

Chapter 2

The Imbalance Between Knowledge Paradigms of North and South: Implications for Peace Psychology

Siew Fang Law and Diane Bretherton

Introduction

Peace psychology develops theories, methodologies, and practical approaches to address issues of conflict and violence and to promote peace. Grounded in the discipline of psychology, those who are identified as peace psychologists often find themselves having to navigate and negotiate multiple competing and, at times, contradictory demands and priorities. In particular, peace psychologists are expected to function within certain structures and systems. While knowledge making is one of their key contributions as peace psychologists, discussion of how peace psychologists are situated in systems of knowledge making is rare. Similarly, literature on how these systems of knowledge making might conflict with core values of peace is sparse.

Given that the 2015 Symposium on the Contributions of Psychology to Peace was held in the Southern part of the world, and much of the research literature in psychology comes from the North (Arnett, 2008), we used this opportunity to reflect on and examine knowledge domains and influences of the North and the South. We explored imbalances in knowledge that exist: what are some of the dilemmas and paradoxes confronting peace psychology in the past and present? How can we as peace psychologists address the imbalance as individuals and in our professional capacities?

This chapter addresses four themes. Firstly, recognising that peace psychology is grounded in the discipline of psychology, we deconstruct and problematise power inherent in the discipline. Secondly, through unpacking some of the history of

S.F. Law (✉)

College of Arts Australia, Victoria University, Melbourne, Australia

e-mail: Siewfang.law@vu.edu.au

D. Bretherton

University of Queensland, St Lucia, QLD, Australia

e-mail: d.bretherton@uq.edu.au

dominant psychological institutions, we explore how psychological knowledge from the North has impacted on and continues to influence the rest of the world. Thirdly, we examine the systems of knowledge making. We argue that systems perpetuate this power imbalance. Finally, we will discuss what peace psychologists might do, at personal and professional levels, to address the imbalances.

Power, Privilege, and Prestige Within Psychology

Unlike other disciplines, such as social work and community development, psychology has long been established as a “profession” and a “science” (Hergenhahn, 2009; Oshodi, 1996). The institutionalisation of psychology as a discipline has granted the psychologists a “brand” that comes with certain privileges, power, and prestige.¹ The American Psychological Association (APA)’s strategic plan goals are to “maximize the association’s organizational effectiveness, expand psychology’s role in advancing health and increase recognition of psychology as a science” (APA, 2015).

Being “scientists”, psychologists are expected to operate under a set of stringent expectations, regulations, and frameworks that are governed by organisations such as the APA and, in the Australian context, the Australian Psychological Society. The regulations aim to ensure a standardised high quality of ethical practice for all psychologists. While the protection of clients meets a genuine need, the creation of one dominant normative form can function to exclude other perspectives and marginalise psychologists from other regions.

Peace psychology, as recognised by the APA as Division 48s “Society for the Study of Peace, Conflict and Violence” in the USA, often finds itself confronted by various ideological, theoretical, methodological, and practical dilemmas and paradoxes. While aspiring to promote peace using non-competitive, collaborative, equal, and fair approaches, members of Division 48 need to fulfil certain requirements in order to obtain institutional support, formal recognition and credentials, and career opportunities. Gaining greater institutional recognition has direct implications for peace psychology. Establishing formally recognised course offerings, attracting student enrolments, and publishing research in recognised journals are important to the progress of the field of peace psychology. Without sufficient institutional support and formal recognition, peace psychology may not be considered to be “real” psychology. There is a dilemma in that processes of gaining institutional recognition and support might require psychologists to operate in ways that are competitive, economically-driven, hierarchical, and at times imperialistic.

¹ These are evidenced in advertisements of psychology courses and career paths. For example, <http://psychcentral.com/diff.htm>; <http://studyassist.gov.au/sites/studyassist/mytertiarystudyoptions/providers-that-offer-commonwealth-assistance/pages/heproviderprofile?title=The%20Cairnmillar%20Institute%20School%20of%20Psychology%20Counselling%20and%20Psychotherapy>.

A number of studies have reported that psychological research is dominated by North American scholarship (Cole, 2006; Denmark, 1998). Arnett's (2008) study found that some of the most influential psychological journals owned by the APA overwhelmingly reflect North American perspectives: 73 % of the first authors live and work in USA (an additional 14 % from other English-speaking countries and 11 % from Europe). A narrow range of humanity is being studied—most samples were USA undergraduate psychology students (Arnett, 2008). Taking into consideration the fact that Americans living in the USA only represent 5 % of the world's population, and that their way of life, social and political environment, culture, and economy are vastly different from the 95 % that constitutes the rest of the world's population, raises questions as to whether mainstream psychological theories apply to the entire human population. The claim that discipline of psychology is the “science of humanity” is therefore debatable.

The flagship journal of peace psychology, *Peace and Violence: Journal of Peace Psychology*, was not included in Arnett's (2008) review. Unlike the journals reviewed by Arnett, the *Journal of Peace Psychology* has a diverse representation of editors, reviewers, and authors and publishes international articles that look at a wide range of geo-locational contexts. Nevertheless, it remains the case that, because the field of peace psychology is situated in a structurally unequal playing field, peace psychologists are often confronted with ideological and practical dilemmas when producing and publishing their work.

Systems of Knowledge Making

Historically, psychological theory has been developed and influenced by affluent, educated scholars in the Northern part of the world, with roots in Europe and then predominately in the USA (Arnett, 2008). Mainstream psychology is often considered to be Eurocentric (Naidoo, 1996) and derived from a White middle-class value system (Katz, 1985). Key theorists from Europe and the USA, such as B. F. Skinner, Sigmund Freud, Erik Erikson, and Jean Piaget, appear on reading lists of psychology courses all over the world (Hergenhahn, 2009). While acknowledging their important contributions to the field of psychology, psychological knowledge from the North penetrates and dominates the work and imaginations of psychologists in the rest of the world.

