the Soviet Union. In dealing with these events, members of Division 48 have learned to be rather quick on their feet. In 1991, for example, the division membership arranged on very short notice a dialogue session on the Soviet coup attempt, and this turned out to be one of the most energetic, provocative peace-related events at the convention. In 1995, in the face of mounting pressures to send U.S. troops to Bosnia and in the aftermath of the bombing of the federal building in Oklahoma City, Ralph White led a session on Bosnia, while Morton Deutsch led one on dealing with militia groups. These sessions brought forward diverging views, and they served well the larger functions of educating, raising new questions, and stimulating the additional inquiry needed to construct informed analyses and policy stances.

Usually at the APA convention, the division has given a variety of annual awards to honor and encourage excellent work and outstanding commitment. In 1992 the division instituted a Presidential Award for Lifelong Contributions, the recipients of which have been Ralph White (1992), Jerome Frank (1993), Milton Schwebel (1994), and Morton Deutsch (1995). In 1992 the division copresented with PsySR a National Service Award to Helen Mehr, the first secretary-treasurer of the division, shortly before her death. The division then instituted an annual Outstanding Service Award, the recipients of which have been Dorothy Ciarlo (1994), Linden Nelson (1994), and Daniel Mayton (1995).

### **Long-Range Planning**

A significant and ongoing activity of the division is the construction of its first long-range plan, which owes much to the leadership of Susan McKay during her term as president. Regular executive committee meetings with their packed agendas did not permit the longer-term, more creative orientation that planning required. In spring 1994, McKay began the

planning dialogue via e-mail but was cognizant that not everyone used e-mail and that there is no substitute for face-to-face interaction, particularly on difficult issues. During the August 1994 APA convention, McKay brought together a group of Division 48 leaders for the initial planning meeting. Meeting informally in Paul Kimmel's home, the group members generated many ideas concerning the vision, goals, and strategies for the division as it headed toward the next millennium. As a result of this meeting and subsequent discussions held in conjunction with the winter 1995 executive committee meeting, the division adopted a sweeping statement of vision that called for "the development of sustainable societies through the prevention of destructive conflict and violence and the amelioration of its consequences, the empowerment of individuals, and the building of cultures of peace and global community" (Appendix to the Minutes of the 1995 Winter Executive Committee Meeting). In addition, the executive committee membership adopted six broad program goals that reflected the perspectives from various working groups, which commented on and refined the proposed operational goals and strategies at the 1995 APA convention.

By design, this planning effort lacks a distinct end point, because the intent is to create an ongoing dialogue about planning and a rolling plan adjusted to meet changing needs and realities. Already, the effort has helped the division members to think consciously about the division's priorities and strategies, and it has bolstered the norm of participation that has been so conspicuous throughout the life of Division 48.

## UNRESOLVED ISSUES

Like any new organization, Division 48 has experienced a variety of growing pains associated with difficult issues. The nature of these issues reflects the division's values and identity, and the process through which it addresses them says much about its character.

### **Relationship With Psychologists for Social Responsibility**

As mentioned, the relationship with PsySR was an issue for peace psychology well before the establishment of the Division 48. At the 1990 APA convention, an open discussion in the PsySR–Division 48 hospitality suite evoked general agreement that PsySR and Division 48 are sister organizations, with PsySR being more activist and Division 48 being oriented more toward scholarly pursuits. Although tidy in concept, this strategic positioning is not so orderly in reality. Many Division 48 members have wanted the division to become more active and vocal in regard to the key issues of the day (e.g., Pilisuk, 1994), raising the possibility of duplicating

the functions traditionally performed by PsySR. Indeed, at the 1990 APA convention, the Division 48 executive committee voted to support a resolution from the APA Board of Social and Ethical Responsibility to condemn nuclear, chemical, and biological warfare. At the 1995 APA convention, members of PsySR and Division 48 agreed to collaborate in drafting a resolution condemning France's plan to continue nuclear testing that could undermine the negotiations for a comprehensive test ban.

