Applied Psychology in International Relations

Edgar Galindo *

Resumo

Em consequência da globalização e dos actuais conflitos mundiais, milhares de pessoas deixaram a sua pátria para viver durante alguns anos noutros países, frequentemente junto dos seus familiares. Alguns partem pela sua própria vontade, porque trabalham para o seu Governo, para as suas empresas ou para uma organização internacional, porque querem estudar no estrangeiro ou simplesmente porque procuram um emprego e uma vida melhor. Outros, normalmente num contexto violento, são forçados a partir e apenas procuram paz e apoio. Este artigo apresenta um panorama das contribuições da Psicologia para as relações internacionais (RI). Propõe cinco tipos de actores de RI: diplomatas (incluindo pessoal consular e administrativo), voluntários internacionais (ONG e participantes em missões de paz), expatriados (incluindo estudantes), migrantes (documentados e não documentados) e refugiados. Define as suas tarefas (e/ou neces-sidades) e os problemas inerentes, também para a família. Depois, trata as seguintes áreas de pesquisa que podem ajudar os actores a realizar as suas tarefas e resolver os seus problemas: análise de aconteci-mentos políticos, análise de conflitos; resolução e prevenção; negociação e mediação; tomada de

* Centro de Estudos de Psicologia Política e das Relações Internacionais – U.L.H.T.

Edgar Galindo

decisão, análise da linguagem, análise de factores culturais, operações de *peacekeeping* & desenvolvimento da paz pós-conflito, saúde mental, e *know--how* e gestão organizacional. É feita uma breve consideração sobre cada área, enfatizando assuntos práticos.

Abstract
As a consequence of globalization and current world conflicts, thousands of people leave their homeland, to live some years in other countries, often together with their families. Some leave on their own decision, because they work for their Government, for their enterprise or for an international organization, because they want to study abroad or simply because they are looking for a job and a better life. Other persons are forced to leave, usually in a violent context, and they just look for peace and relief. This paper presents a panorama of the contributions of Psychology to the international relations (IR). It proposes five types of actors of IR: diplomats (including consular and administration personnel), international volunteers (NGOs and participants in peace missions), expatriates (including students), migrants (documented and undocumented) and refugees. It defines their tasks (and/or the needs) and the inherent problems, also for the family. Then, it reviews the following research fields, that can help the actors to accomplish their tasks and to resolve their problems: analysis of political events; conflict analysis, resolution & prevention; negotiation & mediation; decision making, analysis of language, analysis of cultural factors, peacekeeping & post conflict peace building, mental health, and organizational & management know-how. A brief account of each field is made, emphasizing practical issues".

Most of the existing studies on psychology and international relations concentrate on the work of diplomats, and on the topics of political analysis and conflict analysis & resolution (including negotiation and mediation). The aim of this paper is to explore the applications of psychology to explain the tasks and resolve the problems of the diverse actors of international relations. Some words will be said about the application of these topics in the practical training.

As a consequence of globalization and current world conflicts, thousands of people leave their homeland, to live for some years or for ever in other countries, often together with their families. Some leave on their own decision, because they work for their Government, for their enterprise or for an international organization, because they want to study abroad or simply because they are looking for a job and a better life. Other persons are forced to leave, usually in a violent context, and they just look for peace and relief. These persons are the Actors of modem international relations, together with the already known members of diplomatic and consular services, and they are the ultimate object of our studies.

The theme of the relation between psychology and international relations is new in a certain way –I would say the modem way–, but very old in the "ancient" way, Le., when we think about the many efforts made since the beginning of the XX Century to explain psychologically the behavior of international politicians. We know, for instance, the famous letter exchange of Einstein and Freud (1933) on war.

In a modem way, since the symposium on "Psychology and Diplomacy", held during the XXVII International Congress of Psychology (Stockholm, July 23-28, 2000), we have seen a growth of papers on

the subject "psychology and international relations", where the works of Alexander, Levin and Henry (2005), Brewer and Steenbergen (2002) and Castano, Sacchi and Gries (2003) are the best examples.

Consequently, there is a huge amount of information about the subjects that I will treat. Nevertheless, I do not have the intention to make an exhaustive analysis of the existing literature, but to provide a panorama of the possible contributions of psychology for the fulfillmen"t of the tasks and the understanding of the problems of diplomats and of the other actors of the international relations. I will start defining these actors and their tasks and problems.

A diplomat is one of the various actors of modem international relations. He stands on the top of a pyramid, which includes downwards the members ("volunteers") of international organizations (like Red Cross and other NGOs), expatriates, foreign students, migrants and finally, on the basis, refugees. All these groups have much in ~orm~" anf.- their ways ~ross constantly in the whole world. Some times they must fulfill similar tasks. Some times they have similar problems. And some times the ones are a part of the work environment of the others, as we shall see.

First of all, let us describe the tasks of diplomats. Most of the people have heard about international negotiations made by high ranking diplomats and politicians, but know little about the tasks of normal diplomats. I will describe briefly the daily work and sorries of normal diplomats on the basis of some known authors on the field (Nicolson, 1952; Cambon, 1916; Macomber, 1975 and Kowaljow, 1980) and of my own experience as a member of the diplomatic corps (Galindo, in press).

According to the authors, the first task of a diplomat is working for peace. A diplomat tries to avoid the situations producing war and to look for peaceful and fair solutions to international differences. Even during a war, the main function of a diplomat is finding a political solution to a conflict:

"When war comes, it represents the ultimate failure of the diplomat. In failure, however, his responsibilities are not at an end. He must seek to contain the fighting and bring it to an acceptable conclusion as soon as possible. Equally important, he must seek, often in the face of muchdiminished influence, to guide events in such a way that post-war conditions will not undermine a future peace: (Macomber, 1975, p. 25).

This task has to be accomplished, says Macomber, in a complex environment, with forces often opposing to peace. Therefore, a diplomat has to show skills like energy, discipline, intelligence, knowledge of foreign languages, conflict resolution and the mastering of the own emotions and tendencies. It is probably true, but it is not enough, as we shall see. Further, according to these authors, the main task of a diplomat is acting in international negotiations to solve world conflicts, Le., /a *grande po/itique,* the relationships between the great powers, mediation in situations that could produce a war, signing peace agreements and the analysis of the present situation in the world:

"(Diplomacy)... is the art of negotiating agreements in precise and ratifiable terms. (Nicolson, p. 60).

One of the classiques on diplomacy called his masterpiece "De la manière de negocier avec les souverains: de l´utilité des negociations, du choix des ambassadeurs et des envoyés, et des qualités necessaires pour reussir dans ces emplois.' (François de Cailleres, 1716).

In my opinion, this is only partially true. In reality, the diplomatic work is not done mainly during the meetings of the world leaders and it has usually nothing to do with the great contemporary conflicts. Most of the diplomats are employees of a state or an international organization, whose way of life, in the best case, is similar to that of other state employees. In the worst case, if they live and work in a hostile environment, they are persons affronting difficult problems, with consequences in their daily personal life.

The world has changed since the status and

functions of diplomats were defined in the XIX Century. Today, an important part of the work is done in multilateral organizations and the role of a diplomat has become more economical, more commercial, more organizational and/or more cultural. Simultaneously, the number of the actors in the international relations has grown: for instance, the role of diplomats, volunteers and expatriates role often very similar.