Peace psychology has a similar historical pattern: notable scholars, such as William James, referred to by Morton Deutsch as the first peace psychologist (cited in Hergenhahn, 2009), Konrad Lorenz, Theodor Adorno, Irving Janis, Gordon Allport, John Burton, and Stanley Milgram, have contributed to psychological understandings of peace, conflict, and violence. Their work has been included in many peace and conflict studies curricula in North American and Western European institutions of higher education (Webel & Sotakova, 2012). Their knowledge has been used in teaching and cited in writing in other parts of the world.

Knowledge and mental models from societies of the Southern periphery exist, but are less well-known. In this chapter, the descriptions of “North” and “South” are used not as fixed sets of propositions, nor do they refer to physical geographical locations. They are used to signify the geopolitical systemic and structural inequality that exists across the globe. Connell (2007) describes Southern communities as those marginalised in the global sphere, including, but not limited to, people from Africa, South and Latin America, the Middle-East, South and South-West Asia, and Aboriginal Australia. These communities in the South share commonalities such as a history of colonisation. Their culture and societies are highly plural and hybridised. They represent some of the communities most impacted upon by colonisation, postcolonisation, and globalisation. They are often misunderstood and labelled as “other” and their intellectual work is under-represented in the mainstream media and the research literature.

Hence, knowledge is unequally and unfairly produced. It both reflects and creates privilege for some and is oppressive of others. Connell asserted that:

[t]he effects of a world economy of knowledge are structured by the history of colonialism and current north-south global inequalities. The differentiation of knowledge rests on the very different histories and situations of metropolitan, creole, colonized and postcolonial intelligentsias. Different knowledge projects have been constructed in global space, which feed back on our understanding of knowledge itself. Less recognized, but increasingly important, are uses of southern and post-colonial perspectives in applied social science (Connell & Dados, 2014, p. 117).

Systems of knowledge making (epistemologies) and of the way we construct reality (ontologies) are not only culturally bound in time and space, but are also embedded in power relations. Within such systems, knowledge is considered to be a “controlled substance” as it “is protected and manipulated by individuals and groups” (Leitko & Peterson, 1982, pp. 447–448). To maintain power and control, structures of knowledge making and knowledge dissemination are established. Increasingly, *credible* knowledge becomes something that can be possessed, patented, traded, ranked, and measured. These processes require governance of much larger and powerful regulatory groups or institutions. Through institutionalised incentives and disincentives, academics are now engaging in new subjectivities that are defined by a market-driven discourse. These neoliberal systems of knowledge production force academics to make *knowledge* that fits in the systems and structures that produce and reproduce prestige, power, and privilege (Cornell, 2014).

Knowledge systems of the North emphasise structure, logic, rationality, and linear thought processes (Trompenaars, 1993). These mental modalities are evidenced in many social and psychological practices, research approaches, and publication systems. This thinking orientation has been valued as “better” than approaches that have other structures and emphases.

In the competitive system of knowledge production, credentials from Northern universities are often accorded greater credibility and economic worth. Coupled with the rise and spread of English as a language of international communication (Harris, 2001), knowledge from the Anglophone regions, mainly from the USA, Canada, and the United Kingdom has greater circulation in the literature and

remains predominantly influential in disseminating psychological constructs, concepts, and approaches, compared to literature published in other languages.

Through promoting “psychology as a science”, the APA, for instance, established that certain knowledge, such as empirical findings, has greater value and economic worth than other forms of knowledge, such as Aboriginal dreaming and storytelling. A review of the history of psychology by Hergenhahn (2009) suggested that, since the APA was founded in 1892, pure, scientific psychology has been valued more than less-scientifically oriented psychology. Many forms of knowledge in the South, such as traditional folklore and spiritual rituals that are richly expressed in oral, visual, or ceremonial forms, receive lesser credence in mainstream psychology (Walker, 2015).

Language has a significant role in the functionality, communication, and dissemination of knowledge. Since the English language is a global language (Crystal, 2003; Graddol, 1997), academics in the English-speaking regions have been accorded greater prestige, power, and privilege than academics in non-English speaking regions. Knowledge produced in the English-speaking, White-dominated societies has dominated knowledge produced in non-English speaking regions. There are pockets of English speaking countries in the South, for example, in South Africa, Australia, and New Zealand, which can compete with their Northern counterparts to meet the “world standard” and achieve recognition in the “world ranking systems”.

Languages other than English have a unique intellectual tradition. The structure and functions of a native language do bear upon the ways in which some philosophical problems are posed and some ontological insights are shaped (Mou, 1996). Further discussion on the implications of language and the theory of language in the context of philosophy will be explored and examined in the next section of the chapter.

North–South Imbalance of Psychology Knowledge Making and Distribution

Contemporary, neoliberal approaches to knowledge production create, as Cornell (2007, 2014) suggests, a form of white-collar labour or workforce. Using a metaphoric example, she illustrates that indigenous knowledge from peripheral sites is usually treated as *raw data*. Once raw data has been *extracted* from the periphery and made into the form of knowledge projects, it is then *exported* and *processed* using the methods, theories, and assistance of *modern technology* invented and used by the knowledge workers in the North. *Processed* knowledge is then written in the language of the workers, *tested* (undergoes the scrutiny of peer reviews and feedback from editors, mostly in the North), then given credit as “quality knowledge”. The credence given to the processed knowledge gives greater status and prestige to the knowledge workers and manufactures (publishers and universities) than to those

who provide the *raw data*. New knowledge is then disseminated in *reputed* publications that may or may not reach or gain feedback from the South. At times, the “new” knowledge, which may be so processed that it is unrecognisable to the indigenous society, is imposed on the global South (Connell & Dados, 2014). This cycle essentially enriches and privileges a particular group of knowledge workers and their institutions, establishes a hegemonic practice, and in the process disempowers the South. The rise of corporate control over publishing and profit-making results in a concentration of influential topics and authors, situated in the North. Furthermore, credible knowledge requires a systematic and structured intellectual workforce and institutions to control space and manage its economic structure (i.e. income and ranking) and regulate production (i.e. accreditation and standardisation).

