

SPECIAL ESSAY

Clash or Meeting Between East and West: An Analysis of the Post-9/11 Challenges

Elena Mustakova-Possardt
Psychology Department
University of West Georgia

This article adopts a macrocultural approach to understanding complex current global tensions and the way they may account for recent acts of terrorism. It proposes that the recent conflict between the West and radical militant Islam can be understood as the polarization of 2 partial perspectives on social justice—the secular democratic individualistic Western worldview and the spiritual and collectivist Middle Eastern worldview—that need to inform one another. I examine this polarization in the context of the following systemic aspects of current globalization: the twin processes of global integration and social disintegration as reflected in the Social Breakdown Syndrome, the deepening gap between the Global North and the Global South, and the unsustainable ideologization of the 20th century. The article suggests that the East–West conflict reflects the fragmented nature of contemporary individual and collective consciousness. It proposes the need for an integrative psychological approach to cultivating optimal individual and collective global consciousness and achieving a meeting and interpenetration between East and West.

The increasing encounters between different cultural perspectives and worldviews in the context of globalization have become a growing problem with the vertiginous pace of global change (Spariosu, 2004). September 11, 2001, brought to our awareness the escalation of this problem and has forced social scientists to seek increasingly complex interdisciplinary frames of reference to understand intractable

recent volumes on *The Psychology of Terrorism* (Stout, 2002) represent a unique coming together of academic, clinical, and activist perspectives, seeking to encompass the full range of factors related to terrorism. Although this collection reveals a distinct movement toward more integrative perspectives, it still manifests some difficulty in moving beyond the limitations of the Western worldview in the way it describes dimensions of terrorist motivations and issues of mass psychology (McCauley, 2002). Psychological interpretations of Islamic-based terrorism tend not to acknowledge that they are situated in their own sociohistorical context and the partiality of their individualistic cultural perspective. They also tend to overlook the significance of the continuous juxtaposition of Western and Eastern history. Because efforts to move beyond an exclusive focus on Western approaches have not been successful, there is yet to emerge a discussion of the East–West conflict that is clearly situated in the context of the historical transition currently underway on both the collective and the individual levels.

CURRENT GLOBAL HISTORICAL CONTEXT

There are many different ways to understand current global trends that have led to the polarization and split that are the focus of this article. From my perspective, one of the most salient aspects of the dawn of the 21st century is the passionate desire for sustainable peace that is growing in the world. As Khan (1986) pointed out, “Not only are nations yearning for peace and working to avert the destruction that world conflict would bring, but people are searching for the means to achieve harmonious relationships among the diverse and dissonant elements of society—racial, religious, cultural, and ideological” (p. ix).

The current global context can be understood in terms of the simultaneous operation of two opposing processes—increasing global integration and deepening social disintegration. These processes have been discussed at length by Marsella (2001, 2003) as the positive and negative aspects of globalization.

On the one hand, we are witnessing the steady growth of global collaborative efforts to create international structures for sustainable peace on the planet. As suggested by the historical analysis of British economist John Huddleston (1989), this intensification of efforts toward global peace can be seen as a culmination of the struggle to move in the direction of more just societies. The creation of the United Nations (UN), and the movement toward “official languages” in the UN, universal education, and universal aspirations for freedom have all become aspects of our collective consciousness, embodied in the human rights movement and the efforts of over 1,000 nongovernmental organizations working for the emerging global civil society.

On the other hand, the general lack of enthusiasm or even interest in these significant historical achievements in the media and the public mind “exposes the

depth of the crisis the world is experiencing at the century's end" (Universal House of Justice, 2001, p. 131). Globalization, and the prevailing philosophy of materialism that is driving it, has brought into focus the gross disparities in the distribution of wealth in the world. As Deputy Director-General of the World Health Organization (WHO) Adeoye Lambo (2000) pointed out, "The human race today, engaged in a mighty outward and inward struggle for a new and universally binding order of life, stands at a point where two worlds meet, amid an almost inconceivable devastation of traditional values" (p. 122).