Nevertheless, it is true, that the main tasks of diplomacy are conflict analysis & resolution, negotiation and mediation. The importance of negotiation is evident in this context, but we must understand it in a broader sense, as we shall see.

The vast majority of diplomats never meet queens or presidents; they are common citizens with a middle level of education, which work 8 hours a day (or more!) In an office, in a foreign country, doing the following tasks:

1) Negotiating. – It is true that the life of a diplomat is negotiating, but not necessarily within a conflict. Negotiating is an exchange process in which one gives and the other receives something. As a member of a diplomatic agency, you negotiate the distribution of guests on a table for dinner, the number of hotel rooms given to a delegation, how often will the name of your country mentioned in a document and many other details that outsiders hardly perceive. The best possible result of a negotiation is an agreement. Every year, thousands of agreements are negotiated in the whole world, covering so different topics like military cooperation or the observation of fishes in the seas. But the signature of an agreement is only the last step of a long process, during which numerous diplomats have been analyzing every word and every comma:

"Sie (die diplomatische Arbeit) begann Lange bevor der Konferenzprasident die Sitzung (…) eroffnete. Gewohnlich ist der Zeit-und Arbeitsaufwand für die Vorbereitung von Verhandlungen und Begegnungen um ein vielfaches grosser als für die Verhandlungen und Treffen selbst".

(The diplomatic work began *long* time before the opening of the meeting by the Chairman. The preparation of negotiations and meetings demands usually much more time and work than the proper negotiations and meetings) (Kowaljow, p. 31).

On the other hand, negotiation is not only a part of the *Grande Politique* and of diplomatic life, but involves almost every aspect in the life of a normal citizen, as we shall see.

2) Informing.– This task implies the daily ledure of newspapers, journals and other information sources (sometimes even conversations with foreign colleagues) and the elaboration of reports for a) the central government, b) the government of the host country or c) the public opinion; it implies often the predidion of possible future events. The most appreciated skills are a real knowledge of the situation, an ability to understand the point of view of the host government, objectivity and ability to synthesize. The worst enemies of a diplomat are ignorance (especially of the local language!), frustration, prejudices and the so called "protagonisme" (an ambition to play the first fiddle. Observing the reactions of local public opinion to events in the own country is an essential part of this work. Obviously, information might be political, economical, and cultural and so on.

3) Making demarches.– Negotiating and making demarches are similar activities, but in this case there is no interchange; here you have usually a goal and you begin by an analysis of a situation in order to seled the best way –maybe the best person- to attain your goal. One of the most common tasks of diplomats is making demarches for the solution of urgent situations with no apparent solution, like for instance, buying plane tickets for a delegation in a few hours, during the high season. A good known type of demarches is the so called "good offices": a diplomat tries to solve a difficult situation for a "friend" country.

4) Organization.– A diplomat must organize his travels, meetings, conferences and talks of other people; but the most important is organizing the own

office, the own routine and some times the routine of the colleagues; sometimes it happens, that he has to open a mission in a new environment and organize all details, from hiring a flat to buying carpets.

5) Management.– As a state employee, a diplomat is also a manager. He manages personal, time, archives, work routines, and material & financial resources.

6) Making and keeping contacts.- Public relations is a very important task. In order to fulfill his tasks, a diplomat must maintain contacts with local authorities and other persons of the political, economical or cultural world. Taking part in parties, celebrations, cocktails and ceremonies is a daily life activity. Sometimes this task is especially important: under certain conditions, the voice of a diplomat is understood as the voice of his country.

7) Writing documents.– The result of a negotiation, a demarche, mediation or a contact is often a document. Therefore, writing documents is very important. Usually, every word, every phrase and every comma have been thought and analyzed carefully before writing and this is equally valid for a political treaty and for a simple aide-mémoire. The language of diplomacy has its special rules and must be object of research on its own.

8) Consular work.– The member of the mission in charge of consular work has the most human task in the diplomatic corps: the protection of the own citizens abroad. He must not only issue a variety of official documents, like passports and visas, but take care of the own citizens, which are in bad need for some reason or have been victims of accidents or crimes, or even perpetrators of crimes. In any case, a consul has to take care of the health and the rights of the unfortunate citizen. He must indeed be in contact with local civil and judicial authorities. It is the crossroad of the work of a diplomat and the problems of migrants and refugees.

The structure, composition and functions of diplomatic missions (embassies, consulates or offices) and other juridical and protocol details are regulated by the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations (Vienna, 1961). A diplomat spends most of his life living abroad, working in a mission, who may be big, with hundreds of colleagues, or small, with two or three persons. Usually, a diplomat gets a new appointment –and must go to a new country– every 3 or 4 years.

Diplomats have hierarchical degrees similar to a military organization: ambassador, minister, counselor, first secretary, and so on; if there is no ambassador in a mission, his task is fulfilled by the member with the highest level and he is called "charge d'affaires". You have also non diplomatic personal, in charge of the usual office work. For the objectives of this paper, I make no difference between both of them, because they must cope with the same stressors and support all negative or positive consequences of living abroad.

A mission is a closed universe, situated in a foreign (sometimes hostile) country, in which a group of previously unknown persons with political, human, and financial responsibilities, must work together many hours a day. There are huge pressures acting on them, which (for instance in case of a political crisis) may attain very high levels.

The head of the mission is a key figure in this universe and his behaviour may be a source of relax or a source of additional stress for his personal. Therefore, he has a moral responsibility added to the other already mentioned responsibilities. In the many missions of all existing countries in this world, you find modern management systems, with the head of the mission making a team with his people, or authoritarian –even tyrannical– management systems. Obviously, more democratic governments tend to be less authoritarian.

Evidently, in these conditions, the mental health of diplomats and other members of the personal is subjected to high pressures.

As a psychologist and former diplomat, I agree with the diplomatic "virtues" above mentioned by Macomber, but I add "resilience" in the sense of Mash & Wolfe (2002, p. 14) as a fundamental skill, because

a diplomat is exposed to great pressures and temptations; it is extremely easy to lose the sense of reality and not every one can cope in the same way with the numerous risk factors implied not only in a peace negotiation, but in the fulfillment of the other diplomatic tasks, as we shall see.

The tasks and the problems of the other actors of international relations are very similar.

International volunteers are more and more present in international relations, as ONGs take part increasingly in international aid tasks, like the reconstruction of devastated regions and helping population after wars or catastrophes. Their tasks are not only those specific to their mission (like health care, or reconstruction of pipelines), but also mediation between conflict groups, making demarches before local (or home) authorities, informing their heads, organizing effective functioning systems for their aims, managing personal, managing goods, informing national or international public opinion about their tasks and accomplishments, and maintaining active contacts with local groups at power. We can assume, that the members of police and armed forces taking part in peace missions abroad are also a case of international volunteers.

Expatriates are a new category emerging from the globalization of economic and commercial links; almost every company of a certain level has managers and workers abroad or receives foreign workers. It is people sent abroad for many years, with a specific aim, like organizing a production system, modernizing a fabric or developing commercial circuits in a new country. Again, they have to fulfill the already mentioned tasks of organization, management, establishing and maintaining contacts, making demarches and writing informs. There is no big difference with respect to diplomats and their problems are very similar too!