Through the leadership of its working group on public policy and action (Kimmel, 1992, 1995; Kimmel & Dane, 1993), members of Division 48 have worked to define the division's role in regard to public policy. As articulated by Paul Kimmel, the division's fourth president, the division's work should be more proactive than reactive, it should reflect a collectively constructed vision informed by a careful analysis of the values underlying its programs, and it should link peace and social justice concerns in the pursuit of a sustainable world. Within this framework, the working group membership proposed educational programs for policy makers, media programs to educate the public, and the construction of a proactive code of ethics supportive of public interest science. Many of these ideas informed and have been incorporated into the division's long-range plan. As this deliberate, long-range approach spawns tangible programs, additional dialogue about the relationships between Division 48 and PsySR will be necessary.

Fortunately, these two organizations have developed a mutually supportive relationship that enriches peace psychology and heightens its impact. Their overlap in leadership has enabled mutual understanding, and both organizations have benefited from cooperation on various projects and a constructive, ongoing dialogue about their roles and future. In 1993 this relationship was cemented when Division 48 entered a cooperative office arrangement wherein it contracted out to PsySR tasks such as maintaining the membership database. Nevertheless, PsySR, like all peace activist organizations, has experienced declines of membership and finances since the 1980s, leading some of PsySR's prominent elders, notably M. Brewster Smith and Ralph White, to voice strong concerns about the sustainability of activism on very small budgets. This issue of how to sustain responsible activism within peace psychology remains a central, if unanswered, question.

### **Diversity, Inclusiveness, and Equity**

A second unresolved issue, one that goes to the heart of issues of peace and justice, is that of diversity within Division 48. This is not a single issue but a package of interrelated issues having to do with inclusiveness of and equity among people and ideas from diverse cultures. Recognizing the impossibility of achieving peace without social justice, the

fundamental question is whether the division will be a U.S. enterprise dominated mostly by White males or a multicultural, international enterprise that contributes to peace by embodying diversity and by stimulating collaboration and learning across lines of race, class, gender, ethnicity, and nationality (Wessells, 1992b).

In addressing issues of diversity, the division membership encounters significant obstacles associated with the history and practices of the society, the academy, the discipline, and the peace movement. For example, the division membership has worked to include African Americans in its executive committee, its membership, and its projects. Yet the pool of African American psychologists working on issues of peace is rather small, in part because of issues associated with the U.S. history of discrimination and the economic and educational underprivileging of people of color. As a result, it has been difficult to build African American membership within the division. In the same way, both the national peace movement and psychology have a long history of male domination. This pattern also exists within peace psychology, where men have been much more visible than women and have held most of the leadership positions (McKay, 1992, 1995). In the first 2 years of the division's history, it was apparent that women needed to have a stronger voice within the division.

That the division has imported much baggage from society on issues of diversity is less important than how the division has attempted to handle this baggage. To begin with, the division membership set up working groups to focus on such topics as ethnicity and peace, feminism and peace, and international alliances and ventures in hopes of integrating diverse perspectives and people into the division's projects and leadership. Thanks to the efforts of determined people such as Curtis Branch, Jeanette Diaz-Veizades, and Hector Betancourt, the division offered in its early years numerous important convention programs on issues of ethnicity and conflict, and the international alliances and ventures working group has regularly arranged sessions that feature psychologists from developing nations. Space limitations preclude a detailed description of the division's efforts to address diversity issues. It is instructive, however, to examine the case of gender balance more closely because it reveals much about the division's work and the current situation.

To activate women in the division, Susan McKay and Bianca Cody Murphy, cochairs of the Task Force on Feminism and Peace, sent out a mailing in Spring 1992 to all female members of the division, inviting their participation and encouraging them to develop programs for the APA conventions. This mailing stimulated lively responses from many people, and by August 1992, the Feminism and Peace group had become the most active of all the Division 48 task forces and had established subgroups working on book reviews, writing newsletter articles, and networking. Over the next several years, women became much more prominent in the di-

vision, and Susan McKay became the division's first woman president in August 1994. At the same time, women became more active in the Division 48 convention program, with the imbalance between men and women presenters and session chairs having been corrected by 1994. In planning the journal, gender balance received significant attention, as two of three associate editors (Susan Fiske and Ethel Tobach) are women, and women comprise one third of the editorial board, a figure that compares favorably to APA journals (Boyer & Swain, 1995). Owing to the hard work of people such as Judith Van Hoorn and Michele Stimac, current cochairs of the working group on feminism and peace, women maintain a high level of activity within the division, and significant dialogue occurs via a feminism and peace e-mail group, which includes Daniel Christie, the current division president.

