From: H.C. Kelman (Ed.), *International behavior* (pp. 3-39).
New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965.

1

Social-Psychological Approaches to the Study of International Relations

DEFINITION OF SCOPE

Herbert C. Kelman

During the past decade or so, ever-increasing attention has been paid to the systematic analysis of the psychological aspects of international relations. There has been a steady growth of theory and empirical research on problems of international behavior in general, which has included the concerted use of psychological—and particularly social-psychological—concepts and methods. Part of this development has involved the attempt to define certain aspects of war and peace as researchable problems, to which the tools of behavioral science can be applied. At the same time, psychologists and social scientists in related fields have increasingly addressed themselves to matters of policy in the field of international relations: They have questioned some of the psychological assumptions underlying various approaches to foreign policy and have developed policy recommendations based, at least in part, on psychological considerations.

We are witnessing the beginnings of what seems to be a new and rather vigorous area of specialization. It is impossible to define exact boundaries for this emerging field, which of necessity spans several disciplines, but it might loosely be called the "social psychology of international relations."

THE DEVELOPMENT OF A SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Before attempting to define the scope of this new area of specialization, let us examine some of the historical antecedents of the more recent developments.

Earlier Approaches

The concern of psychologists with problems of international relations is by no means an entirely new development of the past ten years. Research efforts in this general area go back at least to the early 1930s. It was at that time, for example, that some of the associates of L. L. Thurstone at the University of Chicago initiated studies of attitudes toward war and related matters (for example, Droba, 1931). In the early 1940s Ross Stagner and associates published a series of studies on attitudes toward war, nationalism, and aggression in other areas of social life (for example, Stagner, 1942 and 1944), as well as attitudes toward war prevention (Stagner, Brown, Gundlach, & White, 1942). Much of this work was done under the auspices of the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues Committee on the Psychology of War and Peace. There were various other studies during these years, particularly in the areas of national stereotypes, attitudes toward international relations, and sources of aggressive attitudes. The entire domain of research on social-psychological aspects of international relations, through 1949, was thoroughly reviewed by Klineberg (1950). Reviews of specific problems within this field can be found in some of the chapters of a volume edited by Pear (1950), especially the chapter by Eysenck (1950). One must also note the steady development of public opinion research, which led to an accumulation, over the years, of data relevant to national images and attitudes toward foreign policy issues. Many of the findings based on American samples were brought together and integrated by Gabriel Almond in his study of *The American people and foreign policy* (1950).

In addition to these research efforts, there were various attempts to develop theories of war and peace based on psychological concepts. Some of these were formulated primarily in psychoanalytic terms (Glover, 1946; Durbin & Bowlby, 1939; Waelder, 1939). Others were rooted in general-psychological frameworks, particularly in theories of learning (Tolman, 1942; May, 1943). Finally, psychologists and social scientists in related disciplines addressed themselves to the psychological barriers to peace and determinants of tension, in an effort to develop recommendations for action conducive to tension reduction and international cooperation. Thus, the third yearbook of the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues, edited by Gardner Murphy (1945), was devoted to a detailed analysis of obstacles to peace and an attempt to carve out a concrete program toward world order. In two later volumes (Cantril, 1950; Kisker, 1951), psychological and social scientists from different parts of the world analyzed various aspects of national and international tensions. These efforts were direct expressions of the value orientation that also motivated most of the other activities of psychologists in this area.

Despite this activity, one certainly could not speak of an area of specialization in the social psychology of international relations. The total volume of research on these problems was exceedingly small, and it focused almost entirely on national stereotypes, attitudes toward war, and public opinion on foreign policy issues. While the study of these factors is and continues to be a central contribution of a social-psychological analysis, it touches only indirectly on the actual interaction between nations or their nationals. There was hardly any research on the processes that are set into motion when persons of different nationalities interact with each other, on either an official or

an unofficial basis. Nor was there any research designed to trace the psychological processes involved in international politics. It is interesting that the only research on interaction between nations presented in the Pear (1950) volume was done by a physicist, L. F. Richardson, whose work has attracted a great deal of attention with the growth of this field of research in recent years (see Chapter 11 and elsewhere in this volume). Even the work on images and attitudes was largely of a descriptive nature. In particular, very little if anything was written before 1950 attempting to link images and attitudes to the interaction between nations—in other words, to assess how such images and attitudes develop out of the relationship between two nations, and what role they play in the foreign policy process. Those studies in which correlates of international attitudes were explored tended to focus on their relationship to other social attitudes, to personality characteristics, and to demographic variables, rather than to features of the international system.

None of these observations is intended as criticism of the earlier work in this area. It would be unreasonable to criticize this area of research for what it has *not* done, particularly if one keeps in mind that this line of work was just in its beginnings and that investigators were working with extremely limited resources. But it should be evident that social-psychological aspects of international relations did not constitute an area of specialization in its own right. What work was done on problems in this area was largely done in the context of the general study of social attitudes, and sometimes in the context of personality research, rather than in the context of the study of international relations.

It is not surprising, therefore, that much that was written by psychologists and psychiatrists on questions of war and peace tended to be at a level removed from the interaction between nations. It did not grow out of specialized study of the psychological aspects of international relations, but rather involved the application to the international situation of psychological principles derived from other areas of work. Such applications can be highly relevant insofar as they deal with general psychological assumptions that might influence international policy. An example of a relevant application of this kind is the conclusion, reached by most psychologists and other social scientists, that psychological and anthropological research offers no support for the assumption that war is rooted in human nature and hence inevitable (see Allport, 1945; Murphy, 1945, p. 455; Cantril, 1950, p. 17). Similarly, it is possible to apply psychological principles derived from work in other areas to certain specific problems in international relations—such as the effects of stress on decision-making processes. Any attempt, however, to conceptualize the causes of war and the conditions for peace that starts from individual psychology rather than from an analysis of the relations between nation-states is of questionable relevance.

Thus, some psychological writers, starting from individual behavior, have tended to overemphasize the role of aggression. They seemed to reason that, since war represents aggressive behavior on the part of nation-states, one can understand its causes by examining the determinants of aggressive behavior in individuals. Occasionally this reasoning was by analogy, but most commonly it was based on the assumption that the behavior of states consists, after all, of the behaviors of individuals. This assumption, however, ignores the fact that the behavior of nations is the aggregation of a variety of behaviors on

the part of many individuals, representing different roles, different interests, different degrees of influence on final decisions, and contributing in very different ways to the complex social processes that eventuate in a final outcome such as war. One cannot, therefore, expect that the behavior of a nation will be a direct reflection of the motives of its citizens or even of its leaders. While war does involve aggressive behavior on the part of many individuals, this behavior is not necessarily at the service of aggressive motives. Leaders may engage in aggressive behavior for strategic reasons, for example, and the population at large for reasons of social conformity. Even where aggressive motives are involved in predisposing national leaders to precipitate war and segments of the population to support it enthusiastically,[1] their role in the causation of war cannot be understood without an examination of the societal (and intersocietal) processes that are involved in the decision to engage in war, and of the way in which different elements of the society enter into these processes. There are certainly things to be learned from the psychology of aggression that are relevant to international relations, but they cannot be applied automatically; only by starting from an analysis of international relations at their own level can one identify the points at which such application becomes relevant.

The personal motivations that play a part in people's preference for war or willingness to accept it are manifold. The motivations of fear and distrust, for example, are likely to be far more relevant to modern warfare than is personal aggression. Even a more complex analysis of the motivational patterns of individuals, however, which takes the entire range of motives into account, is not a proper starting-point for the study of war. War is a societal and intersocietal action carried out in a national and international political context. What has to be explained is the way in which nations, given various societal and political conditions, arrive at various international policies, including war. Part of this explanation involves the motivations and perceptions of different individuals—both decision-makers and various publics—who play different roles in the larger societal process. But only if we know where and how these individuals fit into the larger process, and under what constraints they operate, are we able to offer a relevant psychological analysis. Thus, the study of psychological processes is highly relevant to a full understanding of the causation of war, *if* it recognizes that societal and political conditions provide the framework within which the motivations and perceptions of individuals can function.

Some of the conceptualizations of war and peace that take individual psychology as their point of departure have been marked by another characteristic, related to the emphasis on aggression and other personal motives. This is the tendency to use the language of psychopathology, and to treat war as a form of deviation comparable to psychotic behavior in individuals. Now, war may be an extremely irrational form of societal behavior, in terms of the balance between costs and gains; certainly very few observers today would regard *nuclear* war as an instrument of policy that one would deliberately choose on the basis of rational considerations. But

[1] It is interesting that most of the psychological analyses of war that stress the role of aggression were written with an eye to Nazi Germany, where the assumption about aggressive motives in many leaders and perhaps large segments of the population may have been more justified than is usually the case.

this does not mean that the causes of war are in any way comparable to the etiology of pathological behavior in individuals. Such an analogy is likely to obscure the societal and intersocietal dynamics that generate conflicts between nations and that favor particular mechanisms for their resolution.

Insights derived from the study of behavior pathology are certainly relevant to the way in which individuals—decision-makers and members of the population at large—react to other nations and to foreign policy issues. Thus, for example, projection and other forms of perceptual distortion, denial in the face of threat, or rigidity in a situation of stress, are behavior mechanisms that often occur in response to international situations. But—in line with our discussion of psychological processes in general—whether and how these mechanisms contribute to the causation of war can only be understood in terms of the larger societal processes that serve as their context.

A clear implication of the preceding observations is that it makes little sense to speak of *a* psychological theory of war or of international relations. There cannot be a psychological theory that is complete and self-contained and can in any way be proposed as an alternative to other theories, such as economic or political. There can only be a general theory of international relations in which psychological factors play a part, once the points in the process at which they are applicable have been properly identified. Within such a framework, however, psychological—and, particularly, social-psychological—analyses can potentially make a considerable contribution to the study of international politics, and of international behavior in general. This is the conviction on which the present volume is based.

The tendency, particularly in some of the earlier psychological and psychoanalytic writings on war and peace, to focus on aggression and other motives of individuals and to emphasize irrational and pathological processes, without taking the societal and political context into account, has caused some specialists in international relations to question the relevance of psychological contributions. There is no inherent reason, however, why psychological analyses must ignore the environmental context within which behavior occurs, or must focus on irrational processes at the expense of rational ones. In recent years, the trend in psychology in general has been to move away from this kind of orientation. Psychological analyses of international relations, in particular, have tended increasingly to start at the level of international relations itself and to observe behavior within the context thus provided. Similarly, they have increasingly tended to use conceptual approaches in which neither rationality nor irrationality is a built-in assumption, but in which, instead, both cognitive and affective factors are integral parts of a common explanatory scheme.

Recent Developments

The social-psychological study of international relations in recent years certainly has not overcome all the shortcomings of earlier work in this area. In absolute terms, the amount of research on these problems is still very small, and the amount of dependable evidence that has been amassed is smaller yet. As the present volume will indicate, our ability to pose questions is not always matched by our ability to answer them. We have to consider seriously the possibilities—raised by some critics—that some of the current research and conceptualization may have only limited relevance to international politics, and especially to the issues of

war and peace; that they may pay insufficient attention to the political realities that set constraints on psychological processes; that they may overemphasize the role of attitudinal and personal factors in national behavior; and that they may not focus their analysis on the right people and the right settings. Some of these issues are taken up in several of the chapters in this volume, and I shall return to the whole problem of the relevance of social-psychological research in the final chapter. There is no question, though, that many fundamental methodological and theoretical issues must be clarified as this field develops, before we can begin to resolve the problem of relevance.