In this context, there appears to be a pervasive crisis of meaning and of faith in the ability of human rationality to resolve global discrepancies, and a corresponding paralysis of will. In addition, the increasing contact between widely diverse societies and cultures has brought about a deepening destabilization of traditional communal values, accompanied by ambivalent and sometimes aggressive secularization, and its twin, fundamentalism (Armstrong, 2001). The radical questioning in all areas of human life in the last few centuries has both brought to the surface undermining inconsistencies and spurred a movement in the direction of greater congruency and universal responsibility. At the same time, it has deeply shaken people's trust in the reliability of ideals, and left the average person with little ground to stand on.

In the West, minds have spun faster and faster, breeding deepening inner instability and alienation. According to Bryson (1999), 500 million people in the wealthy developed nations suffer neurotic, stress-related, and somatoform illnesses, and 200 million more have mood disorders such as chronic and manic depression. The crisis of meaning is evident not only in the increasingly common mental disturbances but also in the quality of ordinary social life, as described by social critics (Bellah, Madsen, Sullivan, Swidler, & Tipton, 1985). From the perspective of the more communal Eastern worldview, it is not hard to understand why the Western worldview and lifestyle have become suspect, and the Western view of development called into question.

The Western combination of precarious engagement in relationships and a utilitarian and morally relativistic approach increasingly infiltrates the economically less developed countries as a mistaken symbol of progress and advanced thinking. Centuries-old bonds of interrelatedness are breaking, and new ones are difficult to develop. The more people encounter difficulties in cultivating character in the young generation, the less clear are the common moral values that should guide the cultivation of the character in the context of fast-paced global change and growing ambiguity. Internal oppression has reached a new level: People are now contending not just with corrupt social forces, but even more with a deep spiritual vacuum that, on a personal level, both reflects the state of the world and perpetuates it (Fromm, 1989; Marcuse, 1989a, 1989b; Mustakova-Possardt, 2003).

The WHO has characterized this overall condition of the world as manifesting a Social Breakdown Syndrome, described as "a rising incidence and prevalence of

psychosomatic diseases, mental disorders, anxiety and neurosis, prostitution, crimes, political corruption, and a variety of sexual diseases, including AIDS” (Lambo, 2000, p. 114). Research on the psychosocial issues related to globalization has also described multiple and pervasive contemporary sociocultural pathways to distress, deviancy, and disorder (Marsella, 2001).

Overall, the chasm that divides the Global North from the Global South, and the Social Breakdown Syndrome on a global scale, with its many social, political, and spiritual manifestations, provide an important context for understanding contemporary terrorism and clashes of worldviews. Because globalization is increasingly recognized as an intrinsic feature of human society (Marsella, 2001; Universal House of Justice, 2001), it is important that we understand our potential ability to address the dangerous polarizations that derive from partial perspectives on the massive changes occurring in the world.

FROM DIFFERING CULTURAL AND SOCIAL PATTERNS TO CLASHING IDEOLOGIES

Polarities of Individualism and Collectivism

One of the most significant cultural dividing lines in the world runs along the pervasive cultural syndromes of individualism and collectivism. Although, as Triandis (1995) pointed out, there is great variation over time in social patterns of organization both within and across cultures, the cultural syndromes of collectivism and individualism have exhibited four stable universal dimensions, namely: (a) interdependent versus independent definitions of the self; (b) alignment of personal and communal goals; (c) cognition focused on norms, obligations, and duties versus cognition focused on attitudes, personal needs, rights, and contracts; and (d) emphasis on relationships versus emphasis on rational analysis of advantages and disadvantages. Further, in each type of culture, there can be discerned horizontal and vertical dimensions, so that the full range of cultural typologies includes horizontal individualism (focused on independence, uniqueness, and universal rights), vertical individualism (focused on independence, competition and achievement, and differences of social status), horizontal collectivism (focused on interdependence, sense of social cohesion, cooperation, and oneness), and vertical collectivism (focused on interdependence, duty, and differences of social status). To add to the complexity, within each culture there are variations across different domains of social life and across social classes, and sociohistorical changes from one syndrome to the other occur (Triandis, 1995).