De Sousa Santos (2007), a critical theorist from the Southern periphery, echoes this sentiment and argues that the systems of knowledge making are products of colonisation and imperialism. Within this history of knowledge inequality, local and indigenous work produced in the Southern periphery, especially articles published in languages other than English, continue to be marginalised from the dominant knowledge systems. Despite the importance and relevance of local knowledge, their publications rarely meet the *standard* set by those in the North. As a result, much of the literature of the Global South remains largely unknown in the North, further widening the North–South imbalance (Maluf, 2014; Mellor, 2015).

“There has been certainly, and unfortunately—for colonialist reasons and legacies—a disproportion of white scholars on many levels of study fields, African studies included” (Hassan, 2015, n.p.). At the time of writing this chapter, we found very little literature that covered psychology from Africa. Among the references, we found the term “African Psychology” or “Black Psychology”, which is essentially referring to African American Psychology (Belgrave & Allison, 2010; Holliday, 2009; Oshodi, 1996). Journals such as *Journal of Modern African Studies* are dominated by editors from the North (of the 26 members on the Editorial Boards, 22 are in the USA, UK and Europe, only four editors are from Africa). The *Journal of Psychology in Africa* is no longer published in Africa. Instead, for the last decade, it has been published in the USA. Once we came to South Africa (as part of the Peace Psychology Symposium), we found there is a vibrant critical psychology footprint. However, the local (to South Africa) journals, such as the *South African Journal of Psychology*, the *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology*, and the *African Safety and Peace Promotion Journal of Injury and Violence Protection* did not receive adequate recognition from the North. The *Journal of Black Studies* loudly asserts that it “offers important and intellectually provocative articles exploring key issues facing African Americans” (Journal of Black Studies website) and its main publications are articles focusing on the African–American context.

At the time of writing the chapter, we heard the protests of a collective Somali academics on Facebook and Twitter to a newly launched Somali journal entitled *Somaliland Journal of African Studies* (SJAS), a peer-reviewed scholarly journal that claims a particular focus on East Africa, but has no Somali acting as an editor, advisory board member, or contributor. Somalian academics turned to the social media to voice their discontent. As Hassan (2015) notes, “twitter activism is nothing new...people used social media to deconstruct the privilege within academia while

connecting communities internationally, strengthening the message that black voices will no longer be undervalued in African and Black studies” (n.p.). Markus Hoehne, a White German anthropologist and a co-editor of *SJAS*, responded to the critique of his academic journal on social media. Hassan (2015) reports that Hoehne insisted “there is a general absence of Somalis in academia because they don’t seem to value scholarship. He went on to claim that this issue would subside if Somalis were willing to do the work” (Hassan, n.p.).

We have focused our discussion of the South on Africa, but of course the arguments apply equally to other parts of the South, such as South and Latin America. Maluf, a prominent educational psychologist from Brazil, who publishes her work in the Portuguese language, called for greater balance between the Global North and South (2014). In one of her recent studies that involved interviews with prominent psychology academics across South America, she found that, due to the cost of accessing literature and academic databases, many academics in South America have limited access to international academic literature and research materials. Moreover, due to English not being their first language, many academics find it difficult to get their work accepted and published in English language journals. Most of their research findings were published in their first language and non-English publications that are not widely distributed to and accessed by academics and students across the globe (Maluf, 2014). This has direct implications for the ways they contribute to new knowledge. Through measurements of citations, impact factors, and rankings, their work would be considered to be less rigorous, influential, and significant than their English-language colleagues in the North.

Due to geopolitical and historical differences, psychology from the South has unique and different, but equally important, knowledge as the North. Montero (2015) asserts that a number of key philosophers from the South America region could contribute to the understanding of Peace Psychology. For example, Enrique Dussel’s concept of *analectic* (1985, 1988) is a vital philosophy in diversity and inclusion of “others”. It “expands and enriches one’s totality, with aspects coming from beyond what one considers as our usual reality” (Montero, 2015, p. 159). The ‘Others’ include those rejected or ignored or marginalised from society’s benefits. *Analectic* theory emphasises the co-existence of “I”, “you”, and “they” in a balanced ecosystem. The exclusion of “others” impoverishes the “I” as well as the relationship. According to Montero,

Analectic is a method working for equality, promoting the rights of people and constructing balance in society. Those conditions mean the right observation of two of the most violated aspects regarding peace. This method by putting aside privileges and searching the respect of others, also produce liberating ways of living, opposing exclusions (2015, p.n.).

Neoliberal,² market-driven, globalisation of knowledge production (Cornell, 2014; Epstein & Morrell, 2012) reinforces the domination of privilege and exclusivity in the urban culture of the North. Increasingly, contemporary psychologists operate to maintain their exclusive and privileged status through adopting statistics

²Neoliberalism is generally understood as “a system of ideas circulated by a network of right-wing intellectuals, or an economic system mutation resulting from crises of profitability in capitalism. Both interpretations prioritize the global North” (Connell & Dados, 2014, p. 117).

as a main tool of analysis and by considering only that which is quantifiable. Situated in the space and place of knowledge production superiority, academics often have little option but to continue re-producing knowledge toward the “unshakable hegemony of the historical, philosophical and sociological” privilege (De Sousa Santos, 2009, p. 103). The problem is not that academics do not try to be peaceful, but that they themselves are trapped in a Northern mind-set and unable to see beyond its limitations. Because science functions on the assumption that reduction of the complexities of natural phenomena is a necessary condition for conducting scientific research, the system distrusts the evidence of immediate experience which is based on common knowledge—the “others”. Knowledge from the Southern peripheries continues to be considered as rough, derivative, and inferior and, therefore, excluded.

