

内戦における政治的暴力の心理学的な側面の分析

Analyzing the Psychological Dimension of Political Violence in Modern Civil Conflicts

平塚 広義 HIRATSUKA, Hiroyoshi

● 青山学院大学大学院国際政治経済研究科
Graduate School of International Politics, Economics, and Communication, Aoyama Gakuin University



文化と紛争解決, 文化と内戦, 人間の攻撃性と暴力

Culture and Conflict Resolution, Human Aggressions and Violence, Culture and Civil Conflicts, Cultural Violence

ABSTRACT

今日の内戦は、これまでにないほどひどく、無秩序で、激しい政治的暴力を用いて、苦しみと苦痛をお互いに与える。人間の暴力は、多面的な性質があり、学術分野の境界線を越えて分析の枠組みを考える必要がある。この論文では、内戦における政治的暴力に関して、心理学的側面を、学際的なアプローチを持って研究をする事を試みている。平和研究の分析の枠組みとしての Violence-Peace-Conflict Triangle は、内戦における政治的暴力の分析方法の一つであるが、そのままでは分析の枠組みとしては制限がある。例えば、無秩序で激しい政治的暴力が用いられる理由の一つとして、略奪目的を持つリーダーが、文化アイデンティティーを巧みに操って、対象者の恐怖を煽り暴力に駆り立てる。そのように、現在の内戦と政治的暴力は、何らかの形で文化に繋がっている可能性があるが、環境が人間を形作るのと同様に、文化も形にしていくので、人の社会的責任が問われている。

Today's civil conflicts become messy and intense as political violence inflicts human pain and suffering between communal or tribal groups in intra-state conflict. Human conflict consists of multiple dimensions, and requires an interdisciplinary approach in order to construct a better analytical framework. The Violence-Peace-Conflict Triangle as an analytical framework in the field of Peace Studies clarifies the existing analytical approaches and their limits to understanding of the use of political violence. There is a possible connection between culture and political violence in civil conflicts such as the role of the predatory leaders and their manipulation of cultural identity as a force and source to trigger violence. The environment shapes human beings and culture. Therefore, people have a huge responsibility to prevent violence from being

activated. This article analyzes the psychological dimension in civil conflicts through an interdisciplinary approach, in order to bring about a deeper understanding of violence and its causes and functions.

1. Introduction: Human pain and suffering inflicted by political violence in modern civil conflicts

Increasingly, today's civil conflicts become messy and intense as political violence inflicts human pain and suffering between communal or tribal groups in intra-state conflicts. As some modern civil conflicts involving such cultural dimensions as ethnicity and religion become increasingly violent, and violence is employed to create pain and suffering, one wonders about the cruelty and violent nature of one group or national government over another. The intensity of political violence in today's civil conflicts continue to be unimaginable, and one would naturally seek an explanation for such violence.

Often political scientists explain political violence as the integrative nature of public institutions. For example, traditional security studies focus their analysis on the state, and explain that the protection of the state's interests and security are the fundamental principle. Dannreuther (2007) explained, within the framework of security studies, that governments and states have been habitually "the principal oppressors and causes of human suffering" (p.26). The state can employ violence to control its citizens for the protection of itself and its interests.

It [the state] has the capacity to coercive powers and ability to mobilize people and resources, it has the capacity to inflict great suffering and violence not only on foreigners but also on its own people. The state has undoubtedly been the most lethal killing force in the modern period. (Dannreuther, 2007, p.28)

The political use of violence to protect state institutions and their interests are justified under this perspective. Essentially, the state holds the monopoly on the use of violence to control its citizens and to maintain civil order.

However, the explanation provided by experts in security studies, seem to be unable to explain reasons for an increasing number of religious, ethnic, and other civil conflicts. These kinds of intra-state conflicts are more than just the traditional interplay of economic-political-social factors especially in a failing or failed state where no functioning or legitimate government exists.