Nevertheless, a tremendous amount of work remains in this key area. In a recent survey of active APA divisions, Division 48 ranked 41st in the percentage of female officers and 21st in the percentage of women fellows (Boyer & Swain, 1995). Indeed, the continued use of the term *fellows* indicates the pervasiveness of the problem. Nor has gender balance been achieved on a steady basis within the executive committee (see Table 36), despite much effort by the elections committee, which is chaired by the current past president, to bring forward strong female candidates and a gender-balanced slate. Perhaps the largest imbalance occurs in regard to the journal, in which a significant majority of authors (particularly first authors) are men.

Much more work also needs to be done in regard to ethnicity and international activity. Although the division has developed convention programs jointly with Division 44 (Society for the Psychological Study of Ethnic Minority Issues), too little has been done to build the necessary bridges between peace and ethnic conflict at the community level and international levels. Partly for economic reasons, key divisional activities such as the convention program include few people from cultures outside the United States, making it difficult to stimulate the multicultural dialogue on the origins of conflict and peace and to build peace psychology in diverse countries. In this sense, the division is a microcosm of the APA, and true multiculturalism and international perspective remain areas for significant work in the future.

## STARTING THE JOURNAL

Many of the charter members of Division 48 had long wanted a scholarly journal of peace psychology that would help to legitimate the field, encourage new scholarship, provide a home for work that might not fit into more traditional psychological journals, and communicate the insights

and methods of peace psychology to a wide audience within and outside of psychology. Establishing a journal was to be the central task as well as the major accomplishment of the division in its first 5 years.

### Testing the Waters

To explore the feasibility of establishing a division journal, the publications committee in Spring 1991 invited Richard Wagner, the president-elect, to interview journal editors, publishers, and division members. Wagner's (1991) written report examined issues such as the need and possible niche for the journal, the problem of attracting manuscripts of high caliber, and costs and publishing arrangements. Wagner also arranged discussions at the August 1991 executive committee meeting with Gary VandenBos, executive director of APA Publications, and Terry Hendrix of Sage Publications, who explained that the start-up costs for a quarterly journal were in the neighborhood of \$20 per member for a small division, that even under the best of conditions it took several years to break even on an initial investment of more than \$100,000, and that the current environment was not very favorable for efforts to initiate a journal. Their suggestions started the executive committee along a rather protracted learning process regarding journal publications.

At the August 1991 business meeting, members expressed considerable enthusiasm for starting a journal, and Milton Schwebel accepted the executive committee's invitation to oversee the planning for a journal. Questions arose over a dues increase of \$20 per person to subsidize the journal and the importance of avoiding duplication with existing publications. Members agreed that it would be useful to poll the Division 48 membership regarding a journal, and this participatory method was subsequently employed. In keeping with a suggestion from Gary VandenBos to the executive committee, participants at the meeting decided to create a new publication, the *Peace Psychology Bulletin and Newsletter* (subsequently called *The Peace Psychology Bulletin*), which would be divided evenly between newsletter material (edited by Daniel Jordan and Julie Carvalho) and scholarly articles (edited by Milton Schwebel). The new publication was a stepping stone toward a journal. Ideally, the publication of scholarly papers would provide an interim outlet for research, help to define the field of peace psychology, establish peer review processes, and test the waters in regard to manuscript volume and the feasibility of starting a journal.

The *Peace Psychology Bulletin* fulfilled its promise and by fall 1992 was being published three times a year at a length of approximately 35 pages. Both the newsletter and scholarly articles were increasingly diverse and reflected work being done around the world. The *Bulletin* attracted articles from well-recognized scholars such as Ralph White (1992) and Ervin Staub

(1992), increasing the credibility of Division 48 publications. Equally important, it helped to expand the scope of peace psychology by publishing high-quality papers in diverse areas such as feminism and peace (McKay, 1992), environmental issues (Winter & McKenzie-Mohr, 1993), and ethnicity (Branch, 1992). In a tangible way, the division was now helping to move the field beyond its initial Cold War frame. Early in this initial foray into scholarly publishing, the division developed a policy, endorsed by the executive committee, of providing a constructive, humane review process that would employ rigorous standards but that would help authors to bring their work into publishable form.