Psychologists, in particular peace psychologists, need to rethink and be conscious of the limitations and exclusivity of paradigms we are operating within. If we continue operating within superior, privileged, and exclusive paradigms, we will no longer have sufficient criticality to fully understand the increasingly complex world, where boundaries are blurred and cultures are hybrid. De Sousa Santos (2009) cites Goody who asserts that it is only through understanding global history that academics are able to unveil the unequal intellectual playing field in contemporary societies and avoid falling in the trap of postcolonialism and postmodernism. It is only to the extent that Eurocentrism is superseded that scholars will be able to produce knowledge more accurately on the epistemological level, and more progressively on the social, political, and cultural levels. Only this kind of history will allow the world to recognise itself in its indefinite diversity, which includes the infinite diversity of similarities and continuities as well.

Worldviews. While history prescribes contemporary world politics, James (1892–1985) once said that the single most informative thing one could know about oneself or an individual is understanding his or her *Weltanschauung* (worldview) (Lamberth, 1999). This epistemological question has been explored by many scholars, including Foucault (1972). Different worldviews present different “realities” and “truths” to individuals and groups.

A worldview is a way of describing the universe and life within it, both in terms of what is and what ought to be. A given worldview is a set of beliefs that includes limiting statements and assumptions regarding what exists and what does not... what objects or experiences are good or bad, and what objectives, behaviours and relationships are desirable or undesirable... (Koltko-Rivera, 2004, p. 4).

Our worldviews and belief systems profoundly define the nature of reality (ontology), the nature of knowing reality (epistemology), the role of belief systems in the inquirers, and the types of tools that are used to obtain knowledge (methodology) (Guba & Lincoln, 1994). As Koltko-Rivera (2004) suggests, “worldviews include assumptions that may be unproven, or even unprovable, but these assumptions are superordinate, in that they provide epistemic and ontological foundations for other beliefs within a belief system” (p. 4).

Realities are “mental constructions, socially and experientially based, local and specific, dependent for their form and content on the persons who hold them” (Guba, 1990, p. 27). In this notion, realities are relative or emic as opposed to universal or etic. As the values of participants are part and parcel of their reality construction, excluding participants from the Southern peripheries could be a form of structural violence in knowledge production.

Worldviews are expressed in discourses that have particular formation of language, conveyance of meaning, and use of knowledge. Therefore, language is essential to the imposition, establishment, and functioning of the cultural hegemony that influences what and how people think about themselves and their place in a society.

The concept of an ecology of knowledge was introduced by De Sousa Santos (2007, 2009). This ecology describes the inter-dependent nature of different spheres within the knowledge ecosystem. The ecological approach to knowledge offers a unique perspective to understand unequal power relations and hierarchy. It highlights the importance of having, supporting, and maintaining plurality and diversity of knowledge as keys for global–local sustainable development.

Language. Foucault (1972) states that language and power play significant roles in constructing realities, rather than thinking of reality as something that is there, waiting to be discovered. English has often been portrayed as a global language (Crystal, 1998; Jambor, 2007). Already influential from the British Empire from the seventeenth to mid-twentieth Century, the dominance of English language has been extended by American media and technology (Graddol, 1997). The growing economic and cultural influence of the USA and its status as a global superpower since the Second World War has significantly accelerated the spread of the language around the world (Graddol, 1997). It is also accepted that English is the global *lingua franca*, or a language most utilised for international communication between and among language communities (Jambor, 2007). Nevertheless, the notion that English is the language of all the people of the globe is flawed; English is not the official language of the world. English is the third most spoken native language in the world, after Mandarin Chinese and Spanish (Crystal, 1998).

With approximately 2500 languages (or 30 % of the world’s living languages), Africa is one of the most linguistically diverse continents (Ndhlovu, 2008). “All the languages of Africa invoke ontological and epistemological” realities (Zelena, 2006; cited in Ndhlovu, 2008). As Zelena noted, “language is the carrier of a people’s culture, it embodies their system of ethics and aesthetics, and it is a medium for producing and consuming knowledge, a granary of their memories and imaginations” (cited in Ndhlovu, 2008, p. 20). In the context of Africa, it was known that knowledge is conveyed using proverbs, symbolisms, metaphors, and poetic expressions (Oshodi, 1996; White, 1970). Their practices of psychology and psychotherapy predate the Greek, Roman, and Hebrew traditions in which much of the contemporary psychology has been rooted (Oshodi, 1996; Tay, 1984).

Nevertheless, there is a lack of academic research that recognises the values of Africa’s rich language resources (Ndhlovu, 2008). Mainstream academic literature tends to associate the plurality of African languages with problems, such as socio-economic

backwardness, ethnic conflicts, civil unrest, political tensions, under-development, and poverty. Often, literature links one-language policy with economic prosperity and political stability (Ndhlovu, 2008). The denial of African literature goes so far that some scholars from the North have claimed “there is no ethics in Africa” (Murove, 2014, p. 36).

What is absent in mainstream discourse is the understanding that multilingualism could be an asset as well as a fundamental human right:

[w]hen one looks at language, one would see hundreds, perhaps, thousands of years of experience; a people experiencing life on earth where they interacted among themselves, with outsiders and with the environment. These forms of interactive engagements among themselves and with nature allow people to develop an array of wisdoms, ways of coping with the environment and strategies of survival, all of which are preserved and transmitted through the medium of language (Ndhlovu, 2008, p. 143).