Axworthy (2001) explained what it means to be secure recently in foreign affairs. Actors (perpetrators and victims) in civil conflicts are no longer limited to governmental and military agencies; a number of civilian combatants and victims seem to be on the rise. "Today, the language of foreign affairs includes protecting civilians, war-affected children, the threat posed by terrorism, drug trafficking, and force migration not just states' rights and national sovereignty" (Axworthy, 2001, p.3). The intensity of violence in modern civil conflicts is greater, while finding ways to deal with violence have become very difficult without proper political institutions.

The force of globalization, as McRae (2001) described, brings new problems, and this requires exploring new approaches. Langholtz and Leentjes (2001) explained:

...recent conflicts have been characterized more often by a complicated mixture of paramilitaries, ethno-political rivalries, humanitarian emergencies, and civilian refugees, than by two clearly defined armies sent to war by sovereign leaders. These

complex emergencies present a different psychological environment from earlier conflicts and call for different forms of peace keeping” (p.173).

As globalization progresses to reshape the nature of modern conflicts, the human costs have also become higher and more extensive.

Kaldor defined the term “New War” to describe and to distinguish the current prominent political conflicts like the Bosnian case from other prior conflicts in her publication (2007). Kaldor argued, “The Second World War really did mark the end of ‘old wars.’” (2007, p.9). She specifically pointed out that the wars fought in Europe from the late eighteenth century to the middle of the twentieth century, for example, are what are defined as old wars. The new wars, instead, are the total opposite of previous conflicts (Kaldor 2007):

What is ‘new’ about ‘new wars’ has to do with globalization and this in turn is related to the changed role of the states. Indeed, I am not even sure that the word ‘war’ is appropriate because war does not refer to political violence between social organized groups and, as I often stress, the ‘new wars’ are a mixture of war, human rights violations and organized crime. (p.12)

Focusing on the human costs of political violence in modern civil conflicts has been important as civilians have become the main actors because both predators and victims of violence in the new wars of the global age. Recently The human dimension was finally considered an aspect of war and other civil conflict through the concept of Human Security (UNDP, 1994; Ogata and Sen, 2003).

The force of globalization brings new problems to the surface, and this requires the field to explore new approaches (McRae, 2001; Koldor, 2007). As today’s civil conflicts increasingly involve people (both perpetrators and victims) to be a major part of political struggles, a study of political violence

requires analyzing the human dimension. What are the human elements of political violence employed in today’s civil conflicts? What are possible explanations for perpetrators targeting and inflicting violence? What are the invisible, underlining causes triggering such intense violence in today’s civil conflicts? The article tries to bring more attention to the human actors involved by analyzing the psychological dimension of the civil conflict through an interdisciplinary approach. By integrating both a psychological dimension and a political dimension, the author hopes to identify some explanations for the extent of political violence in current civil conflicts.

2. Clarifying an Analytical Framework of Peace Studies: Violence-Peace-Conflict Triangle and Structural Violence

The field of peace studies constitutes a long tradition of concerns with a short history of disciplinary approaches, but one of the current approaches focus as on reducing or possibly eliminating violence. The Violence-Peace-Conflict Triangle as an analytical framework has been recognized by researchers and scholars in the field. For example, violence studies, according to Galtung (1975), focus on two problems: “the use of violence and the legitimation of that use” (p.291). Galtung distinguished different forms of violence and peace, and provided at least six precise distinctions of violence.

One of the important conceptual developments in the field of peace studies was an attempt to distinguish structural violence from direct violence. The condition of structural violence is sometimes referred to as “social injustice” (Galtung, 1975, p.114). To address an unjust structure that inflicts violence on individuals requires reforming such structures by incorporating social justice. The discovery of this distinctive form of violence has

been one of the most influential contributions of the field.

Unfortunately, however, the definition of structural violence alone is limiting in regards to the violence common today. Increasingly, there is much violence in civil conflicts that is not just structural. For example, terrorism as a form of violence, does not necessarily address violence in the way the definition of structural violence describes. According to Shimko (2005), even though no clear consensus has been made amongst scholars on its definition, terrorism has several essential components: “the use or threat of violence to create a climate of fear,” “indiscriminate targeting of civilians (because the audience is the real ‘target’),” and “a larger social or political objective” (p.314). Without specific institutional entities, terrorism mobilizes people, commits violence, creates conditions of fear, and causes human pain and suffering.