Nevertheless, there has been a change of such proportions in the social-psychological study of international relations during recent years that one is justified in describing this area as having reached a new stage in its development. The volume of work has greatly increased and there has been a concomitant growth in quality and sophistication. The earlier work on international attitudes and public opinion has continued, at a greater rate and with greater methodological refinement, and with increasing attempts to link it more closely to the foreign policy process. There have been quite a number of studies focusing directly on cross-national contact and interaction. There have been various attempts to study international conflict and its resolution experimentally and thus to deal more concretely with issues of foreign policy-making. Many of the investigators in this area are acutely aware of the problems of generalization that this kind of research entails, and make serious attempts to grapple with them: to explore the international situation to which they hope to be able to generalize, and the conditions that would have to be met in order to permit such generalization.

There is, in general, a concern with the theoretical and methodological issues involved in the psychological analysis of international relations, including the questions of what role psychological variables play in internation behavior and what constitutes a proper unit of analysis. In recent theoretical formulations, there is a greater tendency to start with questions derived from an analysis of international conflict and the interaction between nations, and to introduce psychological concepts whenever they can contribute to answering these questions. This has meant a decline in global approaches to the psychology of war and peace, with greater attention to the psychological analysis of specific subproblems. Similarly, psychological contributions to policy questions have tended to be more specific and more directly related to concrete issues in foreign affairs.

All these activities have taken place within a climate that has become increasingly favorable to research on problems of war and peace. Until recently, war and peace "has not been a respectable, meaningful target of rigorous inquiry" for most students of human behavior (Snyder & Robinson, 1961, p. 13). But the situation has changed, probably due to a combination of forces within and outside the social-science community. The external forces no doubt include the advent of nuclear weapons and the consequent change in the meaning of war; the occurrence of various crises engendered by the Cold War; and the gradual relaxation of Cold-War tensions and, in the United States, of the pressures of the McCarthy era. The internal forces probably include the steady growth of behavioral approaches in political science; the development of more complex

theoretical models in psychology; and the emergence of an interdisciplinary behavioral science.

Whatever its sources, this new climate is clearly evident. In the early 1950s, the *Bulletin of the Research Exchange on the Prevention of War*—published by a small group of social psychologists who believed that the problems of war and peace were susceptible to social-science research—had a very small readership and practically no research to report. The Bulletin's successor, however, the *Journal of Conflict Resolution,* soon became a vital and vigorous interdisciplinary publication, with a steady flow of empirical and theoretical contributions reflecting the greatly accelerated rate of activity. There are now a number of research centers and research programs, focusing partly or entirely on social-psychological aspects of international relations. There are committees in professional associations and symposia at professional meetings; there are research conferences and societies. There are inventories of research needs—such as those sponsored by the Institute for International Order (see especially Pool, 1961; and Snyder & Robinson, 1961), and abstracting services for literature on peace research—such as the one sponsored by the Canadian Peace Research Institute. There are undergraduate courses and graduate seminars and—what is perhaps the most promising indicator for the future—the number of doctoral dissertations in this area has increased considerably.

Since all of these developments are extremely recent and still very much in progress, it is difficult to gain the necessary distance to assess them properly. Yet it does seem that these developments include the emergence of a new area of specialization—a social psychology of international relations that begins with the problems of interaction between nations and the individuals within them at their own level, rather than as extensions of individual psychology. It is a young field, an underdeveloped field, a field with many basic issues unresolved and with few concrete conclusions to its credit—but it does have the characteristics of a field of specialization in its initial phase.[2] The present volume is an attempt to assess the status of this field at the moment—to point up what we know, where the gaps are, what approaches are available for filling these gaps, and what problems can and cannot be handled by the use of these approaches.

It will be quite apparent from this volume that the use of social-psychological concepts and methods is by no means restricted to psychologists and sociologists. Much of the work in this vein is done by political scientists, and some by anthropologists, economists, mathematicians, and an occasional historian. It would probably be more accurate to speak, not of the development of a social psychology of international relations, but of the development of approaches to the study of international behavior in which social-psychological concepts and methods play an integral part. It is one of the key characteristics of the behavioral study of international relations that it cannot possibly be linked to a single discipline. The disciplinary background of a large proportion of the contributors to this field is, of necessity, political science with a

[2] It is important to note that the chapters in this volume are written by specialists, on their specialized problems, rather than by people who address themselves to these problems from the perspective of work in other areas. Ten or fifteen years ago it would have been difficult to gather together such a roster of specialists, because of the relative absence of research directly in this area.

specialization in international relations. But they are supported by investigators with a variety of disciplinary backgrounds, and all of these investigators draw very heavily on all of the behavioral sciences. There is, moreover, an increasing number of workers in this field who completely defy classification in terms of the standard disciplinary categories.

The development of social-psychological approaches has to be seen in the context of this broader interdisciplinary development of the behavioral study of international relations. The social-psychological aspects are by no means coterminous with the field as a whole, but it is neither possible nor desirable to draw sharp lines between them. The nature of the problems in this field is such that they generally require a combination of different levels of analysis (cf. Snyder, 1962). It becomes impossible, therefore, to divide them in terms of the usual disciplinary categories. Indeed, it is in large part the embeddedness of current psychological work on international relations in this larger interdisciplinary effort, and particularly its close ties with political science, that make it qualitatively different from the work of earlier years.

In addition to its interdisciplinary character—interdisciplinary not only in the sense that it represents a collaboration of investigators based in different disciplines, but also in the sense that its concepts and methods represent a genuine pooling of the resources of different disciplines—there are two other features that distinguish the behavioral study of international relations. One is the variety of methods that are used—laboratory experiments, simulation studies, surveys, observational studies, content analyses of historical documents, organizational studies, interviews with informants—and the readiness with which investigators combine different sources of data and shift from one to the other. While some investigators tend to prefer one or another method, there appears to be little tendency for the field to be divided along lines of methodological preference. The other distinguishing feature is the apparently comfortable combination of different purposes. There are no sharp divisions between concern with theory-building and concern with practical application, between an interest in the development of a methodology and an interest in addressing policy issues. Very often, the same investigator will shift from one to the other of these emphases on different occasions.

THE NATURE OF SOCIAL-PSYCHOLOGICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

Within the broader context of the behavioral study of international relations, what are the special contributions of social-psychological approaches? The efforts to which social-psychological approaches have contributed during the past few years can be described in terms of four categories: (1) the study of the "international behavior" of individuals; (2) the study of international politics and foreign policy; (3) the development of theory and methodology in international relations; and (4) the formulation of policy recommendations. While these categories are highly overlapping, each one points to a different type of function that can be performed by a social-psychological analysis.

The Study of the "International Behavior" of Individuals

This category involves, essentially, what Klineberg calls "the human dimension in international relations" in the title of his recent book (1964). The

concern here is with the ways in which individuals relate themselves to their own nation and other nations, to the international system as a whole, to problems of foreign policy, and to the broader issues of war and peace; and with the study of actual interactions between individuals across national boundaries.

The research that falls into this category has varying degrees of relevance to international politics and the behavior of nations. Much depends, for example, on whose attitudes and whose interactions are being investigated. The study of attitudes and interactions of diplomats and national decision-makers obviously has more direct relevance to international politics than the study of average citizens contemplating foreign policy questions or traveling abroad. But regardless of its degree of relevance to international politics (a question to which I shall return later), the research in this category is meaningful and justified in its own right. It focuses on the special kinds of problems that arise when individuals confront—directly or indirectly—other nations and the international system. The contributions of social psychology are most obvious and most direct here, for the problems in this category are specifically and inherently of a social-psychological nature in that they concern social interaction (under a special set of circumstances) and the relation of the individual to social institutions.

Some of the types of research in this category that have been conducted in the past ten to fifteen years will be summarized in the following paragraphs.

1. *Attitudes toward International Affairs.* There have been some attempts, recently, to supplement data from opinion polls, which generally use only one or two structured questions on a given issue, with more intensive and extensive surveys. Thus, there have been some studies of national samples in the United States (for example, Withey, 1961) and in Canada (Paul & Laulicht, 1963) in which questions on a whole range of foreign policy issues were asked. Such studies make it possible to explore the relationships between different sets of attitudes and images, between general policy orientations and reactions to specific issues, and between attitudes and various demographic variables. There have also been a number of studies, usually focusing on special samples (such as students or residents of a particular geographical area), assessing attitudes in response to a specific international situation, such as the Cuban crisis in 1962 (for example, Chesler & Schmuck, 1964); or in relation to a specific policy issue, such as civil defense (for example, Barton, 1963; Ekman *et al.*, 1963; Rose, 1963). In such studies it is possible to examine in greater detail the way in which reactions to specific issues are linked to the more general attitudes toward foreign affairs held by individuals and groups.

General attitudes toward foreign affairs have also been examined in a number of studies, with particular emphasis on individuals' readiness to adopt a belligerent stand in international relations. Such attitudes have been related to the social characteristics (for example, Putney & Middleton, 1962) and personality dispositions of the respondents (Christiansen, 1959; Levinson, 1957), as well as to their reactions to communications about international events (Gladstone & Taylor, 1958). Finally, there is research underway to develop scaling procedures for international attitudes that, among other things, would permit periodic attitude measurement as one indicator of the state of the international system (Levy & Hefner, 1964).

One crucial line of research, which is just beginning to take shape, is the investigation of the dynamics of attitudes on international affairs, focusing on the psychological and social processes involved in the development of general orientations toward foreign policy issues within a society and the crystallization of reactions in specific cases. The specific application of research on communication and attitude change to the area of international attitudes is a related research need.

2. *National and International Loyalties.* A key area for social-psychological research is the study of the relationship of the individual to the nation-state, which in turn defines his relationship to the international system. There have been some studies of psychological aspects of nationalism (for example, Doob, 1962; Terhune, 1964), and the research on ethnocentrism certainly has some relevance here. But very little has been done on the nature of the commitment of the individual to the nation-state, on his definition of the rights and duties of the citizen, on the kinds of satisfactions that he derives from his relation to the state, and on his conceptions of the position and purposes of the nation in the international system. What is needed here is research on national ideology, as it is communicated by the national system and as it is interpreted by individuals and groups; on the way this ideology develops; and on the kinds of behaviors it calls forth under various conditions of arousal (including various national symbols). Theoretical analyses in terms of national role (Perry, 1957), social communication (K. Deutsch, 1953), and political ideology in general can be applied to research on this problem.

One type of research that has been gaining momentum recently is the study of special subgroups within the population—such as the extreme right (cf. Proshansky & Evans, 1963)—who, among other things, have special definitions of the role of the national vis-à-vis the nation-state, and of the nation vis-à-vis the international system. Similar questions can be posed with respect to the peace movement, in which there has also been an increasing research interest.

Different kinds of national ideology have different implications for international cooperation, participation in international organizations, and the willingness to surrender sovereignty to international bodies. A closely related area of research, therefore, is the study of the determinants of an internationalist ideology, and particularly of the conditions for the development of multiple loyalties (Guetzkow, 1955). Other problems to which social-psychological research will increasingly address itself are the developing nationalism in emerging nations, the problems of dual loyalty for employees of international organizations, and the ideological underpinnings for such supranational agencies as the European Economic Community.

3. *Images and Stereotypes of Other Nations.* The earlier work in this area has been continued, but also has pushed forward in various directions. There have been various attempts to study images cross-nationally (cf. Duijker & Frijda, 1960; Campbell & LeVine, 1961); to explore their development in children (for example, Lambert & Klineberg, 1959); to discover, through intensive interviews, their sources and the way in which they function (for example, Isaacs, 1958); to show their relationship to the political alignments between the nations in question (Buchanan & Cantril, 1953; cf. also Bronfenbrenner, 1961); and to study their effect on the perception of individuals belonging to these nations (Bruner & Perlmutter, 1957). Personality disposi-

tions to like or dislike foreign nations in general (Perlmutter, 1954, 1956) and the personal meanings that images of a particular nation may have for different individuals (Smith, Bruner, & White, 1956) have also been explored. Finally, a number of studies have investigated effects of cross-national contact on images (see later).

There has been only little systematic effort so far to relate images to national and international events; and, in particular, to explore in detail the way in which they are affected by and in turn affect the relations between nations. This is certainly an area requiring more research, as is the relationship between images of other nations and images of their nationals, which are obviously interdependent, but not completely so.