It is very rare, however, to come across psychocultural interpretations of current conflicts of worldviews that begin by acknowledging that the interpretation itself is situated within one of the aforementioned cultural syndromes. The unintended re-

sult is that, as Prilleltensky (1997) pointed out, when we fail to articulate the assumptions about knowledge, the good life, and the good society out of which we are subjecting phenomena to analysis, we end up promoting a particular worldview. Such has been the nature of current analyses of East–West tensions in general, and terrorism in particular.

Prilleltensky (1997) and Marsella (1998) pointed out that, all too often, Western psychology continues to interpret social problems that originate in the structure of the socioeconomic system or in the very nature of the historical times in intrapsychic terms, giving excessive weight to individual factors. Because of its exclusive focus on the independent self, this partial cultural view fails to understand and appreciate the full power and appeal of other, more communal worldviews. In this way, cultural differences become ideologies, which often result in provoking counterideologies. Sloan (1992) defined ideology as “a complex structure of affect, cognition, and action that functions so as to maintain social relations of domination and to reproduce the social order founded on those oppressive relations” (p. 75). While the individualistic Western worldview has become an unconscious ideology of cultural superiority, this tendency has been paralleled by an amplification of totalizing tendencies in Islamic cultures, as well as by a growing inclination on the part of Islamic religious leaders to formulate militant counterideologies and to manipulate the communal spiritual beliefs and attitudes of their compatriots to bring about their radicalization into militant Islam. The study of critical consciousness (Mustakova-Possardt, 2003) has shown how vulnerable marginalized people from deprived environments are to all kinds of ideologies. In the past, Communism employed the same methods in a similar reactive stance, as have religious and political leaders in many parts of the world.

Polarities of Domination of the Economic Versus the Spiritual Sector

Another helpful perspective may be to examine these clashing differences between East and West in view of Malaska’s (1993) conceptual framework of the structure of human societies. Malaska proposed that any society can be seen as consisting of three human “orders”—the economic, the sociopolitical, and the spiritual orders. These three orders interact with one another, and “society as a whole is harmonious, or inharmonious, according to the quality of relations and interactions between its three parts” (p. 45). To the extent that one order dominates, the imbalance “ruins the autonomy and optimal functioning of the subordinate orders” (p. 46). Malaska suggested that most societies currently represent examples of such an imbalance. Western societies in the main are obsessed with economic development, with rampant materialism overshadowing and distorting the sociopolitical and spiritual orders. Eastern European societies represent the collapse of societies as a result of the dominance of the sociopolitical order over both spiritual and eco-

conomic orders. Some countries in the Muslim world “serve to demonstrate societal dissonance ... because of the marked dominance of the spiritual order,” which has been totalized, and hence distorted. “Certain African societies illustrate what happens when none of the sectors makes an adequate contribution to the societal whole” (Malaska, 1993, p. 47).

Although no single-variable theory can fully encompass complex social phenomena, Malaska’s conceptual framework does provide a useful perspective suggesting that the current clash between East and West reflects opposing extremes of overdeveloped economic and spiritual sectors of human society.

Polarities of Secularism Versus Religious Fundamentalism

Polarities of rampant materialism and secularism versus religious fundamentalism currently characterize not only tensions between different societies but also tensions within societies. Although both East and West, as defined in the beginning of this article, appear to exhibit some configuration of both materialistic and fundamentalist tendencies, the secular democratic cultural traditions of the West favor a fundamentally materialistic, individualistic worldview, whereas the more spiritually oriented cultures of the Islamic Middle East favor a fundamentalist religious approach to social life.

The fact that Western cultures are deeply embedded in the Christian tradition does not significantly change their overall orientation toward material productivity, economic efficiency, and control over the environment. These strengths of the Western worldview have become increasingly misbalanced with the gradual de-spiritualization of Christian practices (Crossan, 1999; Spong, 2001) and the subsequent spread of religiosity and its counterreaction, scientism. Ironically, this process, which continues to discredit not just intolerant religiosity but myth and religious faith, has inadvertently produced a new *religious fundamentalism*, which, according to Armstrong (2001), exists in a symbiotic relationship with aggressive liberalism or secularism. It can be argued that scientism has emerged as a form of secular fundamentalism that counterbalances religious fundamentalism, both within the United States and globally.