### **Economic Support and Planning for the Journal**

The year 1992 was a watershed in the movement to establish a journal. Because limited finances posed the main obstacle to forming a journal, it was no small accomplishment when Milton Schwebel brought home a major gift of \$30,000 from a private donor—the first in the division's history—to be used in establishing a journal. The donor was Luella Buros, widow of Oscar Buros (of the *Buros Mental Measurements Yearbook*), who had worked with Schwebel at Rutgers University. Luella Buros had a passion for peace. In her April 22 letter of gift, she wrote, "I consider it a very special privilege and honor to be a founding contributor to such a highly significant and noble cause in behalf of world peace and understanding." In appreciation of her contribution, the members of the executive committee subsequently established (January 1994) a category of founding contributors to the journal for people who had contributed \$25,000 or more. The committee members also decided to recognize Luella Buros in perpetuity by designating her as founding contributor in writing near the front of each issue of the journal. In January 1994 Buros gave an additional \$20,000 in support of the journal. Luella Buros lived to see the start of the journal, and shortly before her death in June 1995 she endowed the journal through yet another major gift of \$50,000. It was thus Buros' generosity that enabled the establishment of a journal.

The August 1992 business meeting occasioned a lively discussion regarding the journal, which as a result of the initial Buros gift suddenly seemed to be more than a distant dream. It was suggested that the journal should be multidisciplinary, because issues of peace transcend the boundaries of any single discipline. Members also expressed a desire to publish a richer diversity of work than was characteristic of most psychology journals, including applied work on conflict resolution and peace education, reviews and classic contributions now seldom read, and work by clinicians, counselors, peace activists, and people in developing countries. Later that year, Schwebel (1992a, 1992b) published two important concept papers in which he argued that psychology has a responsibility to use its knowledge

and tools to prevent violence at levels ranging from the interpersonal to the international and that no existing peace journals reflected primarily the work of psychologists. Having noted the historic proportions of starting the first full psychology journal devoted to peace, he suggested that the journal should include theoretical, empirical, historical, and interpretive work and contributions from all corners of psychology and the world. This was not to be an academic journal having little relevance to the world. Also in 1992, the division launched an international search for the first editor of the planned journal.

On August 1, 1993, the publications committee consisting of Wessells (chair), Wagner, and Schofield brought forward a written framework of proposed policies, policy issues, and a set of financial models for the journal. Accepting the main elements of this document and making necessary revisions, at its August 1993 meeting the executive committee membership adopted an editorial policy that welcomed contributions from diverse peoples and nations, encompassed diverse kinds of work on peace, and invited work from related disciplines. It also adopted policies regarding the review process, the responsibilities of the editor, and the composition of the editorial board, which would include representatives from diverse geographic areas. The executive committee members unanimously selected as editor Milton Schwebel, who was invited to name several associate editors. The committee members also decided that the editor should receive a minimum of \$3,000 in financial support annually and that the dues increases associated with the establishment of the journal should be incremental rather than large steps that might be aversive to members.

Much less agreement existed, however, on the proposed journal's title, a key factor in defining the journal's identity, niche, and stature. Several publishers had suggested having a broad title that would be inviting to audiences outside psychology, and there were concerns about limiting the scope to war or to conditions of peace. Committee members agreed that peace psychology had much to say about the origins of conflict and the conditions that promote peace, and the title should reflect this. From among suggested titles such as *Journal of Peace Psychology* and *Peace, Conflict, and Psychology*, the committee members settled eventually on Wagner's suggestion, *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*.

Following the 1993 APA convention, the publications committee began the process of preparing a formal proposal for a Division 48 journal and ushering it through the APA, which required approval by the Publications and Communications Board, the Board of Directors, and then by the Council of Representatives. Having received valuable advice from Susan Knapp, director of APA Publications, and having conducted a survey of the literature, Michael Wessells wrote the proposal, which made the case that a respectable but scattered literature on peace psychology existed, that there ought to be a psychology journal focused specifically on peace

and conflict, and that the division had laid an appropriate foundation for the journal by means of the *Bulletin*. The case would have been difficult to refuse in light of the growing literature on peace and the fact that the division membership had followed nearly all of the suggestions made by Gary VandenBos 2 years earlier. In February 1994, the APA council members approved the establishment of the journal—the door was open for institutionalizing peace psychology in the scholarly literature.