4. *Cross-National Contacts.* In recent years there have been numerous studies of cross-national contact, dealing with the processes of interaction between nationals of different countries, the problems of adjustment in a foreign culture, and the effects of personal contacts on images and attitudes. Most of the studies have dealt with foreign students in the United States (see M. B. Smith, 1956; Coelho, 1962; and Lundstedt, 1963, for reports of many of these studies). There have been some studies, however, of students and scholars in countries other than the United States (cf. Danckwortt, 1959). And there have also been studies of various groups of Americans traveling abroad, including students participating in special programs (for example, H. P. Smith, 1955; Isaacs, 1961), Fulbright grantees (Gullahorn & Gullahorn, 1963), Peace Corps volunteers (Smith *et al.*, 1963), and businessmen (Pool *et al.*, 1956). Various applied problems in this area have also been investigated, such as the evaluation of international exchange programs (Kelman, 1963), the selection of personnel for overseas work (cf. Torre, 1963), and the conduct of international conferences.

It would be very useful to link research on cross-national contacts with research on national and international loyalties by studying interaction among representatives of different countries in more official contexts, including international and supranational organizations, and the effects of such interactions on their integration into an international network.

The Study of International Politics and Foreign Policy

This category refers essentially to the behavior of nations, or of decision-makers acting for their nations. The concern here is with the determinants of policy and with their effects on the national and international systems. Of special interest are international conflict and its resolution, and the conditions under which outcomes in the form of war become more or less probable. Clearly, research in this category—unlike the preceding one—is by no means specifically social-psychological. Social-psychological approaches can, however, *contribute* certain concepts and methods that promise to be of some value in a concerted attack on these problems from different vantage points. The relevance of these contributions to the study of international politics may be open to some questions[3]—a matter to which I shall return in the final

[3] It should be noted, of course, that the researches in this category are of interest in their own right, whether or not they are relevant to international politics. Many of them have direct and obvious relevance to certain other problems. For example, an experimental study of bargaining in a two-person game may or may not be relevant to the understanding of international negotiation, but it is certainly relevant to the investigation of interpersonal trust.

chapter—but many specialists in international relations see them as potentially useful tools for grappling with the thorny problems of their field. Let us review briefly some of the types of research in this general category that have been conducted in the past ten to fifteen years.

1. *Public Opinion in the Foreign Policy Process.* Public opinion research has a great deal of relevance to the study of internation behavior, provided deliberate attention is paid to the way in which public opinion (in general, and on specific kinds of issues) affects the formulation and conduct of foreign policy. This in turn requires an analysis of the broader assumptions and purposes that serve as the context within which foreign policy is carried out and within which public opinion can therefore influence the probability of various choices; and of the roles played by different segments of the public in the policy process.

Studies on the distribution of attitudes toward foreign policy issues in the population at large can be useful, insofar as they give an indication of general "moods" that decision-makers are likely to share and to take into account (cf. Almond, 1950). Public opinion studies become more directly relevant if—as is increasingly true—they focus in whole or in part on certain elite groups (for example, Free, 1959; Paul & Laulicht, 1963). Some recent studies have explored in detail the attitudes of special elite groups toward specific foreign policy issues, and have investigated both the sources of these attitudes and the way in which they feed into the decision-making process (for example, Bauer, Pool, & Dexter, 1963; Rosenau, 1963).

In addition to opinion studies per se, there has also been some research on the ways in which different segments of the public—including the "mass public," the "attentive public," and the policy and opinion elites or the "opinion-making public" (cf. Almond, 1950; Rosenau, 1961)—relate themselves to foreign policy issues. Such research has focused on the distribution of information, interest, and activity relating to foreign affairs within the general population; the characteristics of those who constitute attentive publics and opinion leaders; and (to a lesser extent) the way in which opinions on foreign policy matters circulate within the public. (See Hero, 1959a, 1959b, and 1960, for comprehensive reviews of relevant research at all levels of the public.)

There is a need for more detailed research on the actual processes whereby public opinion affects foreign policy decisions. One specifically social-psychological aspect of such research would concern the conditions that generate a particular mood in the public, that determine the choices the public perceives, and that mobilize certain segments of it into various kinds of action. Another would involve decision-makers themselves and explore their general conception of the role of public opinion in the policy process, the way in which they assess the shape of public opinion in any given situation, and the impact it has on their decision behavior.

2. *Individual Actors in the Foreign Policy Process.* A recent focus for conceptualization and research in international politics has been the behavior of the individual actors who are involved in the formulation and execution of foreign policy. Particular emphasis has been placed on the psychological and social processes that come into play when responsible decision-makers choose between alternative actions to be taken by the state (cf. Snyder, Bruck, & Sapin, 1962). This line of research is often—though not necessarily—based on

the assumption that the decision-makers in any given situation *are* the state and that the study of the decision-making process is therefore the most direct way of studying state behavior.

This assumption is particularly appropriate where research focuses on specific major decision cases. Thus, the Snyder-Bruck-Sapin model has been applied to an extensive and detailed study of the United States decision to resist aggression in Korea (Snyder & Paige, 1958). On the basis of interviews with the participants in this decision and examination of relevant documents, the attempt is made to reconstruct the interactions in the decisional unit, within the larger organizational system. This approach concerns itself with both the intellectual and the organizational processes involved in decision-making—with the definition of the situation, the problem-solving procedures, the exercise of leadership, and the flow of communication and influence.

A somewhat different approach to the study of international decision-making has been used by another group of researchers, who have developed detailed methods of content analysis in terms of a number of psychological dimensions (North *et al.*, 1963). This approach has been applied, for example, to a reconstruction of the events culminating in the decision to go to war in 1914, through content analysis of all available personal communications from the key decision-makers in different countries during the weeks preceding the outbreak of war (Zinnes *et al.*, 1961; Zinnes, 1962). The emphasis here is on the relationship of the perceptions and emotional reactions of authoritative individual actors to policy outcomes, in contrast to the Snyder model, which stresses interactional and organizational variables.

Both approaches generate hypotheses about the process and outcome of decision-making under varying conditions. They can also be applied outside of the context of specific decisions, in the study of the assumptions and perceptions of individual decision-makers that underlie their policy orientations (for example, Holsti, 1962) and in the study of the goals and decision processes that characterize organizational units with foreign policy responsibilities.

Research on individual actors in the foreign policy process, in addition to representing a way or operationalizing the behavior of states, may also be designed to explore some of the links in the chain that eventuates in certain state acts. Here the assumption is not that the individuals observed constitute the state for the purposes in question, but that they are important participants in and contributors to state action. By the same token, such research need not focus on the key decision-makers, but could deal with diplomats and other officials who play a variety of roles in the total process. Thus, there has been some research on individual participants in the foreign policy process both within national foreign policy organizations, such as the U.S. Department of State (Pruitt, 1962), and within international organizations, such as the U.N. (Alger, 1961). The research has concerned itself with the kinds of assumptions and role definitions that these individuals bring to their tasks, the kinds of actions and interactions in which they engage in the course of their work, and the ways in which these feed into the foreign policy process and—directly or indirectly—have an impact upon it.

3. *Processes of Interaction in International Conflict and Conflict Resolution.* A research area that has blossomed within the past few years is the experimental study of interaction between individuals or groups, with an

eye to illuminating processes of conflict and bargaining, of competition and cooperation, in the international arena. The underlying logic of this work involves the creation of experimental situations that are analogous, in certain fundamental ways, to the international situation, and that permit controlled observation of some of the interaction processes that also characterize the relations between nations. The assumption is that there is at least some basis for generalizing from the behavior of experimental subjects to the behavior of national decision-makers and negotiators. The validity of this assumption does not necessarily rest on the degree to which the real-life situation has been reproduced exactly in the laboratory, but on the degree to which the crucial variables in the real-life situation have been identified and incorporated in the experiment. Moreover, much depends on how the results of such experiments are used—particularly, as Snyder (1963) has indicated, on whether they are used for the purpose of verifying propositions or discovering new relationships.

Three types of experimental studies in this area can be distinguished. The first is best exemplified by the Inter-Nation Simulation (Guetzkow *et al.*, 1963), an ambitious attempt to simulate an international system—to create, in the laboratory, contrived "nations" with varying characteristics and assign the roles of national decision-makers to the subjects. In the Inter-Nation Simulation, the subjects do not behave as individuals, as in small-group experiments, but play the roles of decision-makers representing their nations. Feedback from their constituents actually enters into the simulation through the programming of intranational consequences of various decisions. Various foreign policy moves on the part of decision-makers—such as armament–disarmament, trade, aid, or alliance—and various outcomes for the international system—such as tension level, international cooperation, and the outbreak of limited or nuclear war—can be observed. With the introduction of experimental interventions into the natural flow of the process, laboratory simulations can provide tests of specific hypotheses about the effects of various strategies, various military and political conditions, and various states of the international system (cf. Brody, 1963; Crow, 1963). Recent studies have used experimental variations in balanced designs to investigate the effects of certain weapons systems (Raser & Crow, 1964), and of crisis conditions (J. Robinson, C. Hermann, & Margaret Hermann, as described in Higgs & Weinland, 1964) on decision-making and on outcomes for the international system. Work currently underway also explores the effects of different values, as reflected in personal and cultural characteristics of the decision-makers.

The second type of experimental study is more removed from the level of international relations, but tries to incorporate some of the crucial variables involved in the interaction between nations. It takes the form of relatively simple two-man games, so structured that mixed (cooperative and competitive) motives are brought into play (cf. M. Deutsch, 1958; Deutsch & Krauss, 1962; Rapoport, 1963; Schelling, 1961). Choices of strategy in this type of conflict situation, processes of explicit and tacit bargaining, and outcomes for each party can be observed in these experiments. They have been studied as a function of such independent variables as the nature of the payoffs, the characteristics of the players, the definition of the situation, the opportunity for communication, and the availability of threats. The players in these games behave as individuals, but the kinds of choices that they have to make have

some structural similarities to those with which national decision-makers are confronted. Recently, various procedures for extending experimental games of this sort so as to incorporate an ever-greater number of the characteristics of international conflict have been developed (Pilisuk & Rapoport, 1964).

The third type of experimental study involves the investigation of intergroup conflict, its manifestations, and its resolution in deliberately devised laboratory or field situations (cf. Sherif *et al.*, 1961; Mouton & Blake, 1962; Bass & Dunteman, 1963). In these studies, subjects actually behave as members and representatives of their experimentally created groups, engaged in intergroup conflict, but these groups are, of course, at a level different from that of the nations to which one would hope to generalize. Among other things, the experimental groups, unlike nations, involve face-to-face interaction both within and between groups. Nevertheless, one can gain some insights into international relations by observing interactions between groups at different levels, provided some of the relevant variables are built into the experiment. By the same token, naturalistic studies of intergroup conflict and conflict resolution at different levels—such as studies of industrial or racial conflict—can serve as sources of insight about international conflict. Particularly germane are studies that focus on negotiation and bargaining processes in labor-management relations and other types of intergroup conflict (cf. Douglas, 1957; see also Blake & Mouton, 1962). These must, of course, be supplemented with observations and detailed study of negotiations at the international level itself (cf. Jensen, 1963), if full cognizance is to be taken of the unique features of international conflict and the limits of generalization from other levels.

The Development of Theory and Methodology in International Relations

Traditionally, the discipline of international relations has tended to place its emphasis on historical, descriptive, and normative approaches. In recent years, however, many scholars in the field have become increasingly oriented toward the formulation of general propositions about internation behavior, grounded in empirical observations. This has led to the development of theoretical models and to a general concern with the problem of theory construction in international relations and with the search for suitable methods (cf. Fox, 1959; Hoffmann, 1960; Claude, 1960; McClelland, 1960; Knorr & Verba, 1961; Singer, 1961a). Social-psychological approaches (along with others based, for example, in economics or sociology) have contributed to this process and are continuing to do so.