Would terrorism still be structural violence when the entity which employs violence as a tactic has no institutional form? This type of violence in today’s conflicts is different from structural violence, as these conflicts have more human dimensions. The current discussions on different aspects of violence in civil conflicts are often focused on the nation states, but it is not the institution that has attitudes, emotions or behaviors; rather it is people. It is individual human beings who have attitudes, experience emotions, and behave accordingly, albeit frequently in a collective way as members of an organization, a community or a nation state. A more inclusive concept or analytical framework, which integrates more human dimensions, is essential in order to analyze these new forms of violence. Moreover, analyzing and explaining today’s civil conflicts requires new and more comprehensive tools for preventing and resolving violence.

3. Analyzing the Psychological Dimension of Violence in Human Conflicts

When a civil conflict becomes violent, and no functional or legitimate governmental actors exist to monopolize violence to create civil order, the analysis requires a psychological approach regarding interpersonal, intergroup or communal violence. McNair (2003) defined violence “as injurious activity that is done directly or socially supported, or inflicted by social institutions in the form of poverty” (p.1). Geen (1995) defined violence as the infliction of intense force upon persons or property for the purposes of destruction, punishment, or control (p.669). In fact, violence can be applied not only physically but also psychologically; harmful effects, including threats, should be considered as violence. “I see violence as avoidable insults to basic human needs, and more generally to life, lowering the real level of needs satisfaction below what is potentially possible. Threats of violence are also violence” (Galtung, 1990, p.292).

Several social psychologists consider violence a form of aggression, and cite different factors impacting violent human behaviors have also been suggested (Krahe, 2001; Okada, 2001; Yukawa, 2005). Krahe (2001) argued that there are possible internal and external factors for activating human aggression:

The psychological explanations of aggression share the assumption that aggressive behaviour is not inevitable, but that the likelihood of its occurrence depends on the operation of a variety of promoting and inhibiting factors located both within the person and the environment. (Krahe, 2001, p.46)

One of the oldest research investigations on human aggression was conducted by Dollard (et al., 1939). He and other researchers had established the Frustration-Aggression Hypothesis. According to

Dollard (et al., 1939), aggression is the result of attempts to reduce or end frustration caused by not achieving one's goal. While this hypothesis set an interesting beginning point for exploring human aggression, not all frustration causes aggressive behaviors, and not all sources of aggressive behaviors are from frustration.

There are distinctions between two different types of violence: passionate/emotional violence and unemotional/instrumental violence. Passionate violence is observed when a person goes into an uncontrollable rage, and does great damage to someone or something. On the other hand, the examples of unemotional/calculated or instrumental violence are declaring a war, police action, assassination, and gang execution. As such, violence can be used as a means to an end in order to achieve one's goals; instrumental use of violence is possible in certain contexts by aggressive offenders (Krahe, 2001; Okada, 2001; Yukawa, 2005). Identifying these triggers and avoiding such contexts become a critical exploration for violence prevention.

4. Triggering Fears and Eliciting Violence: Predatory Leaders' Manipulation of Cultural Identities to Trigger Violence in Civil Conflicts

Increasingly in a failing or failed state where economic-political-social structures have almost or completely disappeared, people are gathering around their cultural identities. Without any social structures, power and control is up for grabs, and the difficult life conditions have "...forced human communities—as nations, tribes, and clans—to loosen political bonds and collect under a dome of cultural identity" (Stewart, 1995, p.1). Staub (1989) argued, "In essence, difficult life conditions and certain cultural characteristics may generate psychological processes and motives that lead a

group to turn against another group" (p.13).

Staub (1989) called humans' violent acts "evil". (p.25):

Evil is not a scientific concept with an agreed meaning, but the idea of evil is part of a broadly shared human cultural heritage. The essence of evil is the destruction of human beings. This includes not only killing but the creation of conditions that materially or psychologically destroy or diminish people's dignity, happiness, and capacity to fulfill basic material needs. (Staub, 1989, p.25)

Stewart (1996) believed that this evil element cannot be eliminated or destroyed, and requires examining "the social uses and abuses of organized violence summarized in the metaphor of the cultural demon, concealed in culture's dark side" (p.5). The personal experience of violence in human conflicts naturally transforms the violent experience into shock and horror that causes suffering and fear of death and destruction (Stewart, 1995).