### Selecting a Publisher

With the start-up date of January 1995, the division needed to find a suitable publisher. Although many possibilities had been explored, the two top prospects were the APA and Lawrence Erlbaum. The publications committee opened the dialogue with each publisher via a list of elements that the division wanted and then by means of an official request for proposals. In the subsequent negotiations, which extended throughout the spring, differences surfaced in the strengths and the arrangements offered by the two publishers. The APA (via its subsidiary, the Educational Publishing Foundation) was attractive because of its prestige, extensive journals list, and the strength of its publications office. Lawrence Erlbaum was attractive because it published and marketed in multiple disciplines, published major international journals in psychology, required a very low cash outlay by the division, and had a president (Lawrence Erlbaum) who showed a strong personal commitment to peace. Following extended exchanges between Wessells and the prospective publishers and a careful review of the financial implications of the decision (via a report from the publications committee of June 6, 1994), the executive committee members reviewed the offers by means of two telephone conferences and decided to sign with Lawrence Erlbaum. The incoming publications committee chair, Richard Wagner, obtained the final contracts, and Petra Hesse, as division secretary-treasurer, signed them on July 28, 1994. Concerned about rising costs to members, the executive committee members decided to use the Buros gift to subsidize the journal, thereby reducing members' expenses for the journal.

Through Milton Schwebel's stewardship, the new journal officially began publication in February 1995. With the front page listing a diverse and distinguished editorial board, 20% of whose members came from outside the United States, it was clear that the journal would have both prestige and international scope. Among other items, the initial issue included pieces by Federico Mayor, the secretary-general of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, an analysis of women in peace psychology (McKay, 1995), an examination of when armed intervention is justified (White, 1995), and a classic on the need for a morally condonable substitute for war by William James (1910–1995)

with a companion piece by Morton Deutsch (1995). Subsequent issues contained articles on topics such as peace education (Nelson & Christie, 1995), the Gulf War (Kelman, 1995), urban drug policy (Kahan, Rydell & Setear, 1995), sustainability (Kimmel, 1995), and political conflict resolution in the Philippines (Montiel, 1995), underscoring the wide scope of work within peace psychology. Several articles were written by scholars from disciplines outside psychology. To be sure, this is only the beginning, and much work remains to be done in areas such as attracting more female authors and including work done at the community level.

## CONCLUSION

No one would argue that the world would be a better place if peace were a permanent condition and peace psychology were obsolete. In the post-Cold War era, however, bitter conflicts such as those in Bosnia and Rwanda show that the need has never been greater for psychological analyses and interventions that contribute to peace, which is an essential component of human well-being. The very existence of the Division of Peace Psychology is a significant accomplishment, because it institutionalizes and legitimates work for peace. The establishment of the division signals that what psychologists do pertains to peace—peace psychology is *real* psychology, not a political activity to be pursued after hours.

Because Division 48 is still in its formative stage, it is too soon to tell what its long-term contributions and status will be. Yet its early accomplishments, particularly establishing the first journal in the field and developing a full convention program on peace, bode well for the future. Equally important is the value orientation and the process that Division 48 has established. There is concerted attention to issues of diversity, to the inclusion of people from local communities around the world, and to the need to enlarge the dialogue and the scope of work for peace. It will take many years for psychological work on peace to reach maturity. But peace psychology now has a strong and appropriate foundation, thanks in no small part to the work of Division 48.

## REFERENCES

- Appendix to the Minutes of the 1995 Winter Executive Committee Meeting. In Division 48 Archives, M. Wessells, Department of Psychology, Randolph-Macon College, Ashland, VA 23005.
- Boyer, D., & Swain, J. F. (1995, August). *Women's voice in peace psychology*. Poster presented at the 103rd Annual Convention of the APA, New York.