Hence, although there is certainly plenty of religious fundamentalism in the West, and particularly in the United States, and extreme materialism in the East, the predominant Western worldview can be described as governed primarily by economic considerations that give birth to *both* democratic sociopolitical structures *and* extreme competitiveness, individualism, and raw consumerism (Daloz, Keen, Keen, & Parks, 1996; Wuthnow, 1991), as well as by scientism, positivism, and a deep split between mind and body, and between spirit and matter in most scientific conceptualizations of the human condition.

In the Middle East, where many of the great world religions have originated and still have a strong hold on collective consciousness, the ramifications of the Re-

naissance and the modern age have not undermined the religious quest. With the self in these cultures understood as primarily interdependent, and personal and communal goals closely aligned, cognitions tend to focus on norms, obligations, and duties, and the emphasis is primarily on relationships (Triandis, 1995). The overdeveloped spiritual sector has dominated both the economic and the sociopolitical orders, creating much more communal societies, centered around totalizing and largely unquestioned Islamic religious practices. As a result, in many countries in the Muslim world, to the extent that public education even exists, Islamic education based on the Koran is not adequately counterbalanced by the cultivation of the critical rational/analytical faculties of mind. Although traditional Islamic education seeks to cultivate hearts, in this educational process fear still seems to dominate over love. In more economically developed Islamic societies, Islamic education enters into an uneasy relationship with the sociopolitical and economic aspects of society and generates further tensions that do not require much to become transmuted into radicalized militant Islam.

These two cultural regions have historically laid different emphases on human development. Throughout history, the East, as the dawning place of religion, spirituality, and mystic contemplation, has cultivated a fairly passive attitude to life, giving prominence to the richness of feeling and contemplation over the joys of action. In the East, the modern mind has developed more slowly than in the West, giving prominence to the deep capacity to discern, be attracted to, and be moved by beauty, truth, and goodness.

In contrast, the West has always been strong in its practical, down-to-earth understanding of the realities of life, and in its emphasis on creative action, and the creative analytical powers of the individual mind. U.S. culture represents a pinnacle in this Western trend, and is, of Western societies, perhaps the least concerned with philosophical issues and contemplation and the most obsessed with action. Contemporary Western education bears the stamp of this split between science and religion; recent fundamentalism-driven efforts to introduce a particular religionist perspective into public U.S. classrooms has not substantially changed the deeper nature of the split.

As wisdom traditions have long pointed out, however, an overdeveloped analytical mind, if not counterbalanced by spiritual understanding, breeds arrogance. Conversely, the capacity of the heart is feeble and prone to distortions unless strengthened by the relentless critical examination of an ever stronger rational mind. Hence, as the cultural tendencies in each part of the world have hardened over time, they have produced the fatalism, fanaticism, and totalitarianism of the Middle East and the arid individualism, materialism, and arrogant pragmatic expediency of the West. Freire (1973) and the Critical theorists from the Frankfurt School have shown compellingly how illiteracy and ignorance in less developed societies, and the prevalence of technical means over normative ends in the developed Western world, have each undermined the critical human capacity. In addition, globalization has further

amplified these historical tendencies, leading to the current polarization of worldviews centered, respectively, around individual rights and rational democratic process based on economic incentive, and around a spiritual view of life.

Hence, although there are many other factors at work as well, the current tension between the Islamic Middle East and the West can be understood as the clash of two unsustainably partial perspectives, challenged to become integrated into a mature whole. Ideologization and global polarization derive not only from these conflicting cultural trends and a lack of critical self-awareness, but also by defensive extremist responses made possible by narrowly defined identities coming into increasingly frequent and intensive contact.

THE PROBLEM OF LIMITED IDENTITIES IN A GLOBAL AGE

For the majority of people in the world, current fast-paced globalization is highly intimidating. The struggle to define a place in life in relation to not just a single immediate community but to complex, impersonal, and often perplexing national and international forces in a fast-changing global commons has become overwhelming (Daloz et al., 1996).