There have been a number of attempts by social psychologists to formulate certain limited aspects of international relations in terms of concepts derived from the study of small groups, social attitudes, role behavior, or intergroup relations (for example, Guetzkow, 1957; Kelman, 1955; Perry, 1957; Sherif, 1958). But, more than that, social-psychological processes—such as those relating to motivation, perception, trust and suspicion, definition of the situation, stress, communication, leadership, influence, norm formation, role prescription, group cohesiveness, loyalty—enter importantly into various general conceptualizations of the interaction between nations and foreign policy-making. Typically, these conceptualizations focus on the behavior of individual actors and their inter-

actions for two interrelated reasons: (1) This focus gives investigators some leverage for analyzing the behavior of states in their relations with other states (cf. Snyder *et al.*, 1962; North *et al.*, 1963; Singer, 1961b). That is, it permits the application of certain conceptual schemes, such as the decision-making approach, to a detailed analysis of the generally elusive processes of state behavior. A formulation in terms of individual actors may also reveal certain characteristics of the international system itself, which do not emerge when the state is treated as the primary actor (Alger, 1963). (2) Conceptualization at this level facilitates the translation of theoretical variables into operational terms and hence the empirical testing of propositions (Schelling, 1961; Snyder, 1963).

The use of social-psychological concepts has gone hand in hand with the use of social-psychological methods, such as survey research, intensive interviewing, systematic observation, laboratory experiments, and content analysis in terms of psychological variables. There are many unresolved issues surrounding the role of social-psychological concepts and methods in international relations—such as the question of the proper unit of analysis in this area and the question of generalization from the laboratory to real life—but they do represent potentially useful tools at the present stage of theoretical and methodological development.

The Formulation of Policy Recommendations

Psychologists and other behavioral scientists have taken an increasingly active part in the foreign policy process during recent years, by bringing their specialized knowledge or analytic approach to bear on concrete policy issues (cf. Russell, 1961; Rose & Laulicht, 1963). Thus, social psychologists have examined some of the psychological assumptions underlying Cold-War policies, such as the doctrine of deterrence (cf. Milburn, 1961), and have recommended alternative policies on the basis of this examination. Other kinds of asumptions that could profitably be subjected to social-psychological analysis and research are assumptions about effective negotiation procedures (such as the notion that it is always best to negotiate from strength) or about the role of public opinion (such as the view that the public would not tolerate certain policy innovations). Psychologists have also examined some of the psychological mechanisms that reinforce Cold-War tensions by blocking adaptive responses to the situation (Frank, 1960) and creating distorted perceptions (Bronfenbrenner, 1961), and they have proposed ways of counteracting these mechanisms. Moreover, there have been analyses, from a social-psychological point of view, of the implications of certain specific policies (existing or proposed), such as the development of a national civil defense program (Waskow, 1962), or of certain general policy directions, such as those embodied in the programs for foreign aid and international exchange (Kelman, 1962a).

Psychologists, along with other social scientists, have developed specific proposals for new approaches to international relations, designed to promote disarmament, tension reduction, and international cooperation, and based, at least in part, on psychological considerations. The most influential contribution of this kind has been Osgood's (1962) proposal for graduated reciprocation in tension-reduction (GRIT), a carefully developed strategy based on unilateral initiatives by one side in the Cold War under conditions that are likely to lead to reciprocation by the

other side. There have been other proposals, rooted in social-psychological analyses, for the development of activities involving international cooperation and interdependence, and conducive to the strengthening of values necessary to a peaceful world (M. Deutsch, 1962); and for the development of institutional arrangements and concomitant patterns of loyalty conducive to international security (Kelman, 1962b). Some attention has also been paid to the all-important problem of the psychological and social conditions on which the viability of a disarmed world depends (M. Deutsch, 1962; Frank, 1960).

Policy recommendations made by social psychologists can have varying degrees and kinds of relationship to relevant research evidence.

1. Some proposals may be based on extrapolations from general theoretical principles and the research evidence related to them, rather than on research specifically focused on the policy issue in question. The advocacy of specific policies on this basis is an entirely appropriate activity for the social scientist, not only because he is also a citizen, but because his specialized background enables him to make unique and valuable contributions to the policy process. He is able to bring to it a set of concepts, fund of information, and analytic approach that may provide a needed new perspective. The relevance of this contribution is particularly evident when one keeps in mind that all policies and policy proposals, whatever their source, involve certain basic psychological and sociological assumptions. Certainly the social scientist is in the best position to speak to these assumptions, even in the absence of specific research on the policy issue in question.

In making policy recommendations on the basis of extrapolations from general social science knowledge, however, it is particularly important to be clear about the distinction between research evidence and value preference. There should be no implication that the mere fact that a policy is advocated by a social scientist endows it with scientific validity. Insofar as possible, recommendations should be supported by existing research evidence; and where there is no relevant research, this should be clearly communicated. Policy recommendations based on social-psychological principles cannot wait until all the data are in, but the ultimate value of such contributions rests on the extent to which they can be backed up by research that is directly relevant. The feasibility of such research is demonstrated, for example, by the recent efforts to put some of the implications of Osgood's GRIT model (1962) to the experimental test (Crow, 1963; see also Pilisuk & Rapoport, 1964).

2. Policy recommendations may be based also on extrapolations from a specific body of research that has fairly direct relevance to the policy issue in question. Examples of this kind of approach would be recommendations for the planning of international exchange programs, derived from the research on students and scholars sojourning in foreign countries; recommendations for the conduct of international negotiations, derived from experiments on bargaining and negotiation; and recommendations for the formulation of American policy toward the Soviet Union, derived from an analysis of Soviet public opinion data. Policy recommendations in these cases involve a relationship to research that is intermediate between extrapolation from general principles, on the one hand, and conducting research specifically focused on a particular policy issue, on the other. The recommendations are rooted in research that is directly relevant to the issue, but they involve integration

and interpretation of diverse research findings. Inevitably, this process will be influenced by the value preferences of the social scientist who does the integration and interpretation.

3. Finally, some of the potential contributions of social-psychological approaches to the policy process take the form of research specifically designed to answer policy-related questions. Such research can be done at the request of the agency responsible for a particular policy decision, or it can be done at the investigator's own initiative and then fed into the policy process. It can test assumptions that underlie existing policies, or provide new data that would be relevant to the formulation of policy, or check out the implications of alternative policy proposals. Research in these cases represents an integral part of the policy process, though it may range from being entirely within the existing framework of policy goals to pushing toward a radical redefinition of goals. An example of a research program that is somewhere in the middle of this continuum is Project Michelson (Milburn, 1964; Higgs & Weinland, 1964), a series of interrelated studies that are linked directly to the process of formulating American deterrence policy. Based on the assumption that deterrence is to a very large extent a social-psychological process, it attempts to develop relevant social-psychological thinking and evidence and to feed these directly into the formulation of specific deterrence policies. Research that is now being initiated to determine the degree to which American public opinion would tolerate various innovations in foreign policy exemplifies the possibilities for social-psychological contribution to the formulation of new policy directions. Policy-oriented research in general faces many barriers (cf. Dror, 1964), and policy-oriented research in the area of international conflict, in particular, is subject to a variety of special problems (cf. Archibald, 1963). In the long run, however, such research represents the primary contribution that the social psychologist qua social psychologist can make to the policy process.

THE SOCIAL-PSYCHOLOGICAL LEVEL OF ANALYSIS IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

A central feature of the more recent work on psychological aspects of international relations—in contrast to some of the earlier work—is that it starts at the level at which the problem under investigation occurs, rather than at the level at which the greatest amount of psychological information is already available.[4] These attempts may not always be successful: psychologists may sometimes lack the political sophistication necessary for the task, and even political scientists using psychological concepts may display a tendency to overpsychologize. Nevertheless, there is an awareness of the problem and a serious attempt to come to grips with it. Thus, psychologists working in the area of international relations have become increasingly aware of the danger of translating all problems into psychological ones and then seeking to eluci-

[4] The term *level* is used in several different ways. Richard Snyder has suggested that at least three meanings could be distinguished: (a) the level at which a phenomenon occurs; (b) the level at which an explanation is formulated; and (c) the level at which data are collected. These three do not necessarily coincide in any given case. In the title of this section, the term is used with meaning (b) and to some extent meaning (c). On the other hand, in the first sentence it is used with meaning (a). In general, the term *level* is ambiguous, but it seems rather difficult to do without it.

date them in psychological terms—for example, of defining war as a form of aggression and then turning to the psychology of aggression for its explication. Instead, the tendency more and more is to start out with an analysis of the situation that we are trying to understand, at its own level, and to bring in psychological variables as they become relevant on the basis of this analysis.

For example, an analysis of foreign policy decision-making may reveal that it has a different character in crisis situations as compared to non-crisis situations; to explore these differences, one can then turn to some of the psychological work on cognitive processes under conditions of stress. An analysis of deterrence strategies may reveal certain assumptions about the control of an opponent's behavior through threat of punishment, to which some of the experimental work in the psychology of learning would have obvious relevance. To take another example, after examining in detail the social processes by which a population is mobilized for war, one can begin to specify the kinds of psychological dispositions (habits, motives, and the like) that make such mobilization possible. Or, finally, an analysis of cross-national contacts may point up the frequent occurrence of misunderstandings, which could be elucidated by what is known about the conditions that underlie perceptual distortions.

In an analysis of specific problems in international relations, along the lines exemplified, one could certainly draw on much relevant information from individual psychology. Without wanting to minimize these potential contributions, I would like to propose, however, that a *systematic* application of psychological concepts, starting at the level of international relations itself, must of necessity be *social*-psychological in nature. In making this point, I have no interest in splitting hairs and no intention to reject insights, whatever their source. My sole purpose is to provide a handle for clarifying the oft-debated question of where and how psychological analysis can be relevant to the study of international relations.

The examples given above were deliberately chosen to illustrate the potential relevance of general-psychological work in such areas as cognition, learning, motivation, and perception to certain specific problems in international relations. But even in these examples, the usefulness of a psychological analysis would be greatly enhanced if it were informed by a social-psychological perspective. Thus, the foreign policy decision-making of our first example takes place in a complex situation of interaction—among the decision-makers themselves, between the decision-makers and other elements of their own society, and between the decision-makers and their counterparts in other governments. The process involves not merely problem-solving, but various social phenomena, such as mutual reinforcement, meeting the expectations of certain reference groups, anticipating and evaluating the reactions of others, and the requirement of achieving consensus. What is known, therefore, about the effects of stress on the cognitive processes of an individual, while certainly relevant, can illuminate only a small part of the behavior of decision-makers in this situation. Similarly, in the deterrence example, general experimental work on reactions to the threat of punishment does not tell us much about the social setting in which this threat occurs. Such factors as the credibility of the threat, the threatened person's evaluation of the threatener, his interpretation of the intent of the threat, and the possibility of mounting a counter-threat, are major determinants of

action and reaction, which in turn are rooted in the nature of the relationship between the two parties. In the third example, our understanding of the psychological dispositions that make mobilization for war possible can be greatly enhanced if we view these not simply as parts of the habit and motive structures of individuals, but as manifestations—at the individual level—of the political ideology and national role prescriptions that characterize the nation-state as a system. And, in our final example, the nature of perceptual distortions that occur in cross-national contacts can be conceived most readily, not in terms of characteristics of the individual participants, but in terms of such variables as the relative status of the nations involved, cultural differences in interaction patterns, and the social context in which the interaction occurs.

The review of these examples was designed to illustrate, somewhat loosely, why a systematic analysis of some of the psychological aspects of international relations has to be a social-psychological analysis, even though certain specific insights can, of course, be derived from individual psychology. In order to clarify the basis for this point of view, let me proceed (a) to define briefly my conception of social psychology, (b) to outline the relationship of the conceptual foci of social psychology to the analysis of international behavior, and (c) to point up the relevance of a social-psychological approach to the study of state behavior.