Increasingly, aspects of cultural identity such as ethnicity have symbolically become an important target for triggering violence in civil conflicts. "All cultural symbols are unions, yielding a volatile configuration as strategies for survival, forms for communal living, and content of meaning" (Stewart, 1995, p.4); and it can be a dominant influence in forcing people and groups to turn on each other. However, someone has to appeal to people's emotions which "...includes principles of the cultural roots of hate, rage, and violence, the social and dynamic sides of cultures and the viewpoint of tragedy" (Stewart, 1995, p.1). The goals of predatory leaders in the new wars are about the claim to power on the basis of traditional cultural identities (Kaldor, 2007). by activating negative human emotions.

Recent civil conflicts involve cultural identities such as ethnicity or religion in order to justify the politicized victimization of the involved parties.

Those in power elicit emotionally-driven reactions in one group of people knowing the utility of violence as a tool for division. Kaldor (2007) explained that identity politics "...mean movements which mobilize around ethnic, racial, or religious identity for the purpose of claiming state power" (p.80):

...identity politics tends to be fragmentative, backward-looking and exclusive. Political groupings based on exclusive identity tend to be movements of nostalgia, based on the reconstruction of an heroic past, the memory of injustices, real or imagined, and famous battles, won or lost. They acquire meaning through insecurity, through rekindled fear of historic enemies, or through a sense of being threatened by subdivided. (p.81)

Under these conditions, predatory leaders trigger violence by manipulating cultural identities and their meanings.

People under difficult life conditions become more vulnerable, and more easily manipulated than during peaceful times; and they can be more easily manipulated into justifying systemic violence through the manipulation of cultural identities. As a result, violence to target a particular group of people based on a certain cultural identity becomes a tool used by the leaders to take advantage of the situation for their own benefit. The predatory leaders are aware of the instrumental function of violence in civil conflicts while they tap into civilians' emotional vulnerability to trigger gross violence by manipulating their cultural identities.

5. Discussion: The Role of Culture and its Connection to Conflict Transformation and Peacebuilding

It is not surprising that human beings may have aggressive behaviors and capabilities like all other animals. Aggression is a natural part of human

being. However, what is a concern about violence in today's civil conflicts is that violence tends to spin out of control by involving ethnicity, religion, or other cultural identities. Violence has also become a purpose in and of itself as well as a means to an end for some predatory leaders.

Analyzing violence in today's civil conflicts that involve cultural identities as a source of violence due to manipulation, requires a new comprehensive analytical tool. An interdisciplinary analysis of violence is required to identify possible preventative measures in civil conflicts.

To appropriately articulate culture's role in violent civil conflicts, Galtung (1990) further developed his theory of violence by adding in "cultural violence." Galtung regarded "cultural violence" as certain aspects of culture, specifically the symbolic elements of human existence, being used to justify or legitimize direct or structural violence. "Cultural violence makes direct and structural violence look, even feel, right—or at least not wrong" (1990, p.291). The internalization of violence can be considered part of the effects of cultural violence. According to Galtung (1990):

The study of cultural violence highlights the way in which the act of direct violence and the fact of structural violence are legitimized and thus rendered acceptable in society. One way cultural violence works is by changing the moral color of an act from red/wrong to green/right or at least to yellow/acceptable; an example being 'murder on behalf of the country as right, on behalf of oneself wrong.' Another way is by making reality opaque, so that we do not see the violent act or fact, or at least not as violent. (p.292)

Galtung conceptualized direct violence, structural violence, and cultural violence as a triangle. "With the violent structure institutionalized and the violent culture internalized, direct violence also tends to become institutionalized, repetitive, ritualistic, like

a vendetta” (Galtung, 1990, p.302).