Ubuntu

Hence, when denying and rejecting the plurality of languages in Africa, “it is the accumulated wisdoms that die” (Ndhlovu, 2008, p. 143). One of the fundamental, age-old African philosophies for ethics and peace—*Ubuntu*—has, after many years of marginalisation, surfaced in English language academic literature of mainstream ethical discourses. *Ubuntu* is based on the worldview of rationality. It describes the essence of being human, or humanness, that human beings cannot function in isolation. Instead, human beings thrive in communities. *Ubuntu* suggests that people must live with others in a spirit of respect, generosity, and trust; treat other people with kindness, compassion and care; and live in a way that improves the community around them. The concept of *Ubuntu* inspires sharing and co-operation between individuals, cultures, and nations, instead of possessiveness, competitiveness, and self-interest (Murry, 2013). “*Ubuntu* is part and parcel of the post-colonial quest for a rebirth of an African identity” (Murove, 2014, p. 37). Language is fundamental to one’s identity and thought systems, and African logic is interwoven with religious, socio-cultural, and metaphysical worldviews. African thought processes and languages are largely embedded with myths, metaphors, proverbs, and idioms. Tragically, the *Ubuntu* virtue of collaboration and collectivism has been denied and rejected by a number of scholars based in the global North. For example, Wim van Binsbergen, a Dutch anthropologist, trivialised *Ubuntu* and reduced it to “a remote etic reconstruction” (Murove, 2014, p. 37). A scholar in African Philosophy, at the University of Münster, Germany, Stephen Theron, condemns *Ubuntu* as primitive, tribalism, a formula for under-development of society for its lack of emphasis on individual responsibility. The colonised, individualist approach to humanness has been equated to self-interest, social-economic and capitalist models of humanness, which is incompatible with *Ubuntu*. “Colonisation uses distortion and destruction to achieve total occupation and exploitation” through neoliberalism, colonisation of language and value systems, human relations, and thought processes of the Global South

(Murove, 2014, p. 41). Until today, African notions of ethics remain marginalised in most of the education systems in South Africa and modules on ethics have largely been sourced from Eurocentric literature (Murove, 2014). Tension between the traditional African wisdom of communal relations and the colonial “scientific” understanding of individualistic human relations is an echo of the colonisation of Africa:

The ethic of Ubuntu was denigrated by colonial scholarship as an ethic that was mainly a phenomenon of human primitivity, as an expression of infantile behaviour, and equally a manifestation of an infliction of dependency complex syndrome. The conviction amongst colonial scholars who were too excited and intoxicated by Charles Darwin’s theory of evolution was based on the idea that communal ethic and communal existence was nothing else but an expression of primitivism which ought to be conquered by an ethic of individualism which has been the main reason behind the rise of western civilization (Murove, 2014, p. 38).

The status quo of psychology has been increasingly contested by field practitioners around the world (Katz, 1985; Naidoo, 1996) who have “appealed to the profession to re-examine and re-evaluate the theory and practice base of psychology and its sub-disciplines” (Naidoo, 1996, p. 16).

Implications for Peace Psychology

The conceptual implications for peace psychology and peace psychologists are profound. Epistemology, the study of the nature of knowledge, is fundamental to the endeavour to build the discipline of psychology. It casts a light on the essence of what we do, whether we are researchers, teachers, students, or practitioners of psychology. Many peace psychologists will have experienced criticism from colleagues to the effect that peace values water down the rigour of the discipline, or that advocacy has no place in science. However, the discussion of knowledge paradigms points to the way in which even positivist psychology is being restricted by a Northern worldview, with cultural and economic, rather than scientific boundaries. The fundamental belief in the nature of science as being open to new discoveries and perspectives is being lost to a market-driven discourse. The schism between peace values and academic excellence can be reconciled. Peace values push us to be more open to other paradigms and ways of looking at the world, which expand our knowledge paradigm and increase the sample of the human population that is being investigated. Hence, what peace psychologists can do about the imbalance of North and South is to continue with their efforts, and be encouraged to know that they have a strong epistemological rationale, as well as an ideology of peace to provide a solid ground for their work. They can be more sensitive and mindful in the partnerships they create across the North-South divide. Peace psychology has begun to use more diverse methods that are open to other voices, knowledge paradigms, forms of data, and interpretation (Bretherton & Law, 2015). Also, technological advances are helping to provide data from different parts of the world, which meet scientific standards, such as reliability and validity, but are less “framed” by the researcher than

was the case in earlier studies. Examples of such methods would be the use of Photovoice (Seedat, Suffla, & Bawa, 2015) or data mining (Montiel, Boller, & Galvez, 2015).

When examining peace in a global–local context, it is necessary for peace psychologists to do some hard thinking about our own acquired knowledge, the way we produce and reproduce knowledge, and what other forms of knowledge have been marginalised and relegated to “non-existence”. We need to begin by deconstructing knowledge and systems of knowledge and actively engage in critical thinking, reflexivity, and action, so we do not become passive recipients and re-producers of colonial values.

For many years, psychological contributions to peace and conflict studies have incorporated various psychological theories, methods, and research findings. To promote peace through the work we do, peace psychologists call for the need to conduct research peacefully and to be sensitive to local, cultural, and geopolitical context (e.g. Bretherton & Balvin, 2012; Christie, 2006). Peace psychology researchers are encouraged to enact peaceful values such as respect, listening to understand, and embodying peace values in the design, implementation, and evaluation of practical interventions and research projects. Field projects often attempt to address the inherent privilege and power of psychologists and its impact on those they work with (e.g. Balvin, 2015; Wessells, 2015). Peace psychologists are encouraged to explore and use unconventional psychological theoretical frameworks and paradigms to fully understand peace, conflict, and violence (Mellor, 2015; Walker, 2015). They have also called for more critical, reflective, and integrated methodological approaches (Onwuegbuzie & Tashakkori, 2015). Research methods and data analysis approaches often consider plural perspectives and link multiple levels (Mellor, 2015; Webel & Sotakova, 2012).