A Definition of Social Psychology

Social psychology—which is a subfield of psychology as well as of sociology—is concerned with the intersection between individual behavior and societal-institutional processes. It follows from this concern that the primary focus for social-psychological analysis is social interaction, which is, par excellence, the area in which individual and institutional processes intersect. Social interaction is thus the level of analysis that is most purely and most distinctively social-psychological.

By social interaction I do not simply mean the behavior of individuals in one another's presence, but their mutual attempts to assess and affect one another's goals, images, expectations, and evaluations, as they act and react vis-à-vis each other.[5] Thus, the study of social interaction requires, on the one hand, attention to what the individual brings to the interaction situation—the goals he is trying to maximize, the self-concept he is trying to enhance, his images of the other, and his view of the expectations adhering to his own role and the role of the other. On the other hand, the study of social interaction requires attention to the larger societal context within which the interaction occurs—both the general cultural framework and the specific organizational setting that define the purpose of the interaction, the roles of the participants, the normative expectations and rules that govern the interaction, and the action choices that are available.

[5] This follows, more or less, the definition of social interaction offered by Swanson (1963), who speaks of it as "the conception of individuals trying to take account of each other's minds, that is relating to their fellows' motives, needs, desires, means and ends, knowledge, and the like" (p. 4). "This means that they take into account something of the specifically instrumental character of one another's behavior" (p. 6). Swanson contrasts social interaction with "behavioral interaction" which refers to the behavior of individuals toward each other "as they might toward any other objects in the environment" (p. 7).

In this sense, then, social interaction is precisely the point at which individual and institutional processes come together. Interaction processes—such as group problem-solving or informal communication—can be understood more thoroughly if they are explored as a function of the dispositions that the participants bring to them and of the organizational context within which they take place. At the same time, one would focus on interaction in order to understand the processes whereby social institutions shape the behavior of individuals—as in the study of socialization and social influence; and the processes whereby individuals produce institutional and societal outcomes—as in the study of decision-making and negotiation.

While social interaction represents the level of analysis that is uniquely social-psychological, it is not the only level on which social-psychological research focuses. In a great deal of social-psychological research—the broad area involving the study of social attitudes, opinions, images, beliefs, and values—the basic unit of analysis is the individual. The concern here is with the way in which the individual conceives of and relates himself to various components of the social system. The social system in question may be the society of which he is a part, with its various subgroups and institutions; but it may also be the international system, or a specific organization to which he belongs. The social-psychological study of attitudinal variables views these not merely as manifestations of individual personality, but also as manifestations of the social system to which these attitudes refer. The attitudes of any given individual, for example, toward an organization in which he is a member must be understood in the light of the nature and functions of this organization, the kinds of member behavior that are required if the organization is to carry out its functions, and the social processes whereby members are informed of these behavioral expectations and socialized with respect to organizational norms. There is, of course, considerable variation in the way in which individuals and subgroups interpret and meet these expectations, and in the precise nature of the attitudes they develop. All of these variations, however, represent at least in part a response to the demands inherent in the social system. The relationship between individual attitudes and the social system is mediated through social interaction. It is through interaction with others that an individual develops his attitudes. (This interaction may be indirect, via the mass media, but even the effects of the mass media seem to operate to a large extent through face-to-face interaction.) It is also through interaction with others that an individual's attitudes have their impact on the social system. The mediating role of interaction, however, is often left implicit in the study of attitudes.

A third focus for social-psychological research is at the level of the organization or the society. Social-psychological studies at this level are concerned with the relationship of organizational or societal variables to individual variables. They might explore, for example, the effects of interpersonal relations on certain organizational outcomes, such as productivity; or, conversely, the effects of the authority structure characterizing an organization on the satisfaction of its members. The relationship between individual and organizational variables is, of necessity, mediated by social interaction. At times, however—as, for example, in some of the research on the relationships between personality and social structure—the role of

social interaction in mediating these two levels is not brought explicitly into the analysis.

From this definition of social psychology as the study of the intersection between individual and institutional processes it should be apparent why the most relevant and systematic psychological contributions to international relations are likely to come from *social* psychology. It is inherent in the nature of a social-psychological approach to view individual behavior in its societal and organizational context, and to take deliberate account of the institutional processes that shape the behavior of individual actors and are in turn shaped by it. A social-psychological analysis that seriously attempts to live up to this definition of its task would be more likely, therefore, to do justice to the political realities of the national and international systems as it addresses itself to the psychological aspects of international behavior.

In line with our definition of social psychology, a social-psychological analysis of international behavior would concern itself with the ways in which individuals and groups (with varying positions in the decision-making structure) (a) conceive of their own nation, other nations, and the international system, of the relationships between these systems, and of their own relationships to them; and (b) interact—officially or unofficially, directly or symbolically—with other nations, their representatives, and their individual nationals. Two interrelated foci for social-psychological conceptualization thus emerge: (a) national and international images; and (b) processes of interaction in international relations. Clearly, these cannot be separated from one another. National and international images must be seen as products of interaction among nations and among their nationals. Conversely, interactions across national boundaries can only be understood in terms of the underlying conceptions or images that govern them. One can, however, focus on one or the other—imagery or interaction—as the primary object of study in a given case. The present volume is organized, therefore, around these two conceptual foci, although the arbitrary aspects of this division are clearly recognized. Let me proceed to characterize the issues that these two foci are intended to encompass, and, in doing so, to give a brief overview of the entire volume.

National and International Images

The term image, as used in this volume, refers to the organized representation of an object in an individual's cognitive system.[6] The core of an image is the perceived character of the object to which it refers—the individual's conception of what this object is like. Image is an inferred construct, however, rather than a mere designation of the way the object is phenomenally experienced.

In large part, the individual's conception of the object is encompassed by the points on various descriptive and evaluative dimensions at which he would place it. In line with Boulding's (1956) broader use of the term *image*, however, we would want to include not only the individual's conception of the object at present, but also his view of its past and future. Thus, associated

[6] More detailed definitions of the concept are offered by Scott in Chapter 3, and by Deutsch and Merritt in Chapter 5. Their definitions are phrased in somewhat different terms (in line with the conceptual schemes on which their respective chapters are based), but they are completely consistent with and in fact have greatly influenced the definition offered here.

with the image of an object, would be various specific memories and expectations, various generalized beliefs and opinions regarding the object. Images differ not only in terms of the specific elements they contain, but also in terms of the nature of these content elements and the way in which they are related to each other—in short, in terms of their cognitive structures. Thus, images may vary in the number of elements of which they are composed, and particularly in the number of details and nuances; they may be more or less rich and refined, more or less complex and differentiated. Moreover, images can be characterized in terms of the affect toward the object that they carry—the degree to which the individual tends to approach or avoid, to like or dislike, to favor or oppose this object. This general affective orientation toward an object is what the term *attitude* usually refers to. Typically, the attitude associated with an image has both positive and negative components. If an image is relatively complex and differentiated, then it would be more appropriate to speak of a number of attitudes; that is, the individual may be more or less favorable or unfavorable, depending on the aspect of the object to which he is relating himself.

When we speak of an image as an organized representation of an object, we do not wish to imply that all images are consistent and well defined. The term *organized* is merely meant to convey that images have some coherent structure, that there is at least some tendency to relate different impressions of the object to each other so that they hang together in a unified whole. In other words, the image is not just an accumulation of discrete components, but a grouping of these components into a more efficient structure. This implies that there will be some push toward consistency—among the elements that constitute the image, as well as between the cognitive and affective components. The degree of consistency of images, however, can vary widely; the representation of an object can be coherent and organized even though it contains contradictions and ambiguities.

This leads us to a further qualification. Neither the view that images have some coherent structure, nor the emphasis on the perceived character of the object is meant to restrict our definition of images to conceptions that are clearly articulated and conscious. Many components of an image may be the products of direct and indirect experiences that the individual cannot recall; these components may be vague and incapable of verbalization, but they may nonetheless play an important role in the individual's conception of the object and behavior toward it. Thus, we are interested not only in the individual's verbalizations about what the object is like, but also in the conceptions of the object that are *implicit* in the ways in which he relates himself to it. It follows that, in the assessment of images, one would ideally want to supplement the individual's phenomenological descriptions of the object with observations of (or questions about) his behavior toward the object and with certain indirect devices. On the basis of these one can then make further inferences about the images that govern his relationship to the object.

In selecting national and international images as one of the two major foci of this volume, our intention is not to be restrictive, to use image in a very precise way that would differentiate it sharply from such related concepts as attitude and opinion. Rather, the concept is meant to be broadly representative of the whole family of attitudinal variables. We are concerned with the conceptions that individuals have of

their own nation, of other nations, and of the international system as a whole. Directly linked to these conceptions are a variety of attitudes, opinions, and beliefs, with varying degrees of generality; for example, general attitudes toward conciliation vs. belligerence in international affairs, or national sovereignty, or international organization, and opinions on specific foreign policy issues. All of these are relevant to our discussion of national and international images, and the chapters in Part One bring in data on image-associated attitudes and opinions whenever these pertain to the argument. Some chapters, in fact, draw more heavily on data about attitudes toward policy issues than they do on data about images of nation-objects.

In short, no sharp distinction between images and related concepts is intended. We will usually speak of images when we refer to the way in which nations or international systems are perceived, of attitudes when we refer to general policy orientations, and of opinions when we refer to positions on specific issues. It is recognized, however, that these various concepts are closely linked to each other and, to a certain extent, interchangeable. Thus, some recent conceptualizations of attitude and opinion (Smith, Bruner, & White, 1956; Katz, 1960) provide broad and functional definitions of these terms that are completely consistent with the definition of image used here. We were primarily concerned with selecting a term to characterize conceptions of nations and international systems that takes the individual's definition of the object—the way it is seen, the properties with which it is endowed—as the starting-point of analysis. The use of such a starting-point seems particularly appropriate to the study of international behavior, because it makes it easier to link behavior toward nation-objects directly and specifically to the perceived characteristics of these objects; and to deal with the cognitive structures of people's conceptions of nation-objects (which vary widely) and with the existence of mixed and often contradictory evaluations of these objects. The term image lends itself quite readily to this cognitive emphasis, although it is certainly not the only term that could have been employed.

In the study of international behavior it is also useful to have a concept that links perceptions of nation-objects to the characteristics of these objects. Again, the concept of image seems to facilitate this kind of linkage. The image can be seen as a joint product of the characteristics of the object and the characteristics of the perceiver (Kleining, 1959). One can use the same descriptive dimensions to characterize the image and the object and therefore move more readily from the nature of the object to the perception of the beholder. It thus becomes possible to integrate within the same conceptual scheme the "public image" of an organization, as Boulding (1956) calls it, and the images of the organization as held by its members, as long as one keeps in mind, however, that "the image is always the property of the individual persons, not of the organization" (Boulding, 1956, p. 28).

For example, the nation-state as a system conveys—through its institutional structures, basic documents, and elite communications—a certain definition of its character and functions and of the roles that its nationals must enact if the system is to carry out its functions. Individual nationals in turn adopt, as part of their personal belief systems, certain images of the state and of their own roles in relation to it; typically these images will be some variant of the "public image." The term image can thus be useful in conceptualizing

political ideology in a way that bridges the system level and the individual level, since comparable dimensions can be used to describe both the definition that is communicated and the image that is adopted.

Similarly, in the study of the mutual images of two nations, one can develop a common set of dimensions, not only to compare various images held by A and B (A's image of B with B's image of A; A's self-image with B's image of A, and vice versa; A's self-image with his image of B, and vice versa), but also to compare the way in which each nation tries to present itself with the way in which it is perceived. This latter possibility, unfortunately, has led to some perversion of the concept of image when used in a public relations context. One often hears references, nowadays, to the need for some product, organization, or political candidate to "project" a certain image. This not only is questionable on ethical grounds, in that it implies an attempt to change the perception of an object by manipulating the perceiver rather than the object perceived, but it also misuses the term image. It treats image as if it were a deliberate creation of the object rather than a property of the individual who beholds the object. This is definitely not the way in which the concept is used in the present volume. At the same time, the possibility of using the same dimensions to characterize the object as represented in the cognitive system of the perceiver, and as presented in communications directed to him, makes the concept of image useful in the effort to relate individual and societal processes.