At the turn of a new millennium, people in both East and West are still constructing their sense of identity primarily on the basis of the group, national, ethnic, and socioeconomic distinctions that have characterized the 20th century. Despite the fact that these limited identities have produced widespread conflict and strife, larger frames of reference are not yet readily available to assist people in their identity development in a global age. Hence, the explosive encounters of cultures and worldviews, the difficulties with tolerance, and the reactive hardening of boundaries in ordinary people in the face of the overwhelming experience of multiplicity and uncontrollable change (Daloz et al., 1996).

There is now a crying need to cultivate expanding circles of shared identities, and beyond that, world citizenship, a process clearly illustrated in the lives of people who exhibit critical consciousness (Marsella, 2003; Mustakova-Possardt, 2003). At the dawn of our transition to a global civilization, relationships between races and ethnic groups will be among the ultimate tests of our ability to progress toward a sense of common global citizenship. The implications of our shared global identity need to be explored and taught through the spiritual principle of the oneness of humanity, which is reflected in our historical, collective evolution (Rutstein, 1999).

What might be the role of psychology in this paradigmatic challenge?

An Integrative Psychological Perspective

Understanding the so-called clash between East and West as resulting from an extreme polarization of partial worldviews allows us to appreciate and begin to ad-

dress a core problem: the current split between mind and heart in the contemporary human psyche. Over the last 10 years, I have developed an integrative psychosocial and psychospiritual model for conceptualizing the historical evolution of collective human consciousness and the large-scale emergence of optimal moral consciousness (Mustakova-Possardt, 1996, 2003). Understanding and supporting this global process moves psychology in the promising direction of global community psychology (Marsella, 1998) and global intelligence (Spariosu, 2004).

This optimal consciousness, or critical moral consciousness, manifests a qualitatively higher level of integration of cognitive, volitional, and affective capacities, across all stages of structural cognitive development. It is marked by a greater consistency between what we know, what we love, and how we exercise our will. It constitutes a progressively more harmonious working of mind and heart, an empowered unity of rational understanding, intuitive knowing, and inner vision, which is the result of an essentially spiritual understanding of life, an “activated depth dimension of existence” (Marcuse, 1989b). It allows people to become what Freire (1973) called Subjects of history.

Optimal consciousness is understood in terms of three leading human powers: the powers to know, to love, and to exercise will (Danesh, 1994). As Prilleltensky (2004) pointed out,

critical consciousness is about the achievement of high levels of knowledge, love, and agency, in synchronicity. The pursuit of knowledge, without a parallel pursuit of love, may render technological advances and academic brilliance, but not necessarily moral concern. Likewise, vigorous pursuit of agency and relentless exercise of will, may render great pragmatism, but without knowledge and love, the solution may be worse than the problem. It is all about balance in this trilogy of critical consciousness. (p. 500)

These three fundamental human faculties have so far been studied separately in psychology, with a heavy emphasis on analytical knowing, and only recently, an emerging interest in the kinds of intuitive and direct knowing that Middle Eastern cultures rely on in their more explicit spiritual orientation. Despite the fact that in the last 2 decades the long-standing divide between cognition and affect has been overcome, and cognitive developmental psychology has made a compelling case for the fact that cognition and affect are two sides of one and the same process (Hoffman, 1989; Kegan, 1982), we have yet to develop a thorough understanding of the human capacity for love as a creative power of attraction.

In view of this gap in current psychological understanding, it is helpful to consider Danesh’s (1994) definition of love as “an active force of attraction to beauty, unity, and growth” (p. 67). Danesh described this force developing in the lifespan in relation to central human concerns with self, relationships, and time (see Table 1). Mature love, from this perspective, implies an orientation to self-development

TABLE 1
 Danesh's (1994) Model for the Life-Span Development of Human Spiritual Powers in Relation to Primary Human Concerns

<i>Primary Human Concerns</i>	<i>Main Human Powers</i>		
	<i>Knowledge</i>	<i>Love</i>	<i>Will</i>
Self	Self-experience Self-discovery Self-knowledge	Self-preoccupation Self-acceptance Self-development	Self-control Self-confidence Self-responsibility
Relationships	Sameness of people Uniqueness of people Oneness of people	Acceptance of others Empathy with others Unity	Competition Cooperation and equality Service
Time	Present Mortality Immortality	Primary union Separation Secondary union	Desire Decision Action

and an ever expanding unity with others. From this perspective it becomes clear that although work on emotional intelligence (Goleman, 1995) and other related concepts has begun to move us in the right direction, there is yet much to be done to develop a systemic understanding of how this capacity encompasses and integrates the ontological and developmental strengths of both the East and the West.