Through a conscious effort by peace psychologists from the North to reach out to psychologists from other parts of the globe, the community of peace psychologists has become increasingly diverse and has grown to include more psychologists and psychological knowledge from the South. Peace psychology is at the forefront advocating for different paradigms, models, and methods to represent reality from the vantage point of the oppressed (Soon, Smith, & Meyers, 2015). This has been echoed in the literature as: postcolonial psychology (Duran & Duran, 1995), decolonisation (Fanon, 1952, 1964), humanistic psychology (Schneider, Pierson, & Bugenta, 2014), and a call to contextualise and indigenise psychology (Kim & Berry, 1993; Kim & Park, 2004).

To counter the force of unequal knowledge making, peace psychologists need to be reflexive and aware of our own socio–political positioning, worldviews and, hence, our own assumptions and practices. It is through continually unpacking and de-constructing ideas that we can become more aware of the “knowns” and “unknowns”, as well as the subjective and objective implications of our actions and contributions to the complex world. To do this, peace psychologists could employ analectic methods to detect our deep-seated subjectivities and the biases in our consciousness. Processes, such as naturalisation, habituation, and alienation, have

implications for privilege and oppression (Montero, 2015). These processes are about engaging in dialogue, openness to others, asking critical questions, and problematising ideas and situations that are taken for granted.

There are a number of small and practical actions that peace psychologists can take to bridge the gap. As we have said, the first and most important implication is the need for peace psychologists to be aware of the power imbalances that exist and to reflect on their own position in the knowledge making system. By being part of a diverse community, they can work together to build a better understanding of different paradigms and expand their knowledge of the world.

Secondly, we should put in greater effort into engaging in dialogue with a diverse group of people. It is easier to have dialogue with people who are similar to us, in terms of age, language, culture, religion, politics, school of thought, or ideology. Individuals who are more similar to us are usually closer, easier to work with, and more accessible than individuals who are more different or foreign, such as our enemies, competitors, and those who simply may not “exist” in our cognition. We could learn a lot about ourselves, “them”, and the relationships between “I” and “them” when we are prepared to open and shared spaces, ideas and worldviews, and address questions that we may be unable to answer in separate silos. Due to a history of distrust, engaging in dialogue with the others may require patience, time, and effort. Hence, we could be conscious of any feeling of superiority, put aside our sense of entitlement, and approach others with humility, humbleness, and respect. We could visit places, spaces, and cultures that differ from our own. We should not limit our imagination only to travelling to foreign countries; we could also explore places within our own neighbourhoods. Most societies have pockets of communities that have a congregation of newly arrived migrants, refugees, gays and lesbians, indigenous and religious backgrounds, as well as disadvantaged communities such as the homeless and disabled communities. The embodied experience in places and spaces of vulnerability and less-in-control contexts could provoke thinking, openness, flexibility, and critical reflections. Through “forging professional and personal links with committed individuals and associations in the diaspora may provide important sources of support and research collaboration” (Naidoo, 1996, p. 19).

Thirdly, we could learn another language. Acquiring another language could help us better understand different worldviews and perspectives. Language and semantic grammar show different logical structures and priorities in society. Moreover, learning to write in another language gives us an embodied experience of being in a less powerful position—as a learner, rather than an expert. Writing and publishing in a second, less fluent language could be challenging, but this experience allows us to understand and embody the perspectives of the vulnerable. It forces us to think outside the square and operate beyond our comfort zone. The experience of learning another language could also make us better, more effective, and more humble teachers, writers, reviewers, and editors.

In the fourth place, we could be more proactive in embracing the qualities of peacemakers (Bretherton & Bornstein, 2003), such as optimism, recognising the contradictions in nature, valuing the interconnectedness of humanity and the world,

and being less egocentric in our work. Individually and collectively (as a community of peace psychologists), we need to be resilient when confronted by ongoing forces and pressures that promote inequality and injustice in the macro systems and structures.

At a professional level, we could, in the fifth place, initiate more collaborative projects that consist of team members across disciplines, school of thoughts, regions, cultures, languages, and ages. Diversity brings new knowledge and creativity. It gives a more balanced perspective to ideas and approaches to problems. While science has dominated psychological research and thinking, perhaps peace psychologists could consider also embracing other modalities and approaches, including philosophy, spirituality, religion, cultural studies, anthropology, arts, and language in peace psychology research. Examples of collaborations include co-teaching, co-researching, co-authoring, and co-editing work.

In the sixth place, we could encourage greater representation of academics in the South in editorial and reviewing processes. Editors determine the types of knowledge and define the quality of knowledge to be accepted in publications. Taking into consideration that editors have authority and power as gatekeepers in publishing, they could ensure reviewing and editing processes that have reviewers and editors who represent different regions as well as different language groups.

In the seventh place, we could continue to encourage and promote the creation of broader avenues for academic publication, including open source journals. Market-driven academic publishers dominate the knowledge-sharing systems of the Northern hegemony. Often, academics are forced to publish with narrowly defined “recognised” publishers. At times, authors are required to pay fees in order to get their articles published. Hard copies of psychology textbooks are extremely costly, yet, the electronic copies of books and articles are charged per download. Knowledge is, hence, for sale at a price that many cannot afford. We could also initiate publications that consider diverse expressions, such as writing genre (i.e. use of first-person voice, reflections, poems, creative, and metaphoric expressions), languages (i.e. in languages other than English), and art forms. These diverse approaches to expressing knowledge and ideas should be recognised at institutional levels. As academics who produce work in this way are not regarded and promoted in the same way as conventional, English-language academics, we, peace psychologists, need to be active in advocating for structural changes in academia.

As an eighth point, organising symposia and conferences in the less-represented regions can help address the imbalance. The Committee for the Psychological Study of Peace (CPSP) does very well in ensuring that its biennial symposia are held in places and regions that have rich knowledge and cultures, but are less well-represented in the academic world. Due to different economic and political opportunities, the theorists from the Southern periphery often do not have the same opportunities to engage and contribute knowledge and exchange ideas through attending and participating at international conferences. CPSP has hosted Symposia on the Contributions of Psychology to Peace not only in the Northern, but also in the Southern peripheries. There is a norm to ensure regional participation and a balanced and equitable representation from the world of peace psychology.