The concept of national and international images is used, to varying degrees, in both parts of this volume, but it represents the central focus of attention in Part One. For the chapters in Part One, national and international images are the objects of study, while in Part Two they are brought into the discussion (along with other concepts) as explanatory variables. Perhaps one way of putting it—though this is only an approximation—is that images are the *dependent* variables in Part One, while they are typically *independent* or *mediating* variables when they are used in Part Two. The seven chapters in Part One explore, from different vantage points, the *determinants* of national and international images. They can be grouped into three categories:

1. Chapters 2 and 3 are concerned with the sources of national and international images in the psychological structure of the individual, the social structure of his society, and his own place within that social structure. In Chapter 2, Robert LeVine draws on ethnographic data from preindustrial societies to explore the ways in which intersocietal images develop in the course of socialization, and the effect of the social structure of the society into which the individual is socialized on the nature of these images. In Chapter 3, William Scott examines data from industrial societies that bear on the structure of images and their relationship to various personality and demographic characteristics of the individual.

2. The next three chapters are concerned with the effects of various specific experiences on the formation of images and their modification. Chapter 4, by Ithiel de Sola Pool, focuses on the effects of direct cross-national contacts that occur in the course of travel in foreign countries. Chapter 5, by Karl Deutsch and Richard Merritt, deals with the effects of external events, both national and international, and messages about these events. Chapter 6, by Irving Janis and Brewster Smith, focuses on the effects of deliberate attempts to modify images, through education and persuasion.

3. The last two chapters of Part One are concerned with the ways in which images and associated positions on foreign policy issues are related to the nature of the interaction between two nations and the foreign policy process. In particular, they deal with the kinds of images and attitudes that tend to be manifested in the context of a conflictual relationship between two nations. In Chapter 7, Ralph White uses data on Soviet citizens' images of their own society and of the United States as a case in point, and examines these in terms of the dynamics of intergroup conflict. In Chapter 8, Milton Rosenberg draws on data about American public opinion regarding Cold-War issues to illustrate the way in which images and attitudes flow out of the process of foreign policy formation and execution. Of the contributions to Part One, these last two chapters have the most direct relevance to the study of international politics. The other chapters do have some very definite implications for international politics, but they must be viewed primarily as contributions to the study of the international behavior of individuals.

Processes of Interaction in International Relations

The term interaction, like the term image, is used rather broadly in the present volume and is meant to encompass a whole family of processes that can be subjected to a social-psychological analysis. The empirical focus and the basic unit of analysis of all of the chapters that are subsumed under this rubric is the social interaction of individuals. In some chapters, the focus is directly on processes of social interaction—for example, the process of bargaining, or joint decision-making, or informal communication. In other chapters, the focus is on certain societal processes that represent aggregations of social interactions occurring throughout the population—such as the evolution of a mood or the arousal of an ideology. In all cases, however, the basic data are the behaviors of individuals in interaction with one another.

Social interaction has already been described (see p. 22) as the pattern of mutual actions and reactions of two or more individuals who are engaged in a continuing attempt to assess and affect one another's goals, images, expectations, and evaluations. I have also indicated that social interaction is, par excellence, the area in which individual and institutional processes intersect, and must be studied with an eye to the larger societal context within which it occurs. Thus, when we speak here of processes of interaction in international relations, we refer to social interactions for which the national and international systems serve, at least in part, as the defining context. An international relations context would characterize almost any situation in which nationals of *different* countries interact with each other—certainly when they interact as representatives of their respective countries, or when they interact within the framework of an international organization, but also (to varying degrees) when they interact as private individuals.

Similarly, when nationals of the *same* country interact with each other around matters of foreign policy—whether they be national decision-makers planning a course of action for their government in its dealings with another government, or a group of private citizens who have come together either to build fallout shelters or to oppose building them—we again have an instance of social interaction in an international relations context. Finally, another instance would be those processes of reverberation and reinforcement within and sometimes across national populations

that yield a state of readiness for particular kinds of international action—whether it be a climate of hostility or *détente*, a feeling of outrage or sympathy toward some other nation, a sense of national pride or national shame.

We have defined our focus as the social interaction of individuals within an international relations context. This is, indeed, the appropriate focus for social-psychological conceptualization, which must ultimately derive its data from the behaviors of individuals. Yet the designation "processes of interaction in international relations" suggests another possible focus, namely the interaction between *nation-states*. This degree of ambiguity or surplus meaning has some real justification, however, for it calls attention to another level of interpretation of the materials presented.

As far as the basic unit of analysis is concerned, we are indeed dealing with the interaction between individuals rather than nation-states. The situations of interaction themselves, however, can be seen (to varying degrees) as aspects of the behavior of states and the interaction between them. This is most obvious with respect to the study of decision-making in foreign policy: our data consist, to be sure, of the interactions between individuals, but we are certainly observing an aspect of state behavior. Some analysts, in fact, would say that the behavior of the key decision-makers *is* state behavior. It is also clear that the interactions of national representatives in international negotiations or international organizations can be seen as aspects of the interaction between states. It is least clear when we study cross-national contacts of private individuals, but even here it must be kept in mind that international exchange represents one component—albeit a minor one—of the foreign policies of most states. Thus, even the interactions between travelers in foreign countries and their hosts can be seen, in some sense, as manifestations of the interactions between nations.

In short, then, the conceptual focus of Part Two of this volume can be defined at two levels. The actual object of study is the social interaction of individuals in an international relations context. Insofar as these interaction situations constitute aspects of state behavior, however, their investigation has some relevance to the study of interaction between nation-states. This is not to say that one can equate the behaviors of the individuals observed with those of the state. Conclusions about state behavior as such can only be drawn if one specifies the precise links between the individuals and groups observed and the loci of state action.

The seven chapters in Part Two explore different processes of interaction in different settings. In line with some of the distinctions that have already been made, they can be grouped into three categories:

1. Chapters 9 and 10 are concerned with some of the processes of interaction that are widely distributed across the elites and publics of a national population and serve to create a state of readiness for certain kinds of international action. What we are dealing with here are essentially societal processes formed by the aggregation of social interactions among many individuals and groups throughout the population. In Chapter 9, Harold Lasswell discusses the development of widespread moods within a population at certain historical junctures, which provide a climate conducive to particular kinds of action in the international arena. In Chapter 10, Daniel Katz discusses the development and arousal of different kinds of nationalist ideology within different kinds of national sys-

tems, and relates these to the orientations toward international relations—particularly to the strategies of international conflict resolution—that these national systems are likely to adopt.

2. The next two chapters focus on interaction processes involved in the on-going conduct of foreign affairs—in the determination of the actions and reactions of two or more nations vis-à-vis each other, in specific cases and over a more extended period of time. The emphasis here is largely, though not exclusively, on interactions among the decision-makers within a national government who are responsible for international action. In Chapter 11, Dean Pruitt examines the processes of perception and orientation, occurring simultaneously and sequentially among the decision-makers (and publics) of two interacting nations, that lead to different kinds of definition of the situation—and thus, in turn, predispose to different kinds of international action. In Chapter 12, James Robinson and Richard Snyder examine both the processes of deliberation and the organizational processes in which national officials engage, as they develop and execute foreign policy decisions.

3. The final three chapters of Part Two focus on three different kinds of situations in which individuals of different nationalities engage in direct, face-to-face interaction. In Chapter 13, Jack Sawyer and Harold Guetzkow examine processes of negotiation and bargaining in international relations, which involve direct interactions between different nationals as *representatives* of their respective governments. In Chapter 14, Chadwick Alger presents data on personal interactions in intergovernmental organizations—such as the United Nations—which include not only national representatives but also a supranational secretariat, and in which even the national representatives often enact nonnational or supranational roles. Finally, in Chapter 15, Anita Mishler examines cross-national interactions that occur in the context of international exchanges, which involve interactions between different nationals as private *individuals*, although in a certain sense they may see themselves and be seen by others as representatives of their nations.

Relevance to International Politics

A considerable portion of the material to be presented in this volume, as has already been noted, is intended to have some bearing on the study of international politics. This is true to some degree for Part One, and to a much greater degree for Part Two. While the basic units of analysis are typically the behaviors of individuals and their interactions, a number of chapters are directly and others indirectly concerned with the effects of these individual behaviors on the behavior of nation-states and with the way in which they mediate certain societal outcomes for national and international systems—outcomes that are ultimately linked to the probability of peace or war. Let us take another look, therefore, before concluding this introduction, at the whole question of the relationship of the social-psychological level of analysis in international relations to the study of international politics.

It should be clear, from our delineation of the scope of social-psychological approaches to international relations and of the coverage of this volume, that we are dealing with a research area that is both broader and narrower than the study of international politics. It is broader because it includes not only the study of international politics, but also what we have designated—for lack of a better term—as the study of the "international behavior of individuals."

The empirical focus of social-psychological approaches in this field is almost always, and almost by definition, the international behavior of individuals. In some of the research, however, this focus is used for the purpose of illuminating the behavior of nations, while in other studies it is an end in itself. That is, the study of people's images of other nations and of the international system, of the sources of their attitudes toward foreign affairs, of the nature of their involvement in national roles, or of their experiences in cross-national contacts, may be remote from the questions of war and peace, but it represents a legitimate and fascinating area of social-psychological research in its own right.

In the long run, this kind of research may have some real contributions to make to questions of war and peace by building up our understanding of the psychological and social processes that run parallel to the operations of national and international systems. In the short run, however, this work can stand by itself and does not need to be justified by its relevance to international politics. In this sense, then, our concern is *broader* than the study of international politics.

Our concern is *narrower* than the study of international politics in the sense that a social-psychological analysis, where it does address itself to questions of international politics, can deal only with part of the picture. It can *contribute* to the study of international politics, along with other analytic approaches, but it can never *be* the study of international politics. I have already emphasized that, when we deal with war or peace, we are dealing with behaviors of nations, carried out in a historical context and within the terms of a national and international political structure. This must be the starting-point of our analysis. Such an analysis can then reveal certain problems that can be handled most adequately through the use of social-psychological concepts and methods. In other words, a social-psychological approach is not a total approach to the study of international politics, which can serve as a substitute for alternative approaches. Rather, it is part of a total approach to which it can contribute once relevant points of application have been identified.

Ideally, we would want to have a broad conceptual framework for the analysis of interstate behavior. Such a framework would yield the kinds of questions that need to be answered, and would help us to identify those questions that can be answered most appropriately in social-psychological terms. To the extent to which such a procedure is approximated, we would be able to maximize the relevance of social-psychological research that is undertaken and see precisely where it fits into the larger picture and contributes to rounding it out. In an earlier paper (Kelman, 1955, reprinted in Hoffmann, 1960, pp. 209–222) I attempted to sketch out the beginnings of such a framework. While it is extremely tentative and rudimentary, it may help to illustrate the point that social-psychological considerations can fit into a larger framework but certainly not substitute for it.

