

6-30-2000

Transboundary Areas and Peace: Virtual Peace and Virtual Reality in the 21st Century

Editor

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.erau.edu/ibpp>

 Part of the [Defense and Security Studies Commons](#), [International Relations Commons](#), [Other Political Science Commons](#), [Other Psychology Commons](#), [Peace and Conflict Studies Commons](#), and the [Public Policy Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Editor (2000) "Transboundary Areas and Peace: Virtual Peace and Virtual Reality in the 21st Century," *International Bulletin of Political Psychology*: Vol. 8 : Iss. 22 , Article 1.

Available at: <https://commons.erau.edu/ibpp/vol8/iss22/1>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in International Bulletin of Political Psychology by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact commons@erau.edu.

International Bulletin of Political Psychology

Title: Transboundary Areas and Peace: Virtual Peace and Virtual Reality in the 21st Century

Author: Editor

Volume: 8

Issue: 22

Date: 2000-06-30

Keywords: Boundaries, Peace, Political Violence, Public Policy, War

Abstract. This article outlines a conceptual structure for developing knowledge and assessing the impact that transboundary areas may have on Issues of war and peace. This structure is based on the constructs of virtual peace and virtual reality. Also, this structure can be used by psychologists and other researchers, political leaders and policymakers, and citizens throughout the world committed to a world with more peace and less war.

There are some common problems in the quest towards a world at peace or at least with more peace and less war. First, peace may be wrongly construed as the human state of how things should be. War and variants of political and other violence may--at least for some people in some situations--be deemed adaptive in an evolutionary sense or appropriate in some behavioral calculus comprising instrumental and ethical/moral goals.

Second, peace actually may be reified as the continuously desired state of human existence and this reification may present a paradox. Here, the quest for peace may constitute a subjugating discourse that induces an ideology exemplified as false consciousness that reinforces the status quo supporting hegemonic entities that ultimately live and die by the sword. In other words, well-meaning peace advocates serve the needs of those against peace by their very advocacy.

Third, the belief in the essential goodness of the quest for peace is so heavily invested and even cathected that well-meaning peace advocates approach the psychodynamics of the True Believer. Unfortunately, the various rigidities of the True Believer personality structure mitigate against effective application of the scientific method as well as other epistemological approaches to description, inference, prediction, and influence of human phenomena.

Fourth, there are certain long-standing mantras about the quest for peace that at the least must be heavily qualified by theoretical, empirical, and experimental research. These mantras suggest that adversaries are much less likely to employ violence and even to remain adversaries when they are able to experience face-to-face contacts, collaborate on joint projects, role play each other's perspectives, develop empathy, and, ultimately, when they give peace a chance. The many qualifications derived from research and inferred from historical and contemporary events do not seem to have much of an effect on the mantras that continue to crop up as general principles, means, and ends in the quest for peace--even by peace psychologists and other social scientists who should know better.

One mantra involves the positive consequences for peace and the minimization of violence when political boundaries are removed, become more permeable, or are otherwise transcended. What follows are some of the research qualifications and agendas that must be addressed when considering the relationship of political boundaries and peace. First, political boundaries between and among groups of people seem to characterize human history. An evolutionary psychologist might claim that this is so because boundaries are positively correlated with reproductive success or with successfully engaging in terror management--the attenuation of fear and anxiety related to considering one's mortality in a world with a too-high potential for morbidity. Of course, knowing why something psychological has

International Bulletin of Political Psychology

occurred and is occurring does not mean it should continue to occur morally, ethically, and even instrumentally. And knowing that something psychological has occurred through an evolutionary, instinctual, innate, or pre-programmed route does not preclude the identification or development of a change agent to modify it. Thus, the research agenda is to delineate whether the positive correlation is a causal, modifying, moderating, error, or yet some other extraneous factor before a full-bore action agenda would be advocated for, effected, and evaluated.

Second, intrapsychic boundary Issues constitute an important part of personalities and some personality disorders as defined by diagnostic and taxonomic manuals such as the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of the American Psychiatric Association. Just one example is the borderline personality disorder. One of its essential features is a pervasive pattern of instability of self-image. Related to this pattern is the periodic overwhelming of cognition by affect and sudden metamorphoses in affective intensity and quality. Often boundaries within the psyche for individuals who can be characterized by this diagnosis cry out for less permeability, less transcendence, and for further construction, not removal.

Now, the world is not full of such individuals, but there are many individuals with other diagnoses and other personality types who also would profit from the strengthening of intrapsychic boundaries. The key Issue here is that events external to these individuals and to all individuals--like changes in political boundaries--are consciously and unconsciously perceived as having direct effects on intrapsychic boundaries to varying degrees. A change in political boundaries can activate and attenuate propensities for suicide, homicide, assault and battery, rape, and form a substrate feeding into political violence including war. Much as Harold Lasswell taught us about political leaders acting out psychodynamic conflict upon the political stage, events on the political stage lead to isomorphically parallel changes in the psyche that in turn can lead to further political change. The research agenda is twofold. There is a need to develop methods to anticipate such phenomena and develop primary prevention techniques. There also is a need to develop methods to identify such phenomena and attenuate them through developing secondary and tertiary techniques.