Ninth, while many conventional academic conferences are useful for academics in sharing research findings and knowledge and for networking purposes, conference topics are often narrowly defined and programmes are highly structured. We could more fully embrace the concept of social entrepreneurship in the work we do. This would entail being proactive in hosting and running more innovative knowledge-sharing spaces and places; professional development seminars that focus on how to support academics and early career researchers to deal with undesirable systemic and structural academic pressures; and workshops, modelled on the community café, that promote the use of alternative avenues of publishing academic research findings (e.g. legitimate open source journals, short-listing of publishers that promote social justice and equality).

Lastly, recognition should be given to innovative social entrepreneurs, activists, and academics who have made positive change in the field. They are the unsung heroes of academia. Their achievements and successes are focused on supporting others and are not measured using the individualistic mainstream academic indexes and ranking systems. They may not be those recognised psychology researchers with long lists of first-authored publications. They are those who resist the systemic and structural pressures, are willing to put in extra time and effort to assist, and empower and give opportunities to students and colleagues who otherwise would be marginalised or pushed out in the competitive field. Many of these are excellent educators and mentors and have qualities that are of utmost value to all academicians and students, yet unfortunately they do not receive a well-deserved amount of recognition in the mainstream systems. In the process of addressing North–South imbalances, we should not forget to recognise and acknowledge the work of individuals who have “worked behind the scenes” for many years.

Conclusion

The experience of the 2015 Peace Symposium in South Africa was a reminder that peace psychologists from across the world share experiences and that global trends and events play an important role in shaping human thought and action. Peace psychology has moved from considering only individuals and concerns itself with collective bodies such as communities and societies. Thinking more globally, contrasting the role of North and South in the generation of knowledge also reminds us that peace psychologists need to be more aware of global dynamics. Working within an ecology of knowledge, the different levels of understanding and intervention need to be linked to each other, rather than considered in isolation.

Peace psychologists have been proactive in promoting peace at different levels and in various ways. Due to our psychological training, backgrounds, identities, and socio-political positioning, many peace psychologists carry historical baggage and need to take care to not reproduce colonial processes. Through interrogating the notions of unequal knowledge production and distribution as structural violence, and critical reflection on our roles as researchers and knowledge producers, peace

psychologists can move forward in a way that meets the values of sound scholarship and effective peace. Small but powerful actions can give peace psychologists an extra edge and perspective. It is through consciousness, deliberation, and strategic activism that contemporary scholars can swim against the currents of inequality in knowledge-making systems and reach a more comprehensive understanding of humanity.

References

- American Psychological Association (APA). (2015). Retrieved November 2, 2014, from <http://www.apa.org/about/index.aspx>
- Arnett, J. (2008). The neglected 95%: Why American psychologists need to become less American. *American Psychologist*, 63(7), 602–614.
- Balvin, N. (2015). Translating psychological research into policy, advocacy and programmes in international development. In D. Bretherton & S. F. Law (Eds.), *Methodologies in peace psychology: Peace research by peaceful means* (pp. 361–380). New York: Springer.
- Belgrave, F. Z., & Allison, K. W. (2010). Introduction to African American psychology. In F. Z. Belgrave & K. W. Allison (Eds.), *African American psychology: From Africa to America* (2nd ed., pp. 1–25). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bretherton, D., & Balvin, N. (2012). *Peace psychology in Australia*. New York: Springer.
- Bretherton, D., & Bornstein, J. (2003). The qualities of peacemakers: What can we learn from Nobel Peace Prize Winners about managing conflict? In W. J. Pammer & J. Killian (Eds.), *Handbook of conflict management* (pp. 33–49). New York: Marcel Dekker.
- Bretherton, D., & Law, S. F. (2015). *Methodologies in peace psychology: Peace research by peaceful means*. New York: Springer.
- Christie, D. J. (2006). What is peace psychology the psychology of? *Journal of Social Issues*, 62, 1–18.
- Cole, M. (2006). Internationalization in psychology: We need it now more than ever. *American Psychology*, 61, 904–917.
- Connell, R. (2007). *Southern theory: Social science and the global dynamics of knowledge*. Crows Nest, NSW, Australia: Allen & Unwin.
- Connell, R., & Dados, N. (2014). Where in the world does neoliberalism come from? The market agenda in southern perspective. *Theory and Society*, 43(2), 117–138.
- Crystal, D. (1998). *English as a global language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- De Sousa Santos, B. (2007). Beyond abyssal thinking: From global lines to ecologies of knowledges. *Review (Fernand Braudel Center)*, 30(1), 45–89.
- De Sousa Santos, B. (2009). A non-occidentalist west? Learned ignorance and ecology of knowledge. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 26(7–8), 103–125.
- Denmark, F. L. (1998). Women and psychology: An international perspective. *American Psychologist*, 53, 465–473.
- Duran, E., & Duran, B. (1995). *Native American postcolonial psychology*. New York: SUNY Press.
- Epstein, D., & Morrell, R. (2012). Approaching southern theory: Explorations of gender in South African education. *Gender and Education*, 24(5), 469–482.
- Fanon, F. (1952). Black skin white mask: The experience of a black man in a white world (C. Markmann, Trans.). New York: Grove Press.
- Fanon, F. (1964). Wretched of the earth: A Negro psychoanalysts study of the problem of racism and colonialism in the world today (C. Farrington, Trans.). New York: Grove Press.
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge*. New York: Pantheon Books.