According to Galtung (1990), violence can start at any corner, and is easily transmitted to the other corners on the violent triangle. Stewart (1996) stated, “Cultural decay, violence and chaos are not determined by a single cause; instead, the internal threats to people are deeply enmeshed in the cultural matrix of a society” (p.5). Escape out of cultural violence, Galtung (1990) claimed, requires working on the three different corners of the violence triangle to create a triangular syndrome of peace; a “virtuous triangle rather than vicious triangle” (p.302). Instead of expecting that change in one corner leads to changes in the other two corners, all three corners have to be confronted at the same time.

Transforming cultural violence requires transforming minds and changing the discourse between cultural groups. “What is essential to reconciliation in my view, is that each party revise its own identity just enough to accommodate the identity of the other” (Kelman, 2004, p.119). The most important feature for reconciliation focuses on removing the negation of the other as a core component of one’s own identity (2004). This effort for reconciliation has the potential to transform cultural violence into a culture of peace.

The cultural shift from violence to peace will involve focusing on shared human values among involved individuals and parties. One must work with values such as beauty, honor, dignity, harmony, reverence and respect by infusing these values into these human relations (Stewart and Hiratsuka, 2008). “The change in each party’s identity may go further by moving toward the development of a common, transcendent identity--not in lieu of, but alongside of each group’s particularistic identity” (Kelman, 2004, p.119). Even these values are illustrated in different stories and symbolic acts in wartime (Hedges, 2002; Gagnon, Jr., 2004), and one needs to collect these stories to use them as a

foundation for building a culture of peace by sharing the pain and suffering of human beings and transforming conflict in to peace.

6. Conclusion

Aggression is not specific to human beings; all animals, including humans’ closest biological ancestors like chimpanzees and gorillas have illustrated aggressive behaviors in one form or another (Luckley, 2003). Also, several anthropologists confirmed that aggressive behaviors were part of these groups in simple societies such as Yanomamo and Gebusi (Chagnon, 1995; Knauff, 1987). Considering human beings as a part of the evolutionary chain in the animal kingdom and aggressive behaviors as important strategies of adjustment for human beings in the risky external world, it is important to identify better ways of preventing and addressing violent aggressive behaviors before their activation.

Recent developments in brain-imaging technologies and new research about the mind and brain of human beings continue to explore new ways of thinking about their aggression and the use of violence. While there is still more empirical exploration that to be done, scientists have rejected biological determinism as the explanation of human aggressions (The Seville Statement, 1986), and strongly cautioned against making conclusions that anything, including human aggression, is hardwired in the brain. Staub (1989) argued, “Human beings have genetic propensities for both altruism and aggression. Which of these propensities evolves more depends on individual socialization and experience” (p.24).

More importantly, there is no excuse for individuals to claim that violence is inevitable; it is people’s responsibility to pursue non-violent alternatives in conflicts. Wexler (2006) discussed how the environment shapes human brains

including their cultures as cultures shape our thoughts, beliefs, and values. As humans shape their environment that in turn shapes their brains, there is a huge possibility for humans as a collective community to create or not create violence (2006). These arguments only reinforce the importance of both the human brain's plasticity and social responsibility in preparing the next generation of human minds to be less violent and more peaceful.

In order to reduce violence in civil conflicts, further exploration of culture's roles in triggering or preventing violence will play an important role. It is up to us as human beings to construct a culture for peace rather than for violence.

References:

- Amanpour, C. (International Correspondence). (2008). *Buddha's Warrior*. [TV Broadcast] (Available from Cable News Network, One CNN Center, Atlanta, GA, 30303).
- Axworthy, L. (2001). Introduction. (p.3-13). McRae, R. G., & Hubert, D. (eds.). *Human security and the new diplomacy: protecting people, promoting peace*. Montreal, QC.: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Chagnon, N. (1996). *Yanomamo. case studies in cultural anthropology. (5theds.)*. Chicago, IL: Harcourt Brace.
- Dannreuther, R. (2007) Thinking about security studies after the Cold War. In Dannreuther, R. (eds.). *International Security. The Contemporary Agenda*. (p.14-33). Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Dollard, J. (eds.). (1939). *Frustration and aggression*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Donald, M., Lewis, M. Petersen, J., Webster, C., and Wexler, B. (2009). Hardwired to hurt? In Stavros, R. (Producer). (2009, February, 20). *Aggression, violence, and the brain: Are some of us hardwired to hurt others?* TVO 2180 Yonge Street, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, M4S 2B9.
- Freud, S. (1932). Why war? In Barash, D. P.(eds.). (1991). *Approaches to peace*. (p.1-19). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Gagnon Jr., V. P. (2004). *The myth of ethnic war: Serbia and Croatia in the 1990s*. Ithaca, NY.: Cornell University Press
- Galtung, J. (1975). *Peace: Research, Education, Action*. Copenhagen: Christian Ejlert.
- Galtung, J. (1990). Cultural violence. *Journal of Peace Research*. 23, p.291-305.
- Geen, R. G. (1995), *Human motivation: A social psychological approach*. Belmont, CA: Cole.
- Hedges, C. (2002). *War is a force that gives us meaning*. Cambridge, MA: PublicAffairs.
- Huntington, S. P. (Summer 1993). The clash of civilizations? *Foreign Affairs*. 72. 3. p.22-49.
- Krahe, B. (2001). *Social psychology of aggression*. Oxford, UK: Taylor and Francis, Inc.
- Kaldor, M. (2007). *New and old wars: Organized violence in a global era*. Stanford, CA.: Stanford University Press.
- Kelman, H.C. (2004). Reconciliation as identity change; a social-psychological perspective. (p.111-124). In Bar-Siman-Tov, Y. (eds.). *From conflict resolution to reconciliation*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press
- Knouft, B. (1987). Reconsidering violence in simple human societies: Homicide among the gebusi of Papua New Guinea. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Society*. 13, 563-565.
- Langholtz, H. J. and Leentjes, P. (2001). U.N. Peace Keeping: Confronting the psychological environment of war in the Twenty-First Century. In Christie, D. J., Wagner, R. V., and Winter, D. D. N. (eds.). *Peace, conflict, and violence: peace psychology for the 21st century*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- MacNair, R. *The psychology of peace: An introduction*. Westport, Conn.: Praeger.
- McRae, R. G., & Hubert, D. (eds.). (2001). *Human security and the new diplomacy: Protecting people, promoting peace*. Montreal, QC.: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Ogata, S. and Sen, A. (2003). *Human security now*. New York, NY: Commission on Human Security.
- Okada, T. (2001). *Kougekisei no shinrigaku*. Kyoto: Nakanishiya Shuppan.
- Yukawa, S. (2005). Baioensu: Kougeki to ikari no rinsho sinrigaku. Kyoto: Kitaooji shobou.
- Staub, E. (1992). The origin of genocide and mass killing: core concepts. In Staub, E. *The Roots of Evil. Origins of genocide and other group violence*. (pp.13-34). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Shimko, K. L. (2005). *International Relations: Perspectives and controversies*. New York, NY: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Stewart, E. (1995). The cultural trilogy. *NEWSLETTER: Intercultural Communication*. Chiba, Japan: Intercultural Communication Institute. Kanda University of International Studies. 21, p.3-6.
- Stewart, E. (1996). A triadic analysis of culture.

Intercultural Communication Studies. Chiba, Japan: Intercultural Communication Institute. Kanda University of International Studies. 9, p.1-30.

Stewart, E. and Hiratsuka, H. (2008). *Contrast culture method: Confronting culture of war and peace*. Paper presented at the meeting of NAFSA: Association of International Educators National Conference. Washington, D.C.

The Seville Statement on Violence. (1986). Seville, Spain: The United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). Available at http://portal.unesco.org/education/en/ev.php-URL_ID=3247&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html <First Accessed at September, 2008>.

United Nations Development Programme. (1994). Human Development Report. New York, NY, U.S.A.: Oxford University Press. Available at http://hdr.undp.org/en/media/hdr_1994_en_contents.pdf <First accessed at September, 2010>

Wexler, B. (2006). *Brain and culture: neurobiology, ideology, and social change*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.