Migrants and refugees are actors of intemational relations as well –often against their own will–, even if they are seldom mentioned in diplomatic circles. Obviously, their main "task" is living a better life than the one they had at home, or they want simply survive. They must often solve the most elementary problems for a daily survival and additionally cope with a different culture, to adapt or not in a new environment, or go back home.

Students abroad deserve a special mention. They are usually young adults going abroad voluntarily for a limited period and with a specific aim. Commonly, they have a financial support. They are playing a growing role in the international and intercultural relations; nevertheless, in spite of all their advantages, they must cope with problems of adaptation in the host country, which often are not resolved in a positive way.

Having defined the tasks and the problems of the various actors of international relations, in the next pages, I will analyze the contribution of psychology for their understanding, fulfillment and eventually solving.

An analysis of the many fields of study and research existing in psychology shows the following list of possible topics with application in international relations:

1) Analysis of political events.

2) Conflict analysis & conflict resolution.

3) Negotiation and Mediation.

4) Decision making.

5) Cultural factors.

6) Attention to population after conflicts and disasters.

7) Mental health.

8) Work, organization and management.

1) Analysis of political events.

This is the main topic of political psychology. Consequently, I will only say a few words on the field. The analysis of international politics from a psychological point of view is an old topic. Psychologists and psychoanalysts have tried to explain political and social processes since the beginning of the XX Century. This is especially evident during politically critical periods, like the I World War, 11 World War, Cold War, and recently after the terrorist

attacks in New York, Madrid and .London. William James (see Langoltz, 1998), Sigmund Freud (1933), Harold Dwight Lasswell (1931, v. Rogow, 1969), Edward Glover (1947), Frederick Hertz (1944), Wilhelm Reich (1986) and many others have tried to explain errors of intemational politics and horrors of war through psychological factors.

A recent example is a paper of Murray Sidman (2001), who proposes to the great powers the application of positive reinforcement instead of menace and pressure to build better international relations, as well as the elimination of reinforcement to combat terrorism.

It is difficult to evaluate the practical results of these enterprises. Some of the propositions were obviously naive and we must understand them as the efforts of good-willed scientists, trying to make a contribution for peace in the world. But on the other hand, this epoch of critical thinking anticipate the birth of the modem political psychology, the psychology of conflicts, the psychology of peace, the science of peace, peace research, and of a new science called international relations -all of them mutually linked.

Presently, we know that the analysis of political, economical and social factors determining international politics is the domain of political sciences, especially of intemational relations. And we know that political facts are determined by geoeconomical, social and geopolitical international and internal factors. Now, under these conditions, is it possible to apply psychological research to international politics?

That is the question asked by Tetlock & Goldgeier (2000). The authors analyze two contradictory positions on the role of psychology in politics. On the one hand, political scientists mean that the behavior of politicians is largely determined by the above mentioned forces, with no relation to psychological processes and that there are already enough theories to explain why a politician behaves in a certain way. On the other, psychologists believe that their science can *help* to understand better the problems of the world and possibly to solve them, because a) politicians

are human beings, b) the aim of psychology is to explain, why human beings think, feel and behave in a certain way, c) psychology can explain why politician think, feel and behave of a certain way.

In my opinion, on the one hand, it is very dangerous to psychologize political facts: it is simply too easy to say that Hitler or Saddam Hussein were or are insane! On the other hand, the contributions of psychology to intemational relations goes far away of simplified political analyzes, as we shall see. So for instance, the paper of Tetlock & Goldgeier (2000) and the context in which it was given, represent a renewed vision of the relation between psychology and politics: the symposium "Diplomacy, Conflict Prevention and Psychology", during the XXVII Intemational Congress of Psychology. The papers given during this meeting, some of which later published in a special number of the Intemational Journal of Psychology (2000), show the state of the art of the contributions of psychology to diplomacy and politics.

In the mean time, the analysis of political events has become a well established research field of psychology, covering all possible topics of internal and international politics. The best proof is the rapid development of political Psychology in the USA under the leadership of ISPP and the journal Political Psychology, and also the development of political psychology in Europe and in many LatinAmerican countries.

A quick view of the contents of the journal Political Psychology shows the present concerns of American colleagues: power, authority and authoritarianism, ethnic and national identity, the links between political leaders and counseling systems, dominance and social identity, patriotism, personality and political parties, political image and political preferences, styles of leadership in making decisions in international policy, error and success in international relations, social traumas, perception of menace, psychological war, among others.

In France, the development has been marked by

the publication in *Psychologie Française* (1990) of an issue devoted to the «Political psychologies », the publication of *Fondements de la Psychologie Politique* (Dorna, 1988) and *Cahiers de Psychologie Politique* (since 2002) and the foundation of Association Française de Psychologie Politique (1999). The main topics of French colleagues seem to be the concept of citizenship among young people, the authoritarian personality, populism, multiculturalism, citizenship and the relationship between psychology and democracy.

In Spain, the 1st. Congress on Political Psychology was celebrated in 1987 and the Revista de Psicología Política has been published since 1990. The most important lines of research seem to be sociopolitical participation, and techniques to increase political support, you find also some works on psychological factors in elections, the crisis of democracy , group identity and political protest, social hierarchies and prejudices, corruption and collective memory.

Political psychology in Latin America has also treated a variety of topics; its main feature is probably the fact that psychologists are often militant of political parties and their works reflect the political struggles in their countries, including oppression and repression (see Montero, 1997 and Mota, 1999) .

Germany deserves a special comment. In the German speaking countries, the interest of psychologist and psychoanalysts for political themes has a long tradition. For reasons easy to understand, German intellectuals and scientists have shown a very early concern about the problems of war and peace. The work of German political psychologist in the last 55 years has been developed inside the pacifist movement ("Friedensbewegung"). Following the example of America, German pacifism developed rapidly between the two great wars. But it is especially during the Cold War, that the Friedensbewegung won a special signification: Due to the role of Germany during both world wars and to the German question in the Cold War, political psychology means peace psychology

(*Friedenspsychologie)* and science of peace *(Friedenswissenschaft)* (see Sommer, G; Becker, J.M., Rehbein, K. & Zimmermann, R., 1992; Kempf, W. *et al*., 1993 and Sornmer, G; Stellmacher, J. & Wagner, U, 1999).

As we know, the existence of atomic bomb made the destruction of mankind, for the first time, a possible outcome of any war. Consequently, intellectuals and scientists in America and Europe began to work for peace. Peace research became an important matter since the Manifest of Albert Einstein and Bertrand Russell in 1955. Many universities began to open studies on the causes of war, the conditions of peace, conflict and conflict resolution. The names of K. Boulding, J. Galtung and J.R Burton, and of psychologists like Ch. Osgood, O. R. Hasti and A. Rapaport are linked for always to these developments.

One additional factor has been important in Europe, namely, a responsibility feeling due to the wars and the misery of the ancient colonies.

Germany was especially concerned, because of its responsibility in the beginning of two world wars, the Nazism and above all, for the holocaust of the Jewish people. Last but not least, Germany was divided between a capitalist side in the west and a socialist side in the east.