Love is a creative activity that varies in its power. Even more important, its quality is closely related to the nature of the object of love, as can be seen when we examine humanity's continuing love affair with war and force, and the Western world's particular love for power and control. Further research is needed to establish how we can cultivate attraction to more sustainable, more constructive objects of love. Transpersonal psychology and the world wisdom traditions have a lot to contribute to this task. The conversation about universal values for a global community has already begun (Marsella, 2003; Swindler, 1999), and needs to extend into an education that not only develops the rational capacity but also cultivates sincerity and earnestness, moral passion and self-reflection, the power of the heart to be attracted to beauty, truth, and goodness, and the willingness to act accordingly while continuing to reassess one's understanding of beauty, truth, and goodness (Mustakova-Possardt, 2003).

Because love has not been the focal point of Western scientific explorations, we have so far failed to appreciate the synergistic life-supporting energy generated by more communal Eastern orientations to life. That is one important potential avenue for cross-semination of Eastern and Western perspectives.

In a similar way, integrative psychology can contribute to the development of a full appreciation of the human capacity to exercise will. Human will, understood as a much broader phenomenon than agency, is "our freedom to choose between good and evil, between action and inaction, and to determine the direction and quality of

our lives” (Danesh, 1994, pp. 70–71). Contemporary thought appears split between the philosophical tendency to emphasize the role of free will and the tendency in psychology to place much greater importance on forces beyond the reach of volition, such as childhood experiences or drives. Existential psychologists from Kierkegaard and Nietzsche to Abraham Maslow and Rollo May have explored the capacity for authentic experiencing of meaning and choice by the individual, and the psychopathology resulting from thwarting that capacity. However, existentialism focuses exclusively on the self and does not view individual awareness against the background of a comprehensive and equally humanistic understanding of collective human history. Rather, the individual striving toward authentic choices is viewed as poised against basically inimical and static social forces. What existentialism lacks is a sufficiently broad historical perspective from which to view the striving of human civilization toward authenticity. A balanced historical understanding of the exercise of human will is yet to emerge (Mustakova-Possardt, 2003).

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The human powers to know, to love, and to exercise will with regard to concerns with self, with relationships, and with the larger dimension of time exhibit comparable spiritual immaturity in both East and West. Although the West has bred anomie and an increasingly alienated, positivistic, and frequently arrogant culture, which has generated its own psychological problems and a strong reaction in the rest of the world, the radical Islamic Middle East has allowed the capacity for love to become wrapped around questionable objects, breeding religious fanaticism and destructive wars, as well as intellectually suffocating and socially rigid environments based on relationships of dominance. Generally speaking, neither East nor West has found a healthy balance in cultivating both mind and heart as a foundation for authentic relationships, that is, relationships based on grace rather than force. Each part of the world seems locked in its own biases and problems, viewing the opposite camp with a good measure of contempt and distrust. September 11 brought that reality home.

Any time seemingly opposing forces conflict, there exists a potential for their integration at a higher level. This constitutes the dynamic of transition, both on an individual and on a collective level. Hence, whether the current global situation will deepen into profound and unsustainable alienation between the Islamic Middle East and the Western world, or will become part of a generative movement toward global unity, has much to do with the analysis and understanding that the social sciences bring to this historical moment.

The West has made great strides in the cultivation of mind and has created a standard of education, ethics, organization, and intellectual and scientific develop-

ment that serves as a model for the rest of the world. The East, on the other hand, has preserved its emphasis on the mysteries of the heart. It has continued to contribute peaks of mystical and poetic understanding and a more spiritual and inter-connected view of life. Now the task is to focus on the integration of these different cultural strengths.