The framework uses as its starting-point the following question: "Given a particular level of interaction between two nations, what is the probability that the sequence of events initiated by a given situation of interaction will produce war or peace or some other final outcome?" (Kelman, 1955, p. 55). The framework is designed as a scaffolding in terms of which this question can be broken down and answers to it can be sought. Thus, it suggests an analysis of the sequence of events initi-

ated by a given situation into five steps: (a) communication about the situation to the elite and other segments of the population; (b) definition of the situation and perception of choices; (c) development of a climate or state of readiness for certain actions; (d) commission of specific acts relevant to the interest of the other nation; and (e) achievement of a new level of interaction or return to the initial equilibrium. Furthermore, the framework suggests "a distinction among three types of factors which are likely to affect each step in the sequence and hence the final outcome of the interaction: societal, attitudinal, and structural factors. These three types of factors differ in terms of the units of analysis and levels of theorizing to which they refer: societal factors describe characteristics of nations, attitudinal factors characteristics of individuals, and structural factors characteristics of structures or aggregating machineries. Societal factors set limits on international relations; attitudinal factors determine predispositions towards certain decisions and actions and thus modify the effects of societal factors; and structural factors determine who influences decisions and how this influence is exerted and thus prescribe the way in which societal and attitudinal factors are channelled into action" (p. 54).

The framework can thus be visualized as a fifteen-cell matrix, in which the five steps in the sequence of events represent the rows and the three types of determining factors represent the columns. Table 1.1 presents this matrix in summary form. Each cell in the table contains an illustration of a variable that might affect one of the steps in the

TABLE 1.1

Examples of Societal, Attitudinal, and Structural Variables That Might Affect the Outcome of an Interaction between Two Nations

Steps in the sequence of events initiated by a given situation of interaction	*Societal variables*	*Attitudinal variables*	*Structural variables*
Communication about the situation	Stability of regime	Expectancies in relation to other nation	Degree of centralization of mass media
Definition of the situation	Vulnerability of industrial apparatus	Level of trust vis-à-vis other nation	Power of military-industrial complex
Development of a climate for action	Level of unemployment	General level of optimism-pessimism	Diversity of opinion-making elites
Commission of specific acts	Military capability	Risk-taking propensity	Authority structure of decision-making organizations
Achievement of a new or return to initial level of interaction	Cohesion of alliance system	Responsiveness between the two nations	Effectiveness of international arbitration machinery

sequence of events initiated by a given situation of interaction, and thus the final outcome of that interaction.

Let us say, for example, that a naval vessel belonging to nation A opened fire against a fishing boat belonging to nation B. How this event is communicated to the population of B—and thus, in part, the final outcome of the sequence of events thus initiated—will depend on a variety of variables. An example of a societal variable that will affect this communication is the stability of the regime of nation B (row 1, column 1): If the regime is unstable, the decision-makers may be more likely to play up this event as a way of focusing on an external enemy and thus increasing internal cohesiveness. An example of an attitudinal variable that will affect this communication is the set of expectancies about nation A that are commonly held in nation B as a result of the prevailing level of interaction between the two nations (row 1, column 2): If B expects hostility from A, then it is more likely that this incident will be communicated as an act of deliberate provocation; if B expects friendliness, then the event is more likely to be communicated as an exception or an accident or a misunderstanding. Finally, an example of a structural variable that will affect communication of this event to B is the degree of centralization of B's mass media (row 1, column 3): If the mass media are highly centralized, only one version of the event is likely to be communicated and thus to dominate the definition of the situation; if the control of the mass media is decentralized, then several interpretations are likely to be communicated and a wider range of choices in response is likely to be perceived. It should be noted that the illustrative examples in each cell of Table 1.1 are not necessarily unique to the row in which they are placed, but each example was selected to illustrate a variable that might determine what happens at the step in the sequence of events represented by that row.

A social-psychological analysis would be most directly appropriate to the five cells in the second column of Table 1.1, which refers to the effects of attitudinal variables on the interaction between two nations. Part One of the present volume is devoted to an exploration of the nature of these variables. A social-psychological approach has some relevance to the study of societal and structural variables as well, particularly in providing some methods for assessing these variables and their effects. For example, one might use opinion data (along with other types of data) in order to measure such societal variables as the stability of the regime, the extent of internal conflict within a national system, or the degree of polarization of the international system. Similarly, one might use interview techniques in the study of the power structure and the communication structure within a nation, aimed at establishing who is involved in the foreign policy process and by what means their influence feeds into the final decisions. Societal and structural variables can also be built (and in fact have been built) into such laboratory approaches as the Inter-Nation Simulation (Guetzkow *et al.*, 1963; see especially Chapter 3 by Robert Noel). Nevertheless, the contribution of a social-psychological analysis to the identification and conceptualization of societal and structural variables is less direct than its contribution to the study of attitudinal variables. If we recognize the role of these different variables and the interaction between them in determining international behavior, we can develop a clearer view of where and how social-psychological research fits into the larger picture.

As for the rows of our fifteen-cell matrix, each step in the sequence of events can be analyzed in social-psychological terms—that is, in terms of the processes of social interaction engaged in by decision-makers, elites, and publics. This is essentially the concern of Part Two of the present volume. An analysis restricted to this level, however, would be patently incomplete. What happens at each step in the sequence is heavily determined by societal and structural factors, along with attitudinal ones. For example, how a given international situation is defined in a particular country may depend to a large degree on such factors as the existence of an economic recession in the country or the role of veterans' organizations and groups of superpatriots in its communication structure. These factors are essential parts of the input into the social interaction processes that lead the public to develop a certain climate of opinion and the decision-makers to select a certain course of action. Societal and structural factors also serve as major constraints to the processes that occur at each step, for example to the nature of the communications that can take place and the nature of the decisions that can be made. Finally, societal and structural factors constitute the important outcomes at each step, such as changes in the rate of armament or development of new international organizations. The general level of interaction between two nations, which is the end-point of any particular sequence of events, can be described in terms of such an attitudinal factor as "responsiveness between nations" (Pruitt, 1962, and Chapter 11 in this volume), but this is of necessity associated with certain societal and structural conditions.

In short, in order to understand what happens at each step in a sequence of interaction between nations, we must take into account the societal and structural, as well as attitudinal inputs into the process and constraints upon it. In order to understand the effects of one step in the sequence upon the next, we must also take into account the societal, structural, as well as attitudinal outcomes at each point. Moreover, it may often be possible to gain insights into internation behavior by remaining entirely at the macroscopic level—establishing relationships, for example, between such variables as rate of urbanization in a society and level of arms production (cf. Russett *et al.*, 1964). Relationships of this sort may suggest the operation of important societal processes, with major impacts on international relations, that might be difficult to assess or might even be obscured by a microanalysis of the decision to increase armaments.

This brief presentation of one framework for the study of internation behavior was designed to illustrate both the potentials and the limits of a social-psychological analysis. All one can claim for such an analysis—if it is carried out with due regard to the historical and political context of international relations—is that it can illuminate some aspects of the larger problem of international politics. The relevance of a social-psychological approach, even in this limited sense, is certainly open to question, because of difficulties due, for example, to the problem of generalization from one level of analysis to another, or the existence of severe constraints on the actions of decision-makers, or the limited role of public opinion in the foreign policy process. I shall return to these issues and to the whole question of relevance in the concluding chapter. In the meantime, however, I invite the reader to examine, in the chapters that follow, the illustrations of possible applications of social-psychological concepts and

methods to the study of international behavior, including some aspects of international politics.

REFERENCES

Alger, C. F. Non-resolution consequences of the United Nations and their effect on international conflict. *J. Confl. Resol.*, 1961, *5*, 128–145.

Alger, C. F. Comparison of intranational and international politics. *Amer. pol. Sci. Rev.*, 1963, *57*, 406–419.

Allport, G. W. Human nature and the peace. *Psychol. Bull.*, 1945, *42*, 376–378.

Almond, G. A. *The American people and foreign policy.* New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1950.

Archibald, Kathleen Social science approaches to peace: Problems and issues. *Soc. Problems*, 1963, *11*, 91–104.

Barton, A. A survey of suburban residents on what to do about the danger of war. *Council for Correspondence Newsl.*, March 1963, No. 24, 3–11.

Bass, B. M., & Dunteman, G. Biases in the evaluation of one's own group, its allies and opponents. *J. Confl. Resol.*, 1963, *7*, 16–20.

Bauer, R. A., Pool, I. de S., & Dexter, L. A. *American business and public policy: The politics of foreign trade.* New York: Atherton Press, 1963.

Blake, R. R., & Mouton, Jane S. The intergroup dynamics of win-lose conflict and problem-solving collaboration in union-management relations. In M. Sherif (Ed.), *Intergroup relations and leadership.* New York: Wiley, 1962. Pp. 94–140.

Boulding, K. E. *The image.* Ann Arbor: Univer. Michigan Press, 1956.

Brody, R. A. Some systemic effects of the spread of nuclear weapons technology: A study through simulation of a multi-nuclear future. *J. Confl. Resol.*, 1963, *7*, 663–753.

Bronfenbrenner, U. The mirror image in Soviet-American relations: A social psychologist's report. *J. soc. Issues*, 1961, *17* (3), 45–56.

Bruner, J. S., & Perlmutter, H. V. Compatriot and foreigner: A study of impression formation in three countries. *J. abnorm. soc. Psychol.*, 1957, *55*, 253–260.

Buchanan, W., & Cantril, H. *How nations see each other.* Urbana: Univer. Illinois Press, 1953.

Campbell, D. T., & LeVine, R. A. A proposal for cooperative cross-cultural research on ethnocentrism. *J. Confl. Resol.*, 1961, *5*, 82–108.

Cantril, H. (Ed.) *Tensions that cause wars.* Urbana: Univer. Illinois Press, 1950.

Chesler, M., & Schmuck, R. Student reactions to the Cuban crisis and public dissent. *Publ. Opin. Quart.*, 1964, *28*, 467–482.

Christiansen, B. *Attitudes toward foreign affairs as a function of personality.* Oslo: Oslo Univer. Press, 1959.

Claude, I. (Ed.) The place of theory in the conduct and study of international relations. *J. Confl. Resol.*, 1960, *4* (3).

Coelho, G. V. (Ed.) Impacts of studying abroad. *J. soc. Issues*, 1962, *18* (1).

Crow, W. J. A study of strategic doctrines using the Inter-Nation Simulation. *J. Confl. Resol.*, 1963, *7*, 580–589.

Danckwortt, D. *Probleme der Anpassung an eine fremde Kultur.* Köln: Carl Duisberg Gesellschaft für Nachwuchsförderung, 1959.

Deutsch, K. W. *Nationalism and social communication.* New York: Wiley, 1953.

Deutsch, M. Trust and suspicion. *J. Confl. Resol.*, 1958, *2*, 265–279.

Deutsch, M. A psychological basis for peace. In Q. Wright, W. M. Evan, & M. Deutsch (Eds.), *Preventing World War III: Some proposals.* New York: Simon & Schuster, 1962. Pp. 369–392.

Deutsch, M., & Krauss, R. M. Studies of

interpersonal bargaining. *J. Confl. Resol.*, 1962, *6*, 52–76.

Doob, L. W. South Tyrol: An introduction to the psychological syndrome of nationalism. *Publ. Opin. Quart.*, 1962, *26*, 172–184.

Douglas, Ann The peaceful settlement of industrial and intergroup disputes. *J. Confl. Resol.*, 1957, *1*, 69–81.

Droba, D. D. Effect of various factors on militarism-pacifism. *J. abnorm. soc. Psychol.*, 1931, *26*, 141–153.

Dror, Y. The barriers facing policy science. *Amer. behav. Scientist*, 1964, *7*, 3–7.

Duijker, H. C. J., & Frijda, N. H. *National character and national stereotypes.* Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Co., 1960.

Durbin, E. F. M., & Bowlby, J. *Personal aggressiveness and war.* London: Kegan Paul, 1939.

Ekman, P., *et al.* Divergent reactions to the threat of war: Shelter and peace groups during the Berlin crisis. *Council for Correspondence Newsl.*, March 1963, No. 24, 11–25.

Eysenck, H. J. War and aggressiveness: A survey of social attitude studies. In T. H. Pear (Ed.), *Psychological factors of peace and war.* London: Hutchinson, 1950. Pp. 49–81.

Fox, W. T. R. (Ed.) *Theoretical aspects of international relations.* Notre Dame, Indiana: Univer. Notre Dame Press, 1959.