German peace research movement was born in 1957, as western powers organized a new German army, which had to receive nuclear weapons. Following the example of the Pugwash movement in America, a group of scientist published the "Declaration of Goettingen", calling for the application of nuclear energy to solve the huge problems of mankind and not to war. It followed a broad movement, which has been able to publish numerous books and papers on war and peace. In 1982 was founded at the University of Marburg the forum "Psychology of peace" (Friedenspsychologie), who publishes until now the journal "Science & Peace" (Wissenschaft & Frieden). During the Cold War, this journal and other German similar groups treated themes like the fear before atomic menace and the

role of mass media in the formation of enemy images. Today, the German psychology of peace analyzes topics like the effects of ''preventive war', the building of stereotypes justifying violence, the consequences of the war against terrorism, and the causes and effects of racism.

In America, we have a further development in Peace Psychology: the *Peace Psychology Division of the American Psychological Association Division* exists since 1990 and publishes *Peace and Conflict: The Journal of Peace Psychology.* Modern authors, like Harvey Langholtz, speak about a .peacekeeping psychology'', as we shall see.

Evidently, psychology and diplomacy meet each other, when you speak about peace and conflict resolution. A concrete result of the political analysis has been the practical application of the won knowledge in conflict analysis and resolution, no only at an individual level, but at the level of the relations of different groups, ethnic communities and nations.

2) Conflict analysis & conflict resolution.

From a political point of view, the works on the peaceful resolution of conflicts begin to be known in the second half of the XX Century, in the context of peace research and the science of international relations, with authors like J.L. Richardson (1994) and J.W. Burton (1987).

The most known contribution of science to this topic is probably The Journal of Conflict Resolution, an interdisciplinary journal, published by the Peace Science Society (international), which has made contributions on all political conflicts in the world since in the last 50 years.

Conflicts are obviously a subject matter for anthropologists, historians, economists and politicians; but conflicts have also clear sociopsychological bases. The aim is not explaining group conflicts in terms of intraindividual factors (frustrations, personality and so on), but the dynamics of intergroup phenomena.

Psychology, traditionally concerned with intraindividual conflicts, began long ago to analyze interindividual and group conflicts. We find theoretical

models to explain the origins of conflicts since the middle of the XX Century, like for instance, the once proposed by Dollard, Allport or Sherif.

Today, conflict and negotiation, as social interaction forms among groups is a very good known research field of social psychology. Tajfel and Turner's (1986) social identity theory stresses that each individual defines himself in terms of belonging to a social group and looks for a positive social identity. The works of these authors show that small differences can provoke conflicts between groups. Some apparently irrational aspects of conflicts can be explained as the defence of social identities, even if they have a political or economical origin. But the most relevant found of conflict psychology is undoubtedly the tools to solve conflicts: Negotiation and mediation, which deserve to be mentioned in special chapter.

3) Negotiation and Mediation.

Macomber (1975) stresses that a diplomat must concentrate his skills in defending the interests of his nation. Therefore, you find in our world a huge amount of different opposed interests of the different nations. In this context, the work of a diplomat is transforming the different demands in negotiable demands. The importance of negotiation is evident. A good negotiator, says Macomber, is a person able to: a) evaluate objectively the aims, personality, logics, moral and emotions of his partner; b) evaluate objectively his own limits; c) establishing a good rhythm and strategy of work; d) adapt to different conditions. Unfortunately, says Macomber, you do not find born negotiators: it is a skill that you have to learn.

I am fully in agreement with Macomber. Creating training methods for negotiators is a very important task for psychology, independently that negotiation is not only a task necessary in the *grande politique,* but in many other contexts.

The point of depart of the psychology of negotiation is the fact, that two different persons can perceive e the same reality in two equally correct different ways. The constructivist theory of perception

(Gregory, 1980, et Neisser, 1967) says that information received through the senses is modified by unconscious inferences. Therefore, we will find many individual, social and cultural variations in perception. Empirical research confirms this assertion.

On the other hand, the psychology of negotiation stresses, that conflict is a part of human life; we negotiate every day since the early childhood! Avoiding conflicts is then a mistake: we have to find effective ways of understanding and coping with conflicts. This point of view is fully in agreement, with the facts that we have seen about the work of diplomats.

Then, when we speak about negotiation and mediation, it does not mean only international conflicts. Clinical psychology has developed different methods to cope with individual, interindividual and intergroup conflicts. Many of them can also be applied in the case of international conflicts, because the rules are the same. So, Carnevale & Dong-Won Choi, (2000) study the cognitive factors, cultural conditions, individual traits and motivations influencing judgement and behaviour in a negotiation. Roger Fisher, head of the Harvard Project on Negotiation has created a variety of tools derived from the assumptions of the psychology of conflict to train negotiators and mediators. The methods created by Fischer on the basis of his experience with the course "Coping with International Conflict" aims to help the participants to perceive conflicts in such a way to make solutions possible. They are methods similar to those applied for coping with social and labour conflicts in industrial enterprises. Training is based on such elerrtents of psychological analysis, like "perception of conflict", "taking the point of view of the other", "analysis of language", "personal motives" and "positions and interests". I recommend strongly a lecture of the tables for the analysis of personal motives of negotiators (Fisher, Kopelman e Schneider, 1994, pp. 53 e 58) to understand the dimension of individual subjectivity in political processes, which are apparently objective. They are also essential for people interested in the practical application of these matters.

In a fundamental work, Jeanne Brett (2000) revises the existing types of negotiations and possible results (agreements or impasse) and explores the contribution of cultural factors for the success of a negotiation. A good result, says Brett, depends on real conditions, but it depends as well of a psychological factor: the style of negotiation and the profile of negotiators; of course, diplomats have noted it too (see Macomber, 1975). We will come back to cultural factors!

A negotiation can be made directly, face to face, or it can be made through an agent or a mediator. An agent is an allied of on of the parts, but a mediator is a neutral person.

Mediation is more and more a well-reputed task; you find an increasing number of publications on the matter and research centres for the training of mediation techniques in different context, also in international conflicts.

In diplomacy, mediation is a part of the so called "prevention diplomacy" created by former UN General Secretary Dag Hammarskjold. But mediation in a political sense exists since antiquity and its modern roots have been defined by the international right since the XIX Century. Mediation has been the *raison d'être* of international organizations like the Society of Nations, UNO, OSCE, OAS, etc. In spite of it, the existing mediation mechanisms in international relations do not function because of two reasons:

1) The fact of asking for mediation is seen as a sanction by the international community; many countries reject an UN intervention in their own conflicts, especially internal conflicts.

2) The UN Chart forbids any interference in the internal affairs of a member country.

Consequently, most of the work on mediation is made out of public scenes, especially in the case of internal conflicts. In spite of the inherent difficulties of such a task, we find successful cases.

One of them are the mediation processes

conducted by Jimmy Carter between Israel and Egypt, in 1978, and the subsequent Camp David Agreements, and also the peaceful resolution of the conflict between general Raoul Cedras and President Bertrand Arisitide in Haiti, in 1994. Probably because of these successful interventions, the former American president founded in 1982 the Carter Centre, devoted to strengthen national, regional and international systems dedicated to democracy and human rights.

Today, we find many American and European universities offering courses on negotiation, mediation and peaceful conflict resolution. Even the American Government supports a "US Institute for Peace", whose subject matters are preventive diplomacy, ethnic and regional conflicts, peacekeeping operations, peaceful agreements, reconstruction and reconciliation after conflicts, democratisation and intercultural negotiations.