- Branch, C. (1992). Communities at peace: The same and different? *The Peace Psychology Bulletin*, 1(2), 4–5.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1961). The mirror image in Soviet–American relations: A social psychologist's report. *Journal of Social Issues*, 17(3), 45–58.
- Capshew, J. H., & Hilgard, E. R. (1992). The power of service: World War II and professional reform in the American Psychological Association. In R. B. Evans, V. S. Sexton, & T. C. Cadwallader (Eds.), *100 years: The American Psychological Association, a historical perspective* (pp. 149–175). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Deutsch, M. (1961). Some considerations relevant to national policy. *Journal of Social Issues*, 17(3), 57–68.
- Deutsch, M. (1973). *The resolution of conflict: Constructive and destructive processes*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Deutsch, M. (1983). The prevention of World War Three: A psychological perspective. *Political Psychology*, 4(1), 3–31.
- Deutsch, M. (1995). William James: The first peace psychologist. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 1(1), 27–35.
- Escalona, S. (1963). Children's responses to the nuclear war threat. *Children*, 10, 137–142.
- Frank, J. (1967). *Sanity and survival: Psychological aspects of war and peace*. New York: Random House.
- Galtung, J. (1969). Violence, peace and peace research. *Journal of Peace Research*, 3, 176–191.
- Greening, T. (1984). Commentary by the editor. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 24(3), 3–4.
- Jacobs, M. S. (1989). *American psychology in the quest for nuclear peace*. New York: Praeger.
- James, W. (1910–1995). The moral equivalent of war. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 1(1), 17–26.
- Kahan, J. P., Rydell, C. P., & Setear, J. (1995). A game of urban drug policy. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 1(3), 275–290.
- Kelman, H. C. (1954). Public opinion and foreign policy decisions: Some problems for research. *Bulletin of Research Exchange on Prevention of War*, 2(4), 2–8.
- Kelman, H. C. (Ed.). (1965). *International behavior: A social psychological analysis*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Kelman, H. C. (1972). The problem-solving workshop in conflict resolution. In R. L. Merritt (Ed.), *Communication in international politics* (pp. 168–204). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Kelman, H. C. (1995). Decision making and public discourse in the Gulf War: An assessment of underlying psychological and moral assumptions. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 1(2), 117–130.

- Kimmel, P. R. (1985). Learning about peace: Choices and the United States Institute of Peace as seen from two different perspectives. *American Psychologist*, 40(5), 536-541.
- Kimmel, P. R. (1992). Peace psychology, public policy and action. *The Peace Psychology Bulletin*, 1(1), 14-16.
- Kimmel, P. R. (1995). Sustainability and cultural understanding: Peace psychology as public interest science. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 1(2), 101-116.
- Kimmel, P. R., & Dane, L. (1993). Peace psychology and public interest science. *The Peace Psychology Bulletin*, 2(1), 10-12.
- Klineberg, O. (1956). The role of the psychologist in international affairs. *Journal of Social Issues* (Suppl. IX), 3-17.
- Klineberg, O. (1984). Public opinion and nuclear war. *American Psychologist*, 39(11), 1245-1253.
- Lifton, R. J. (1967). *Death in life: Survivors of Hiroshima*. New York: Random House.
- Mayor, F. (1995). How psychology can contribute to a culture of peace. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 1(1), 3-9.
- McKay, S. (1992). Feminism and peace psychology: Establishing connections. *The Peace Psychology Bulletin*, 1(3), 16-19.
- McKay, S. (1995). Women's voices in peace psychology: A feminist agenda. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 1(1), 67-84.
- McKenzie-Mohr, D., & Winter, D. (1992). The case for approaching global issues systemically: International security and environmental security. *The Peace Psychology Bulletin*, 1(1), 4-6.
- Milburn, T. W. (1961). The concept of deterrence: Some logical and psychological considerations. *Journal of Social Issues*, 17(1), 3-11.
- Montiel, C. J. (1995). Social psychological dimensions of political conflict resolution in the Philippines. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 1(2), 149-159.
- Morawski, J. G., & Goldstein, S. E. (1985). Psychology and nuclear war: A chapter in our legacy of social responsibility. *American Psychologist*, 40, 276-284.
- Murphy, G. (Ed.). (1945). *Human nature and enduring peace*. Cambridge, MA: Houghton-Mifflin.
- Nelson, L. L., & Christie, D. J. (1995). Peace in the psychology curriculum: Moving from assimilation to accommodation. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 1(2), 161-178.
- Osgood, C. E. (1962). *An alternative to war or surrender*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Petition for an APA Division of Peace Psychology. In Division 48 Archives, M. Wessells, Department of Psychology, Randolph-Macon College, Ashland, VA 23005.
- Pilisuk, M. (1994). An agenda for peace psychology. *The Peace Psychology Bulletin*, 2(1), 22-36.