Therein lies the unique opportunity for social science in general, and psychology in particular, at this historic juncture. Integrative psychology and education now have the opportunity to focus on overcoming the partial and fragmented development of the human capacities for knowledge, love, and the enlightened exercise of will, and to move us in the direction of knowledge of the oneness of the human family, cultivating a sense of world citizenship, and the expansion of love to larger circles of the human family. Correspondingly, the use of will has to become much more closely integrated with spirituality as the very creative and relational essence of a human being, that bears on every aspect of a person's being in the world (Fowler, 1980, 1981; Fox, 2000; Huxley, 1974; Lewis, 2000; Peck, 1978; Vokey, 1997). Viable, historically concrete models are needed of what it means to embrace a larger humanity on the basis of the principle of unity in diversity that can happen only between equals.

There are a number of such integrative educational initiatives arising around the world. Psychology needs to study these models, and to begin to incorporate specific proposals for a global-community psychology (Marsella, 1998), critical consciousness (Mustakova-Possardt, 2003), and global intelligence (Spariosu, 2004), subjecting the moral implications of each to careful analysis (Prilleltensky, 1997). Such a psychology can become the meeting ground of East and West, Global North and Global South. We are already seeing the emergence of significant new conceptualizations of the nature of authentic relationships on a collective level (Hatcher, 1998). These conceptualizations, and the integrative interventions they have generated (Penn, 2003), have the potential to enrich our understanding of peace psychology in the post-9/11 world.

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

Elena Mustakova-Possardt, a developmental, clinical, and critical social and community psychologist, is currently Associate Professor of Psychology at the University of West Georgia. Having lived and taught in a number of European, African, and Arab countries, she has studied the psychological, social, philosophical, and spiritual implications of the progressive integration of East and West, North and South into a global civilization. She is the author of *Critical Consciousness: A Study of Morality in a Global Historical Context*, published by Greenwood/Praeger in 2003.

REFERENCES

- Armstrong, K. (2001). *The battle for God: A history of fundamentalism*. New York: Ballantine.
- Bellah, R., Madsen, R., Sullivan, W., Swindler, A., & Tipton, S. (1985). *Habits of the heart: Individualism and commitment in American life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Bryson, A. (1999). *Healing mind, body and soul*. New Delhi, India: Dawn.
- Coleman, P. (2003). Characteristics of protracted, intractable conflict: Toward the development of a metaframework I. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 9, 1–37.
- Coleman, P. (2004). Paradigmatic framing of protracted, intractable conflict: Toward the development of a metaframework II. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 10, 197–235.
- Crossan, J. (1999). *The birth of Christianity: Discovering what happened in the years immediately after the execution of Jesus*. San Francisco: Harper.
- Daloz, L., Keen, C., Keen, J., & Parks, S. (1996). *Common fire: Lives of commitment in a complex world*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Danesh, H. (1994). *The psychology of spirituality*. Manotick, Ontario, Canada: Nine Pines.
- Fowler, J. (1980). Moral stages and the development of faith. In B. Munsey (Ed.), *Moral development, moral education and Kohlberg: Basic issues in philosophy, psychology, religion, and education* (pp. 130–160). Birmingham, AL: Religious Education Press.
- Fowler, J. (1981). *Stages of faith: The psychology of human development and the quest for meaning*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Fox, M. (2000). *One river, many wells: Wisdom springing from global faiths*. New York: Putnam.
- Freire, P. (1973). *Education for critical consciousness*. New York: Continuum.
- Fromm, E. (1989). Politics and psychoanalysis. In S. Bronner & D. Kellner (Eds.), *Critical theory and society: A reader* (pp. 213–218). New York: Routledge, Chapman and Hall.
- Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence*. New York: Bantam.
- Hatcher, W. (1998). *Love, power, and justice: The dynamics of authentic morality*. Wilmette, IL: Baha'i Publishing Trust.
- Hoffman, M. L. (1989). Empathy and prosocial activism. In N. Eisenberg, J. Reykowski, & E. Staub (Eds.), *Social and moral values* (pp. 65–86). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Huddleston, J. (1989). *The search for a just society*. Oxford, UK: George Ronald.
- Huntington, P. P. (1993). The clash of civilizations. *Foreign Affairs*, 72, 22–49.
- Huxley, A. (1974). *The perennial philosophy*. London: Chatto & Windus.
- Kegan, R. (1982). *The evolving self*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Khan, P. (1986). Foreword. In T. G. Hayes, R. A. Hill, A. M. Scheffer, A. G. Atkinson, & B. J. Fisher (Eds.), *Peace: More than an end to war* (pp. ix–xii). Wilmette, IL: Baha'i Publishing Trust.
- Lambo, A. (2000). Constraints on world medical and health progress. In R. Lanza (Ed.), *One world: The health and survival of the human species in the 21st century* (pp. 111–128). Santa Fe, NM: Health Press.
- Lewis, J. (2000). Spiritual education as the cultivation of qualities of heart and mind: A reply to Blake and Carr. *Oxford Review of Education*, 26, 263–284.
- Malaska, P. (1993). Threefold harmony and societal transformation. In S. Bushrui, I. Ayman, & E. Laszlo (Eds.), *Transition to a global society* (pp. 43–51). Oxford, UK: Oneworld.
- Marcuse, H. (1989a). From ontology to technology: Fundamental tendencies of industrial society. In S. Bronner & D. Kellner (Eds.), *Critical theory and society: A reader* (pp. 119–127). New York: Routledge, Chapman and Hall.
- Marcuse, H. (1989b). Liberation from the affluent society. In S. Bronner & D. Kellner (Eds.), *Critical theory and society: A reader* (pp. 276–287). New York: Routledge, Chapman and Hall.
- Marsella, A. J. (1998). Toward a “global-community psychology.” *American Psychologist*, 53, 1282–1291.