In all of them, the main subject matters are cognitive and behavioural training methods derived from social, clinical and educational psychology.

4) Decision making.

Decision making is a very old subject matter of the psychology of motivation. Two modem authors have become famous in the last years. They have discovered that decision making is –sometimes negatively–influenced by factors like valuable information, excess of confidence, status of the person giving information, and aversion to losses. Kahneman and Tversky became the Nobel Prize on Economy in 2002 due to their works on decision making in economy, known as" Prospect Theory" .

To understand the importance of Kahneman's work, it is necessary to describe briefly early psychological motivation theory until the introduction of "decision theory". In the first part of the XX Century, we find two major trends in the research of the psychology of motivation; the first wanted to find a set of basic motives and the second had the aim of analyzing the interaction of motives in specific situations, *i.e.*, choices in conflict, stress or frustration. This second trends led to research on intraindividual conflicts, including decision making, with the prediction of final choice. Therefore, all theoretical approaches of psychology of motivation were interested in the process of decision making, which is basically a conflict of individual motives leading to a final choice; the prediction of this final choice was (and is!) the aim of psychologists.

For example, Edwards (1954) introduced the theory of decisions and games to empirical psychology, whose final aim was the construction of a theoretical model to predict the choice behavior of a person in a given situation. Some other theoretical models were proposed later.

One of the most important is the statistical decision theory formulated to solve a general decision making situation:

If:

1) There exists a set of states of environment.

2) There exists a set of alternative options of the decision maker.

3) There exists a set of possible outcomes.

What is to do to obtain the best outcome given the states of nature and the options to act?

So, if you find the probabilities of the occurrence of the states of nature (including actions of other actors) and the preferences for the possible outcomes, you can predict the choice.

This working schema has been one main contribution of psychology to understand the behavior of individuals, including politicians, making decisions.

Many years later, Kahneman and Tversky tried to improve these conceptions, providing also an applied dimension, and conceived their theory as a theory of economic behavior. So it is necessary to speak a bit about economics.

In the classic theory of economics your have two fundamental variables, supply and demand. Supply depends on the production (the prize of a commodity depending on the production costs) and demand depends on the preferences of consumer. These preferences must be derived form the behaviour of a potential consumer and (very important!) they do not

depend necessarily neither on the production costs nor the real utility of a commodity. Economists have developed a theory of utility in order to estimate the preferences of a consumer. "Utility" of a commodity can be quantified, but in spite of that, it contains a psychological factor: a person evaluates and judges the utility of a commodity –and make decisions concerning this commodity– on the basis of his/her own subjective "measures".

Kahneman and Tversky ran hundreds of laboratory experiments to analyze the impact of these psychological variables in finance. *i.e.*, the judgment bases of a person making an economic decision. The result of this research is the « prospect theory» (Kahneman & Tversky, 1979, and Tversky & Kahneman, 1992).

For instance, they have shown that a person choosing between option A, big gain with little loss probability, and option, small gain without loss probability chooses preferentially option. Summarizing, Kahneman and Tversky have applied the concepts of cognitive psychology on the formation of judgement processes and decision making, in order to understand decision making in economics, especially under risk. They have inspired a research direction, giving birth to the discipline of behavioural finance and. Additionally; the "prospect theory" has been applied for the analysis of risky political situations (Haas, 2001) and international relations (Boetcher, 2004).

5) Analysis of language

The analysis of language has been a historical field of political Psychology (see Lasswell & Leites, 1968).

Language is the main tool of a politician and, of course, of a diplomat. Politics and diplomacy use an own language, in which omissions are equally important than mentions; often one have to read the message behind the words. In understanding diplomatic messages, the context is essential; you would not understand the political meaning of a diplomatic note sent to a foreign country in 1950. This special situation is on the origin of the rigid and ceremonial language of diplomacy. Nicolson (1952) explains clearly the art of writing diplomatic documents: If a government declares that "we cannot be indifferent before the event x", it means that that it is going to intervene in the event x; if the government says that "we observe with concern an event", it means that it is ready to make a serious decision. So, says Nicolson, diplomats have a possibility of warning each other without direct threats, but unfortunately these manners are also disadvantageous, while they may be misunderstood by the common observer.

Kowaljow (1980) adds that language plays an extraordinary role in the relations among states. The Soviet diplomat explains through interesting anecdotes how political events may be determined by the formulation of a phrase. For example, the storm provoked by General Charles de Gaulle during his visit to Canada in 1967, as he shouted "Vive le Quebec libre" in the City Hall of Montreal.

Further, Kowaljow explains some characteristics of soviet notes during the Cold war. A note may express "a protest" or "an energetic protest", like for instance, the note following the flight of an American airplane over the German Democratic Republic: "The Soviet government expresses an energetic protest against this new aggressive action of the American air force and declares..."

It contains a clear warning: "... if military airplanes of the NATO countries are detected in the space, whose security depends on the Soviet air forces (...), they will be destroyed with all available defence means..." (Kowaljow, 1980, p. 13).

The Cold War is over, but not the armed conflicts nor the need of language analysis.

In the modern world, the analysis of language is increasingly important, because of the proliferation of small dimension conflicts and its tendency to become violent very quickly. "Early warning", the early knowledge of the symptoms showing the imminent explosion of a crisis, is essential. In this context, it is extremely important the analysis of the

language of political messages, as it is practised in the training of the Harvard Project of Negotiation (Fisher, Kopelman & Schneider, 1994, pp. 45-46).

A few months ago, the UN General Secretary, Koffi Anan, deplored the fact, that conflicts tend to mobilize public opinion only when they have attained a great dimension ("CNN effect"). He stressed the importance of creating mechanisms to recognize the evidences of an imminent catastrophe; the role of the analysis of language is evident.

6) Cultural factors.

We have seen that cultural factors are important in studying the origin and resolution of conflicts. Psychological research has shown the influence of culture in the way an individual perceives, selects and interprets the information he has received. Psychology has studied cultural differences from diverse perspectives. Triandis (1994, 2000) has shown the importance of cultural distance for the understanding of two persons with different origin; he stresses that an existing conflict between two persons or groups, may be complicated by factors like the difference degree between the cultural background of participants; this is the so called "cultural distance".

According to Triandis, cultural distance depends on following differences:

–Different languages. The distance is greater, if people speak different languages. There are misunderstandings, even between similar languages, like Spanish and Portuguese.

–Different social structures. For instance, family structures vary from a culture to other. You find clan structures in many countries. Belonging to a clan or family may be an advantage or disadvantage. For instance, in Germany a person should not take part in a contest, if there is a member of his family in the jury.

–Different religion. It is a known fact, but one often forgets, that Jewish people do not work on Saturday and do not eat pork, and that Muslims fast during Ramadan.

–Different standard of living. A different standard

of living can determine the way two persons communicate. For instance, in many non European countries (like Cuba), sending an email or make a copy may be extremely expensive, in relative terms.

–Different values. You find a broad variation in the values, even inside the same cultural group. An extreme case is the value given to individual life with respect to community needs.