Third, interpersonal boundaries also constitute a significant aspect of human functioning for the psychiatrically disordered and the normally disordered alike. Continuing with the borderline patient--viewed as a quantitatively more distinct and extreme example of human functioning--one should note that another pervasive pattern is of marked instability of intense interpersonal relationships alternating between extremes of idealization and devaluation. This pervasive pattern is related to the fluctuation in permeability of boundaries between self and other as well as to the above mentioned intrapsychic boundary Issues. And, as with intrapsychic boundaries, changes in interpersonal boundaries can be engendered by isomorphically parallel changes in political boundaries and can lead to yet other changes in political boundaries.

Moreover, interpersonal boundaries often serve as the basis for a number of rules of social transaction impacting on conceptions of normal, normative, and abnormal approaches to conflict and cooperation. At Issue is not only a descriptive behavioral compendium of social exchange and reciprocity, but also a dynamic semiotics and other variants of hermeneutics. Thus, the research agenda for delineating the relationship between boundaries and peace is again two-fold. As with intrapsychic boundaries, there needs to be a venture to establish primary, secondary, and tertiary intervention strategies. As well, there needs to be a systematic exploration of the reciprocal interactions of rules of social transaction and changes in political boundaries.

International Bulletin of Political Psychology

Fourth, boundaries often serve to simultaneously reinforce taboos and an approach-avoidance calculus towards them. Examples include sexual relations between therapist and patient/client, incest, same-sex sex wherein it is proscribed, rape, murder, assault, and the behavioral aggregates--crimes against humanity, war crimes, and genocide--that partially overlap the preceding. Physical, mental, and spiritual boundaries impede the expression of these behaviors. However, they also--with some population segments--serve to increase the attractiveness and stimulus pull of the taboos and can facilitate behavioral expression. In a like manner, political boundaries can impede or facilitate peace and war--each potentially functioning as totem and taboo. The research agenda is when, where, what, how, why, and involving who.

Again, the delineation of the relationship between political boundaries and peace depends on casting aside comfortable assumptions and employing combinations of theoretical, empirical, and experimental research. To do this, peace psychologists and others will need to develop reliable taxonomies for variants of transcending political boundaries. For example, it may well turn out that the label of biodiversity-related peace parks may harbor a number of important structural, functional, and process subgroupings. As well, exacting methods of inducing and deducing causality must be developed and applied to complex aspects of social behavior. Much the same thing was validly stated about social and political psychology in the 1920s. The fact that it can be validly stated today does not speak well for the quality of pertinent research in the interim.

As heuristic devices to progress on the psychology of boundaries and peace, I would like to suggest consideration of the construct of virtual reality and virtual peace. Virtual reality has several denotations. It can refer to the philosophy of science perspective that perceived reality based on various epistemological approaches may have approximations to some actual reality. It can refer to the psychological perspective that phenomenology--biopsychosocially constructed or not--may approximate some actual reality. It can refer to the technological perspective of creating realities to approximate phenomenology. All three perspectives suggest that personal meanings regardless of so-called objective factors may be the linchpin in a psychology boundaries of peace.

Virtual peace can refer to a close approximation of the absence of war and other variants of political violence and the presence of some positive sense of cooperation, belonging, mutuality, and reciprocity. It can refer to the absence of war and violence without the presence of the positive. It can even refer to significant war and political violence that seem as much less significant due to habituation and desensitization or to the instrumental goals that have been concurrently obtained. These perspectives suggest that the type of peace that is desired through some change in political boundaries must be developed from those proximally affected by the boundaries, not outside saviors and helpers--an obvious point that gets lost in the attempt to do Good by the cultural imperialists among us. Finally, technology applications of virtual reality may be used to simulate changes in boundaries and their effects on virtual peace, pace, peace.

The concept of transboundary areas contributing to peace--especially those developed with combinations of global, international, regional, national, and local instrumental benefits--is one that has extremely high face validity. Peace psychologists must not let this face validity blind their eyes to the necessities of establishing other validities more efficacious in the quest for peace. (See Brown, B.S. (1983). A new perspective on the political and psychological nature of borders and sovereignty. *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*, 28, 597-601; Bowker, J.W. (1986). The burning fuse: The unacceptable face of religion. *Zygon: Journal of Religion and Science*, 21, 415-438; Goffman, E. (1971). *Relations in public*. NY: Basic Books, Inc.; Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge*. London: Tavistock;

International Bulletin of Political Psychology

Habermas, J. (1984). *The theory of communicative action*. Boston: Beacon; Lasswell, H. (1930). *Psychopathology and politics*. University of Chicago Press; Murphy, G. (1942). *Psychology and the post-war world*. *Psychological Review*, 49, 298-318; Task Force on DSM-IV. (1994). *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (4th ed.)*. Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Association.)(Keywords: Boundaries, Peace, Political Violence, Public Policy, War.)