- Pilisuk, M., & Hayden, T. (1965). Is there a military-industrial complex which prevents peace? Consensus and countervailing power in pluralistic systems. *Journal of Social Issues*, 21(3), 67–117.
- Polyson, J. (1992). Psychology and nuclear holocaust: The task before us. *The Peace Psychology Bulletin & Newsletter*, 1(2), 6–7.
- Samelson, F. (1979). Putting psychology on the map: Ideology and technology in intelligence testing. In A. R. Buss (Ed.), *Psychology in social context* (pp. 103–168). New York: Irvington.
- Schwebel, M. (1963). Students, teachers and the bomb. *National Education Association Journal*, 52, 46–48.
- Schwebel, M. (1965). Nuclear cold war: Student opinions and professional responsibility. In M. Schwebel (Ed.), *Behavioral science and human survival* (pp. 210–223). Palo Alto, CA: Science and Behavior Books.
- Schwebel, M. (1992a). A journal of peace psychology: A concept paper. *The Peace Psychology Bulletin & Newsletter*, 1(2), 4–7.
- Schwebel, M. (1992b). A journal of peace psychology: A concept paper II. *The Peace Psychology Bulletin*, 1(3), 26–30.
- Sims, G. M. (1995). *One part of the story as to how peace psychology found a place of its own in the American Psychological Association*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Sivard, R. L. (1991). *World military and social expenditures 1991* (14th ed.). Washington, DC: World Priorities.
- Smith, M. B. (1986). War, peace and psychology. *Journal of Social Issues*, 42(4), 23–38.
- Smith, M. B. (1992). Nationalism, ethnocentrism, and the new world order. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 32(4), 76–91.
- Staub, E. (1992). Turning against others: The origins of antagonism and group violence. *The Peace Psychology Bulletin & Newsletter*, 1(2), 11–14.
- Wagner, R. (1991). Report on establishing a journal of peace psychology. *The Peace Psychology Newsletter*, 1(3), 12–13.
- Wagner, R. (1992). Psychologists in pursuit of a division of peace psychology. *The Peace Psychology Bulletin*, 1(1), 9–12.
- Wagner, R. V., de Rivera, J., & Watkins, M. (Eds.). (1988). Psychology and the promotion of peace. *Journal of Social Issues*, 44(2), 1–219.
- Wessells, M. G. (1992a). The Cold War has ended but the nuclear threat has not. *The Peace Psychology Bulletin & Newsletter*, 1(2), 18–20.
- Wessells, M. G. (1992b). Building peace psychology on a global scale: Challenges and opportunities. *The Peace Psychology Bulletin & Newsletter*, 1(3), 31–44.
- Wessells, M. G. (1995). Social-psychological determinants of nuclear proliferation: A dual-process analysis. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 1(1), 49–65.
- White, R. K. (1970). *Nobody wanted war: Misperception in Vietnam and other wars*. New York: Doubleday/Anchor.

- White, R. K. (1984). *Fearful warriors: A psychological profile of U. S.-Soviet relations*. New York: Free Press.
- White, R. K. (Ed.). (1986). *Psychology and the prevention of nuclear war*. New York: New York University Press.
- White, R. K. (1992). The fear motive in twentieth century wars. *The Peace Psychology Bulletin*, 1(3), 1-13.
- White, R. K. (1995). When does intervention make sense? *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 1(1), 85-95.
- Winter, D., & McKenzie-Mohr, D. (1993). Toward a sustainable future: The role of psychology. *The Peace Psychology Bulletin*, 2(1), 16-19.
- Yankelovich, D., & Doble, J. (1986). The public mood: Nuclear weapons and the USSR. In R. K. White (Ed.), *Psychology and the prevention of nuclear war* (pp. 38-54). New York: New York University Press.