Cultural differences are best conceptualized as cultural syndromes, *i.e.*, shared patterns of beliefs, attitudes, self-definitions, norms, roles and values organized around a theme. Syndromes are different in terms of :

–Complexity. Some cultures (*e.g.* peasants in Africa) are simple and uniform, and you do not find great variations among members, who share perceptions and beliefs. Other cultures, like Spanish culture, are complex, with different sub-groups and a variety of specializations.

–Tightness. Tight cultures have many rules and ideas to define the right behaviour in a given situation and members might feel upset, when some one does not follow the rules, with unpredictable results. In loose cultures, people are more tolerant and deviations are common.

–Individualism and collectivism. This topic has been object of many researches, because of the apparent differences between western and eastern cultures. In collectivist cultures, individuals think in terms of "my group" and the aims of the group (*e.g.* the family) are more important the individual ones; conformism is a virtue (*e.g.*, China). Individualist cultures are focused in individual and his/her internal processes (beliefs, attitudes), personal aims are a priority, conformism is rather undesirable, and creativity is a virtue.

–Vertical and horizontal. In vertical cultures, hierarchy is de norm; members think that you will always have rich and poor, chiefs and workers; sometimes the chief is a kind of protecting father. Horizontal cultures accept equality as a given.

–Active-passive. In active cultures individuals

change the environment, in passive cultures individuals change themselves to adapt.

Other important dimensions, according to Triandis (2000) are universalism-particularism, Diffuse Specific, Instrumental-Expressive, Emotional Expression or suppression.

Evidently, diplomacy had to give an answer to the problem of this vast culture and habits diversity; we can imagine the cultural misunderstandings (and conflicts!), that such a situation has caused in the past. The answer of the international community is *protocol, i.e.*, a handbook of rigid behaviour norms regulating all details of diplomatic meetings.

In the last years, we observe an increasing interest for the subject matter of cultural differences, not only in scientific and political circles, but also in the world of business. Papers on this topic are regularly published not only in specialized journals, like *International Journal of Intercultural Relations,* but also in business publications, like *International Journal of Commerce and Management, Journal of Business Communication, Human Resource Management, International Journal of Human Resource Management and Public Administration Quarterly.*

On the one hand, *Political Psychology* devoted one issue (December 1999, vol. 26, issue 4) to cultural factors; where the contributions of Hudson (2000) and Hudson and Sampson (2000), devoted to the influence of cultural factors in foreign affairs, are especially to mention. On the other hand, Multinational enterprises have realized, that being able to understand the language and culture of a country can make the difference between good and bad investments. The increasing number of foreign clients and workers and of the many projects abroad, demand managers with concrete intercultural abilities. Consequently, we find already journals devoted to the topic (like) and training programs for teaching cultural abilities. One of them has been created on the basis of Milton Bennett's works: the *Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity.*

Bennett (1993) explains that an individual must go through several steps to reach a high level of competence in a multicultural context, namely:

1) Negation of difference. The other culture is avoided and the individual tends to isolation and show a lack of interest, even, aggression before the other culture.

2) Defense. Individual defines himself as a member of a totally different group, seeing "the others" in a critical way.

3) Minimizing differences. The person shows a tendency to think, that differences are trivial and stresses similarities, sometimes differences are perceived in a "romantic" way.

4) Acceptance of difference. Differences are recognized and accepted with respect, but the individual does not agree with them.

5) Adaptation. The person is able to understand both cultures and can assume two different ways of perceiving reality.

6) Integration. Both cultures are accepted as equal and the person is able to change accordingly his/her perception and behavior.

The training of intercultural sensitivity aims accelerates consciously and systematically the way through these phases. Obviously, these programs are increasingly important in international relations, not only for managers, but also for the other actors, *e.g.*, diplomats and volunteers. Today, we find a respectable amount of publications devoted to cross-cultural training, like the *International Journal* of *Intercultural Relations*.

7) Attention to population after conflicts and disasters.

We have seen, that the most modem authors on peace psychology, like Harvey Langholtz (1978), speak about the "psychology of peacekeeping", *i.e.*, the application of psychology to the resolution of the practical problems of peacekeeping missions.

Langholtz agrees with the work done in the field of conflict resolution, but he goes further stressing that, today, all conflict resolution measures must

include preventive diplomacy and an analysis of ethnic and cultural facts intervening in a problem. The peacekeeping work must be done, when the conflict is over. In this moment, the most essential tasks are reorganization of society and the diagnostic, treatment and rehabilitation of the conflict victims.

During Cold war, peacekeeping missions were an exclusively military task. UN used to send blue helmets to the crisis regions, after a long negotiation process; they were military forces to separate enemies. Today, we have a different situation: peacekeeping missions must include social interventions: helping refugees, organization of humanitarian aid, treatment of the victims of war or violence, insertion of former soldiers in civil society, reconciliation of enemies, organization of political parties (or of political life), organization of community services, like water supply, electricity, hospitals, etc. This is the field in which diplomats and refugees usually meet. Here, we are entering in a new domain, namely, the mental health of the actors of international relations, as we shall see.

Obviously, tasks of international volunteers and diplomats after a disaster are roughly the same; they do not have to apply reconciliation measures, but otherwise they have to help the population to rebuild their homeland, lives and mental health. And here too, we meet the problems of the mental health of the helpers.

8) Mental health

All actors of international relations –from diplomats to refugees–, have to do with mental health problems.

We have already seen, that a diplomat abroad works in uncommon situations. Every individual reacts differently to the mentioned stressors, according with the own personality traits. Most of diplomats go through successive adaptation crises, which must be mastered successfully, in order to work normally. If this essential task is not well done, the field is ready for disorders to appear. Unfortunately, there are psychological disorders, which *can* be understood like "professional diseases" of diplomats, just like lung

pathologies are typical diseases of miners. The work environment of diplomats makes them especially sensitive to personality disorders, dipsomania, problems of the couple and learning problems of the children.

You do not find much information on the topic in the literature. We know that the State Department has psychiatrists, in charge of the mental health of American diplomats. There is also an interesting epidemiological research on the post-traumatic stress reactions of American diplomats and expatriates after 11th September (Speckhard, 2003).

Probably, the most interesting scientific work on the field is a paper by Nicole Schwartz (2000), that seems to be unique. The author confirms that there is evidence enough to assume, that the rate of mental disorders in the diplomatic corps is much higher than in the general population. On the basis of her own experience in the Canadian diplomatic service, she explains how certain common stressors in diplomatic life, like frequent residence moving, can have a triggering effect on disorders like hallucinations, maniac attacks, deep depressions, suicidal thinking and paranoid states:

"The stresses associated with a family move can be varied and intense, and therefore an effective trigger. So powerful is the "triggering effect", that most dangerous crises have been reported between days or weeks upon arrival. n (Schwartz, 2000, p. 12)

The problem of the mental health of diplomats, says Schwartz, is that governments do not recognize the existence of disorders, because they are afraid of the word "madness". But it is necessary to treat the existing cases and to apply prevention measures to grant the mental health of the diplomat and his family working abroad. Of course, it involves a recognition that the problem exists.

As far as I know, there are no similar works in the literature. Nevertheless, diplomatic authors like Macomber (1975, pp. 122/127) reveals the existence of human problems in the diplomatic work, like couple difficulties and managing of

employees, that have a direct relation to the work environment, as we shall see.