- Graddol, D. (1997). *The future of English? A guide to forecasting the popularity of the English language in the 21st century*. London: British Council.
- Guba, E. G. (1990). *The paradigm dialog*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 105-117). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Harris, D. G. (2001). English as international language in geography: Development and limitations. *Geographical Review*, 91(4), 675-689.
- Hassan, H. (2015). A Somali journal launched without any Somali editors, igniting a debate on white privilege. Retrieved April 20, 2015, from <https://www.vice.com/read/somali-journal-launches-without-any-somali-voices-highlighting-another-case-of-white-privilege-in-academia>
- Hergenhahn, B. R. (2009). *An introduction to the history of psychology* (6th ed.). Belmont: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Holliday, B. G. (2009). The history and vision of African American psychology: Multiple pathways to place, space, and authority. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 15(4), 317-337.
- Jambor, P. Z. (2007). English language imperialism—Points of view. *Journal of English as an International Language*, 2, 103-123.
- Katz, J. (1985). The sociopolitical nature of counselling. *The Counselling Psychologist*, 13, 615-624.
- Kim, U., & Berry, J. W. (1993). *Indigenous psychologies: Experience and research in cultural context*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Kim, U., & Park, Y. S. (2004). Indigenous psychologies. In C. Spielberger (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of applied psychology* (pp. 263-269). Oxford: Elsevier Academic Press.
- Koltko-Rivera, M. E. (2004). The psychology of worldviews. *Review of General Psychology*, 8, 3-58.
- Lamberth, D. C. (1999). William James and the metaphysics of experience: James's radically empiricist Weltanschauung. In D. C. Lamberth (Ed.), *Cambridge studies in religion and critical thoughts* (pp. 9-60). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Leitko, T. A., & Peterson, S. A. (1982). Social exchange in research: Toward a 'new deal'. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 18, 447-462.
- Maluf, M. R. (2014, July 10). Psychology in Latin-American countries: Innovation, trends and barriers. Transversal keynote lecture. In *28th International Congress of Applied Psychology, Paris*.
- Mellor, D. (2015). Postcolonial research. In D. Bretherton & S. F. Law (Eds.), *Methodologies in peace psychology: Peace research by peaceful means* (pp. 177-198). New York: Springer.
- Montero, M. (2015). Philosophies of participation: Analectic and consciousness methods. In D. Bretherton & S. F. Law (Eds.), *Methodologies in peace psychology: Peace research by peaceful means* (pp. 223-236). New York: Springer.
- Montiel, C., Boller, A., & Galvez, F. L. (2015). Using the internet and social media in peace psychology research. In D. Bretherton & S. F. Law (Eds.), *Methodologies in peace psychology: Peace research by peaceful means* (pp. 345-357). New York: Springer.
- Mou, B. (1996). The structure of the Chinese language and ontological insights: A collective-noun hypothesis. *Philosophy East and West*, 49(1), 45-62.
- Murove, M. F. (2014). Ubuntu. *Diogenes*, 59(3-4), 36-47.
- Murry, P. (2013). *260 fingers and the philosophy of Ubuntu*. Retrieved June 8, 2015, from <http://www.paulamurray.ca/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/260-Fingers-and-the-Philosophy-of-Ubuntu.pdf>
- Naidoo, A. V. (1996). Challenging the hegemony of Eurocentric psychology. *Journal of Community and Health Sciences*, 2(2), 9-16.
- Ndhlovu, F. (2008). Language and African development: Theoretical reflections on the place of languages in African studies. *Nordic Journal of African Studies*, 17(2), 137-151.

- Onwuegbuzie, T., & Tashakkori, A. (2015). Utilizing integrated methods for research in peace psychology. In D. Bretherton & S. F. Law (Eds.), *Methodologies in peace psychology: Peace research by peaceful means* (pp. 115–138). New York: Springer.
- Oshodi, J. E. (1996). The place of spiritualism and ancient Africa in American psychology. *Journal of Black Studies*, 27(2), 172–182.
- Schneider, K. J., Pierson, J. F., & Bugenta, J. F. T. (2014). *The handbook of humanistic psychology: Theory, research, and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Seedat, M., Suffla, S., & Bawa, U. (2015). Photovoice as emancipatory praxis: A visual methodology towards critical consciousness and social action. In D. Bretherton & S. F. Law (Eds.), *Methodologies in peace psychology: Peace research by peaceful means* (p. 309). New York: Springer.
- Soon, C., Smith, K., & Meyers, K. (2015). Challenging structural violence through community drama: Exploring theatre as transformative praxis. In D. Bretherton & S. F. Law (Eds.), *Methodologies in peace psychology: Peace research by peaceful means* (pp. 293–308). New York: Springer.
- Tay, A. L. (1984). Psychology in black Africa. *UNESCO Courier*, 37, 11–14.
- Trompenaars, F. (1993). *Riding the waves of culture*. London: Nicholas Brealey.
- Walker, P. (2015). Indigenous research paradigms. In D. Bretherton & S. F. Law (Eds.), *Methodologies in peace psychology: Peace research by peaceful means* (p. 159). New York: Springer.
- Webel, C., & Sotakova, V. (2012). *Psychological contributions to peace studies, the encyclopedia of peace psychology*. West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Wessells, M. (2015). Program evaluation: Why process matters? In D. Bretherton & S. F. Law (Eds.), *Methodologies in peace psychology: Peace research by peaceful means* (p. 381). New York: Springer.
- White, J. E. M. (1970). *Ancient Egypt: Its cultures and history*. New York: Dover.
- Zelena, P. T., (2006). The inventions of African Identities and Languages: The Discursive and Developmental Implications. Selected Proceedings of the 36th Conference on African Linguistics, pp. 14–26. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Enlarging the Scope of Peace Psychology

African and World-Regional Contributions

Seedat, M.; Suffla, S.; Christie, D. (Eds.)

2017, XI, 310 p. 4 illus., 3 illus. in color., Hardcover

ISBN: 978-3-319-45287-6