Frank, J. D. Breaking the thought barrier: Psychological challenges of the nuclear age. *Psychiatry*, 1960, *23*, 245–266.

Free, L. A. *Six allies and a neutral.* New York: Free Press, 1959.

Gladstone, A. I., & Taylor, Martha A. Threat-related attitudes and reactions to communications about international events. *J. Confl. Resol.*, 1958, *2*, 17–28.

Glover, E. *War, sadism and pacifism.* London: Allen & Unwin, 1946.

Guetzkow, H. *Multiple loyalties.* Princeton: Princeton Univer. Press, 1955.

Guetzkow, H. Isolation and collaboration: A partial theory of inter-nation relations. *J. Confl. Resol.*, 1957, *1*, 48–68.

Guetzkow, H., Alger, C. F., Brody, R. A., Noel, R. C., & Snyder, R. C. *Simulation in international relations.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1963.

Gullahorn, J. T., & Gullahorn, Jeanne E. An extension of the U-curve hypothesis. *J. soc. Issues*, 1963, *19* (3), 33–47.

Hero, A. O. *Americans in world affairs.* Boston: World Peace Foundation, 1959. (a)

Hero, A. O. *Opinion leaders in American communities.* Boston: World Peace Foundation, 1959. (b)

Hero, A. O. *Voluntary organizations in world affairs communication.* Boston: World Peace Foundation, 1960.

Higgs, L. D., & Weinland, R. G. *Project Michelson status report I.* China Lake, California: U.S. Naval Ordnance Test Station, 1964.

Hoffmann, S. H. (Ed.) *Contemporary theory in international relations.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1960.

Holsti, O. R. The belief system and national images: A case study. *J. Confl. Resol.*, 1962, *6*, 244–252.

Isaacs, H. R. *Scratches on our minds.* New York: John Day, 1958.

Isaacs, H. R. *Emergent Americans: A report on "Crossroads Africa."* New York: John Day, 1961.

Jensen, L. Soviet-American bargaining behavior in the post-war disarmament negotiations. *J. Confl. Resol.*, 1963, *7*, 522–541.

Katz, D. The functional approach to the study of attitudes. *Publ. Opin. Quart.*, 1960, *24*, 163–204.

Kelman, H. C. Societal, attitudinal and structural factors in international relations. *J. soc. Issues*, 1955, *11* (1), 42–56.

Kelman, H. C. Changing attitudes

through international activities. *J. soc. Issues,* 1962, *18* (1), 68–87. (a)

Kelman, H. C. Internationalizing military force. In Q. Wright, W. M. Evan, & M. Deutsch (Eds.), *Preventing World War III: Some proposals.* New York: Simon & Schuster, 1962. Pp. 106–122. (b)

Kelman, H. C. (with Victoria Steinitz) The reactions of participants in a foreign specialists seminar to their American experience. *J. soc. Issues,* 1963, *19* (3), 61–114.

Kisker, G. W. (Ed.) *World tension: The psychopathology of international relations.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1951.

Kleining, G. Zum gegenwärtigen Stand der Imageforschung. *Psychologie und Praxis,* 1959, *3,* 198–212.

Klineberg, O. *Tensions affecting international understanding.* New York: Social Science Research Council, 1950.

Klineberg, O. *The human dimension in international relations.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964.

Knorr, K., & Verba, S. (Eds.) *The international system: Theoretical essays.* Princeton: Princeton Univer. Press, 1961.

Lambert, W. E., & Klineberg, O. A pilot study of the origin and development of national stereotypes. *Int. soc. Sci. J.,* 1959, *11,* 221–238.

Levinson, D. J. Authoritarian personality and foreign policy. *J. Confl. Resol.,* 1957, *1,* 37–47.

Levy, S. G., & Hefner, R. Multidimensional scaling of international attitudes. *Peace Research Society (International) Papers,* 1964, *1,* 129–165.

Lundstedt, S. (Ed.) Human factors in cross-cultural adjustment. *J. soc. Issues,* 1963, *19* (3).

May, M. A. *A social psychology of war and peace.* New Haven: Yale Univer. Press, 1943.

McClelland, C.A. The function of theory in international relations. *J. Confl. Resol.,* 1960, *4,* 303–336.

Milburn, T. W. The concept of deterrence: Some logical and psychological considerations. *J. soc. Issues,* 1961, *17* (3), 3–11.

Milburn, T. W. *Studies in deterrence: I. Design for the study of deterrent processes.* China Lake, California: U.S. Naval Ordnance Test Station, 1964.

Mouton, Jane S., & Blake, R. R. The influence of competitively vested interests on judgments. *J. Confl. Resol.,* 1962, *6,* 149–153.

Murphy, G. (Ed.) *Human nature and enduring peace.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1945.

North, R. C., Holsti, O. R., Zaninovich, M. G., & Zinnes, Dina A. *Content analysis: A handbook with applications for the study of international crisis.* Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern Univer. Press, 1963.

Osgood, C. E. *Alternative to war or surrender.* Urbana: Univer. Illinois Press, 1962.

Paul, J., & Laulicht, J. *In your opinion: Leaders' and voters' attitudes on defence and disarmament.* Clarkson, Ontario: Canadian Peace Research Institute, 1963.

Pear, T. H. (Ed.) *Psychological factors of peace and war.* London: Hutchinson, 1950.

Perlmutter, H. V. Some characteristics of the xenophilic personality. *J. Psychol.* 1954, *38,* 291–300.

Perlmutter, H. V. Correlates of two types of xenophilic orientation. *J. abnorm. soc. Psychol.,* 1956, *52,* 130–135.

Perry, S. E. Notes on the role of the national: A social-psychological concept for the study of international relations. *J. Confl. Resol.,* 1957, *1,* 346–363.

Pilisuk, M., & Rapoport, A. Stepwise disarmament and sudden destruction in a two-person game: A research tool. *J. Confl. Resol.,* 1964, *8,* 36–49.

Pool, I. de S. *Communication and values in relation to war and peace.* New York:

Institute for International Order, 1961.

Pool, I. de S., Keller, Suzanne, & Bauer, R. A. The influence of foreign travel on political attitudes of American businessmen. *Publ. Opin. Quart.*, 1956, *20*, 151–175.

Proshansky, H. M., & Evans, R. I. (Eds.) American political extremism in the 1960's. *J. soc. Issues*, 1963, *19* (2).

Pruitt, D. G. An analysis of responsiveness between nations. *J. Confl. Resol.*, 1962, *6*, 5–18.

Putney, S., & Middleton, R. Some factors associated with student acceptance or rejection of war. *Amer. sociol. Rev.*, 1962, *27*, 655–667.

Rapoport, A. Formal games as probing tools for investigating behavior motivated by trust and suspicion. *J. Confl. Resol.*, 1963, *7*, 570–579.

Raser, J. R., & Crow, W. J. *WINSAFE II: An Inter-Nation Simulation study of deterrence postures embodying capacity to delay response.* La Jolla, California: Western Behavioral Sciences Institute, 1964.

Richardson, L. F. Threats and security. In T. H. Pear (Ed.), *Psychological factors of peace and war.* London: Hutchinson, 1950. Pp. 219–235.

Rose, P. I. Citizens' opinions on civil defense. *Council for Correspondence Newsl.*, March 1963, No. 24, 25–37.

Rose, P. I., & Laulicht, J. (Eds.) The threat of war: Policy and public opinion. *Soc. Problems*, 1963, *11* (1).

Rosenau, J. N. *Public opinion and foreign policy.* New York: Random House, 1961.

Rosenau, J. N. *National leadership and foreign policy: A case study in the mobilization of public support.* Princeton: Princeton Univer. Press, 1963.

Russell, R. W. (Ed.) Psychology and policy in a nuclear age. *J. soc. Issues*, 1961, *17* (3).

Russett, B. M. (with Alker, H. R., Jr., Deutsch, K. W., & Lasswell, H. D.) *World handbook of political and social indicators.* New Haven: Yale Univer. Press, 1964.

Schelling, T. C. Experimental games and bargaining theory. In K. Knorr & S. Verba (Eds.), *The international system.* Princeton: Princeton Univer. Press, 1961. Pp. 47–68.

Sherif, M. Superordinate goals in the reduction of intergroup conflict. *Amer. J. Sociol.*, 1958, *63*, 349–356.

Sherif, M., Harvey, O. J., White, B. J., Hood, W. R., & Sherif, Carolyn W. *Intergroup conflict and cooperation: The Robbers Cave experiment.* Norman: Univer. Oklahoma Book Exchange, 1961.

Singer, J. D. The relevance of the behavioral sciences to the study of international relations. *Behav. Sci.*, 1961, *6*, 324–335. (a)

Singer, J. D. The level-of-analysis problem in international relations. In K. Knorr & S. Verba (Eds.), *The international system.* Princeton: Princeton Univer. Press, 1961. Pp. 77–92. (b)

Smith, H. P. Do intercultural experiences affect attitudes? *J. abnorm. soc. Psychol.*, 1955, *51*, 469–477.

Smith, M. B. (Ed.) Attitudes and adjustment in cross-cultural contact: Recent studies of foreign students. *J. soc. Issues*, 1956, *12* (1).

Smith, M. B., Bruner, J. S., & White, R. W. *Opinions and personality.* New York: Wiley, 1956.

Smith, M. B., Fawcett, J. T., Ezekiel, R., & Roth, Susan A factorial study of morale among Peace Corps teachers in Ghana. *J. soc. Issues*, 1963, *19* (3), 10–32.

Snyder, R. C. Introduction. In R. C. Snyder, H. W. Bruck, & B. Sapin (Eds.), *Foreign policy decision-making.* New York: Free Press, 1962. Pp. 1–13.

Snyder, R. C. Some perspectives on the use of experimental techniques in the study of international relations. In H. Guetzkow *et al., Simulation in international relations.* Englewood Cliffs,

New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1963. Pp. 1–23.

Snyder, R. C., Bruck, H. W., & Sapin, B. Decision-making as an approach to the study of international politics. In R. C. Snyder, H. W. Bruck, & B. Sapin (Eds.), *Foreign policy decision-making*. New York: Free Press, 1962. Pp. 14–185.

Snyder, R. C., & Paige, G. D. The United States decision to resist aggression in Korea: The application of an analytical scheme. *Admin. Sci. Quart.*, 1958, 3, 341–378.

Snyder, R. C., & Robinson, J. A. *National and international decision-making*. New York: Institute for International Order, 1961.

Stagner, R. Some factors related to attitude toward war, 1938. *J. soc. Psychol.*, 1942, *16*, 131–142.

Stagner, R. Studies of aggressive social attitudes. *J. soc. Psychol.*, 1944, *20*, 109–140.

Stagner, R., Brown, J. F., Gundlach, R. H., & White, R. K. A survey of public opinion on the prevention of war. *J. soc. Psychol.*, 1942, *16*, 109–130.

Swanson, G. E. The structure of a social psychology. University of Michigan, 1963. (Dittoed)

Terhune, K. W. Nationalism among foreign and American students: An exploratory study. *J. Confl. Resol.*, 1964, *8*, 256–270.

Tolman, E. C. *Drives toward war*. New York: Appleton-Century, 1942.

Torre, M. (Ed.) *The selection of personnel for international service*. New York: World Federation for Mental Health, 1963.

Waelder, R. *Psychological aspects of war and peace*. New York: Columbia Univer. Press, 1939.

Waskow, A. I. *The shelter-centered society*. Washington: Peace Research Institute, 1962.

Withey, S. B. *The U.S. and the U.S.S.R.* Ann Arbor: Survey Research Center, University of Michigan, 1961.

Zinnes, Dina A. Hostility in international decision-making. *J. Confl. Resol.*, 1962, *6*, 236–243.

Zinnes, Dina A., North, R. C., & Koch, H. E. Capability, threat, and the outbreak of war. In J. N. Rosenau (Ed.), *International politics and foreign policy*. New York: Free Press, 1961. Pp. 469–482.