UNO seems to be the only international organization applying prevention measures to improve the mental health of his members. There are psychologists, like Brian Kidwell (Langholtz, 1998) working in the Department for Peacekeeping Operations. Also the UN Institute for Training and Research (UNIT AR) offers training programs in preventive diplomacy and "peacemaking", which include –after conflict analysis, negotiation and mediation–prophylactic aspects, whose aim is protecting the mental health of participants, *i.e.*, volunteers, diplomats and NGO members. There are also private organizations, like *Community and Family Services* (www.cfsLph), offering briefings and workshops for volunteers participating in difficult missions abroad.

We can reasonably suppose, that the mental health problems of expatriates, like their tasks, are similar to the diplomats. Therefore, it seems reasonable to recommend the organization of prevention programs for psychological disorders in the health services of expatriates and their families. I have no information about it.

Fortunately, since about 20 years there is a growing interest on mental health issues of immigrants. You often see papers on mental health of different minorities in the USA and Canada in scientific journals like *Hispanic Journal of Behavior Sciences, Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, International Journal of Intercultural Relations, Journal of Immigrant Health,* et *Cutlural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology.* The book of AI-Issa and Toussignant (1997), deserves a special mention; it contents chapters on the psychological problems of Latin-American immigrants and South Asian refugees in the USA and Canada. Also Dasen, Berry and Sartorius (1988) have published an interesting work on acculturation that is especially important for our purposes.

Berry and Kim stress that acculturation is a long process involving diverse changes: physical (new place, new housing), biological (new food and diseases), cultural (new political, economic, technical, social and religious agencies) and psychological (new mental health needs). Those changes elicit an "acculturation stress", that can be a positive force, but it is often negative.

Four types of acculturation can be defined (assimilation, integration, separation and marginalization), and all of them develop through phases: 1) a conflictive phase, characterized by stress and tension, in which the emigrant feels the norms of the dominant group as a pressure demanding another way of life; 2) a crisis, in which conflict and tension attain unbearable levels and end in a resolution; 3) adaptation, characterized by a stabilization of the emigrant relationships to dominant group. Obviously, going through these phases demands great efforts from the emigrant; unfortunately, not every person shows the necessary skills to cope with them and the situation can result in a psychological disorder. The skills for a person to cope with stressors depend on his/her psychological features, *i.e.*, knowledge of the language and culture of the host group, motivation for the contact (is it a voluntary decision?), attitude before acculturation (positive or negative?), education level, positive or negative nature of the contacts, degree of cognitive control over the acculturation process, attitudes before acculturation variations and level of agreement between expectations before the contact and the reality of emigration. The empirical basis of Berry and Kim is a set of observations made in Switzerland with Portuguese emigrants; it is probably the main part of their study.

Of course, diplomats, volunteers, foreign students and expatriates have much better conditions than immigrants, but they all share the problems related to acculturation and the subsequent stress situations; as in the case of immigrants, the other actors can mostly cope successfully with these stressors, but there is always a minority that needs urgently help.

Refugees are the most extreme case. According

to UN statistics, there are between 10,000,000 and 11,000,000 people living as refugee in a foreign country (UN Chronicle. Online Edition, 19972002, p. 1). The problems of refugees are so urgent, that they understandably call the attention of many humanitarian organizations. Numerous studies have shown the impact of traumatic events (dead of beloved, rape, torture, material losses) on mental health of survivors. According to Mollica (2000), refugees that have been victims or witnesses of violence show high levels of post-traumatic stress and other disorders, like depressions, chronic fatigue, memory and learning problems, social adaptation difficulties and somatization processes; many of them remain vulnerable for the rest of their lives and they show a higher probability to suffer unemployment and poverty.

There exists an always insufficient international net of help for refugees (see *Worldwide Refugee Information),* in which the work of psychologists, psychiatrists and psychoanalysts is always needed. I can only add, that Langholtz (1978) and his peacekeeping psychology are on the right way.

9) Work, organization and management

I will end my analysis mentioning one of the best known fields of application of psychology in our society, organizational psychology, whose methods (like personal selection) are applied in all industrialized countries. As we know, his main task is the study of work behaviour, mainly in industrial environments, and its results have found application in the most different aspects of modern life.

The main research field is the analysis of work, not only the process going from production to distribution of a commodity, but also the conditions in which a human being works and the effects on productivity and health of the workers. It means that factors like the place to work (furniture, space distribution, contacts among workers), tools (machines and instruments), division of work (criteria for task distribution), environment (weather, but also human relations), work demands (level of complexity, required skills, concentration level, danger and risks)

and employment conditions (salary, social security) are subject of study and concern. We know too, that according to modern authors (Schein, 1980, 2004), enterprises are complex organizations functioning with a particular dynamics.

Now, we have to go back to the special working conditions of the actors of international relations mentioned above in order to enhance the possible contribution of psychology to accomplish their tasks.

An analysis of the amount of work is important, when considering productivity, but becomes essential if we think on security. In addition to the number of tasks, psychologists recognize other factors affecting the amount of work, namely, risk (what type of errors, and how many, can be made without danger?), weather conditions (especially extreme climates), concentration requirements (pauses or no pauses?) and psychological demands (emotional and cognitive factors). They are exactly the type of factors, which make the work of a diplomat or expatriate more difficult and can become a source of stressors and even of mental disorders.

In studying enterprises, there are three main subjects, namely, structure of the enterprise, management, and work atmosphere. The structure can be vertical or horizontal: the political element is here important, because democratic societies tend to be horizontal, while less democratic societies tend to be more vertical. A horizontal structure requires a more specialized personal, more motivation, and more individual responsibility, while a vertical structure means more "public officials", more "obedience", and less individual responsibility. Obviously, a structure depends on a leadership and it all determines the work atmosphere.

We can find both types of structure in foreign ministries, which are reflected in the missions abroad. Now, in the little universe of a mission, the features of the head and the work atmosphere play a very important role. Unfortunately, arbitrariness and abuses are common in the less democratic missions, while mobbing happens in some more advanced structures.

Analysis of organizations shows, that great projects are characterized by two types of forces, namely, centripetal forces assuring cohesion (*e.g.* cooperation), and centrifuge forces looking for dissolution (*e.g.* rivalries). Psychology has provided three strategies to avoid disintegration, namely, circulation of information among personal, motivation through participation in decision making and teaching modern leadership strategies. A modern organization, say psychologists, demands a decentralized functioning of small relatively independent units responsible of its own tasks, but subordinated to a by all shared clear general strategy.

An application of this knowledge to diplomatic life could ameliorate daily life and mental health of diplomats and, consequently, their work. That is the opinion of Macomber (1975, pp. 122-127), who describes the problems of human relations inside the missions abroad, stressing that many diplomatic services show following deficiencies:

1) A «paternalistic» style of some ministries and heads of mission, allowing excesses and abuses on personal.

2) Absence of mechanisms to defend the rights of employees; these do not have the possibility to exert some control on decisions, that determine their daily routine and family life, *e.g.*, working hours, amount of work and moving.

3) Absence of a clear definition on the status of wives/husbands of diplomats, who might be obliged to take part in some activities of the mission. The right to privacy is often violated, significantly increasing the levels of stress for the diplomat and his/her family.