- Marsella, A. (2001). *Globalization: Psychosocial issues and considerations* [Presentation]. (Paper available from author at marsella@hawaii.edu)
- Marsella, A. (2003, October). *Globalization and psychology: Issues and directions* [Presentation]. University of West Georgia, Carrollton, Georgia. (Paper available from author at marsella@hawaii.edu)
- McCaughey, C. (2002). Psychological issues in understanding terrorism and the response to terrorism. In C. Stout (Ed.), *The psychology of terrorism, Volume III: Theoretical understandings and perspectives* (pp. 3–30). Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Mustakova-Possardt, E. (1996). *Ontogeny of critical consciousness*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts at Amherst.
- Mustakova-Possardt, E. (2003). *Critical consciousness: A study of morality in a global historical context*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Peck, S. (1978). *The road less traveled*. New York: Touchstone.
- Penn, M. (2003). *Overcoming violence against women and girls: The international campaign to eradicate a worldwide problem*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Prilleltensky, I. (1997). Values, assumptions, and practices: Assessing the moral implications of psychological discourse and action. *American Psychologist*, 52, 517–535.
- Prilleltensky, I. (2004). Book review of *Critical consciousness: A study of morality in a global historical context*. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 14, 500–503.
- Roszak, T. (1975). *Unfinished animal: The Aquarian frontier and the evolution of consciousness*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Rutstein, N. (1999). *Coming of age at the millennium: Embracing the oneness of humankind*. Albion, MI: Starr Commonwealth.
- Sloan, T. (1992). Understanding major life decisions: A life history approach. *New Ideas in Psychology*, 10, 63–77.
- Spariosu, M. (2004). *Global intelligence and human development: Toward an ecology of global learning*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Spong, J. (2001). *A Christianity for a new world: Why traditional faith is dying and how a new faith is being reborn*. San Francisco: Harper.
- Stout, C. (2002). *The psychology of terrorism, Volume III Theoretical understandings and perspectives*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Swindler, L. (Ed.). (1999). *For all life: Toward a universal declaration of a global ethic*. Ashland, OR: White Cloud Press.
- Triandis, H. (1995). *Individualism and collectivism*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Universal House of Justice. (2001). *Century of light*. Wilmette, IL: Baha'i Publishing Trust.
- Vokey, D. J. (1997). *Reasons of the heart: Moral objectivity, MacIntyre, and education for critical dialogue in a pluralistic world*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto.
- Wuthnow, R. (1991). *Acts of compassion*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.