Consequently, says Macomber, it is necessary to start a modern personal policy in the ministries of Foreign Affairs. In my opinion all these considerations apply as well for international volunteers.

Expatriates and foreign students have probably better conditions, because multinational companies and universities use to apply the most modern personal policy; but we should not forget, that like in the case of diplomats, every individual reacts differently in coping with stressors and disorders are always possible. So, it is not uncommon to find depressions by the wives of international managers and learning problems by their children.

Conclusion

I have tried to give a new perspective on the application of psychology in international relations. I have defined the international actors of the modern world, enclosing not only diplomats and politicians, but also expatriate, international volunteers, students, migrants and refugees. An analysis of their tasks and problems showed two important facts: 1) diplomats, expatriates and international volunteers have many tasks and problems in common, 2) foreign students and immigrants share with them some problems, like the "acculturation stress" 3) refugees have the usual problems emerging from their traumatic situation and, additionally, they share with the other actors many problems and 4) it is necessary to broaden the perspective of psychology in international relations, to enclose not only the traditional topics of political analysis and conflict analysis & conflict resolution (including negotiation and mediation), but others equally important, like making decisions, analysis of cultural factors, attention to population after conflicts and disasters, mental health, organization and management.

On the other hand an analysis of the practical applications of this accumulated knowledge shows that, in addition to the known methods of clinical psychology, there are already training methods to develop skills like negotiation, mediation and cultural sensitivity.

More research in this direction is evidently needed with the aim of:

1) Increase the skills for intercultural understanding, negotiation and mediation among diplomats and other actors of international relations.

2) Systematize the training of skills to take part in reconstruction tasks after conflicts and disasters.

3) Ameliorate the services offered to victims of war, terrorism and violence in general.

4) Ameliorate mental health services and working conditions for the actors of international relations.

5) Increase the possibilities of "early warning" and "early action" in international relations through political analysis.

I believe psychology can make an important contribution to these matters.

Bibliografia

Alexander, M.G., Levin, S. & Henry, P.J. (2005). Image theory, social identity and social dominance: Structural characteristics and individual motives underlying international images. *Political Psychology, v*ol. 26, issue 1, pp.27-46.

AI-Issa, I. & M. Toussignant (Eds.) (1997). *Ethnicity, immigration and psychopathology.* New York: Plenum Press.

Bennett, M.J. (1993) Towards ethnorelativism: A developmental model of intercultural sensitivity. In M. Paige (ed.) *Education for the Intercultural Experience.* Yarmouth M.E.: Intercultural Press.

Berry, J.W. & Kim, U. (1998). Acculturation and mental health. In P. Dasen, Berry, J.W. & Sartorius, N. (Eds.) *Health and Cross-Cultural Psychology: Towards Application.* London: Sage.

Boetcher Ill, W.A. (2004). The prospects for Prospect Theory: An empirical evaluation of International Relations applications of framing and loss aversion. *Political Psychology,* vol. 25*,* issue 3, pp.331-362.

Burton, J.W. (1987). *Developing deep rooted conflicts: a Handbook.* Lanham, Maryland.: University Press of America.

Brett, J.M. Culture and Negotiation (2000). *International Journal of Psychology.* Vo1.35, NO.2, pp. 97-1 04

Brewer, P.R, Steenbergen, M.R (2002). All against all: How beliefs about human nature shape Foreign Policy opinions. *Political Psychology,* vol. 23, issue 1, pp.39-58.

Cambon, J. M. (1926). *Le diplomate.* Paris: Hachette.

Camevale., P.T. & Dong-Won Choi (2000). Culture in the mediation of international disputes. *International Journal of Psychology.* vol.35, n.° 2, 2000, pp. 105-110

Castano, E., Sacchi, S. & Gries, P.H. (2003). The perception of the other in International Relations: '. Evidence of the polarizing effect of Entitativity. *Political Psychology,* vol. *20,* issue 4, pp.667-676.

Dasen, P., Berry, J.W. & Sartorius, N. (Eds.) (1998). *Health and Cross-Cultural Psychology: Towards Application.* London: Sage.

Edwards, W. 1954. The theory of decision making. *Psychological Bulletin.* 51, 380 - 417.

Einstein, Albert - Sigmund Freud (1933). *Warum Krieg? Ein Briefwechsel.* Internationales Institut für Geistige Zusammenarbeit. Paris: Volkerbund (League of Nations)

Fisher, R, & Ury W. *(1991).Getting to yes.* New York: Penguin Books USA.

Fisher, R. , Kopelman E. & Schneider, A. K. (1994). *Beyond Macchiavelli. Tools for Coping with Conflict.* Penguin Books.

Galindo, E. (in press). Psychologie et Diplornatie. In: Dorna, A. *Traite de psychologie politique contemporaine,* vol. IV. Paris: Serge Perrot editeur.

Glover, Edward (1947). *War, Sadism and Pacifism. Essays on Group Psychology and War.* S1. Leonards, NSW (Australia): George Alien and Unwin.

Gregory, R.L. (1980). *Perceptions as Hypotheses.* Philosophical transactions of the Royal Society of London, Series B, 290,181-197.

Haas, M. L.(2001). Prospect theory and the Cuban Missile Crisis. *International Studies Quarterly* 45,241 - 270.

Hertz, F. (1944). *Nationality in history and politics. A Psychology and Sociology of national sentiment and nationalism,* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.

Holtzman, W.H. & Bornemann, T.H. (eds.) (1990). *Mental health of immigrants and refugees;* Austin, TX: University of Texas.

Hudson, V.M. & Sampson, I. (1999). Culture is more than a statistic residual: Introduction to the special section on culture and Foreign Policy. *Political Psychology,* vol. 20, issue 4, pp.667-676.

Hudson, V. M. (1999). Cultural expectations of one's own and other nations' Foreign Action. *Political Psychology,* vol. 20, issue 4, pp.667-676.

Kahneman D. & Tversky, A. (1979). Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk. *Econometrica.* 47, 263-291.

Kempf, W. *et al.* (1993). *Gewaltfreie Konflikt/osungen (Conflict resolution without violence).* Heidelberg: Roland Asanger Verlag.

Kowaljow, A. (1980) *ABC der Diplomatie (ABC of Diplomacy).* Berlin: Staatsverlag der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik.

Langholtz, H.J. (1998). *Psychology of Peacekeeping.* Westport: Praeger Publishers.

Lasswell, H.D. & Leites (1968): *Language* of *Politics. Studies on Quantitative Semantics.Massachusets:* MIT Press.

Mash, E.J. & Wolfe, DA *(2002).Abnormal Child Psychology.Belmont,* CA:Wadsworth Publishing.

Macomber, W.(1975). *The Angers Game.A Handbook* of *Modern Diplomacy.New* York:Stein and Day.

Mollica, R.F. (2000). Invisible wounds. *Scientific American,* June, 282(6), pp.54-57.

Montero, M. (1997). Political psychology: A critical perspective. In: Fox, D. & Prilleltensky, I. *Political Psychology: An Introduction.* London: Sage Publications.

Mota, G. (ed.)(1999). Psicología política del Nuevo siglo: Una ventana a la ciudadania. Mexico: Sociedad Mexicana de

Edgar Galindo

Psicología y Secretaría de Educación Publica.

Neisser, U. (1967) *Cognitive Psychology.* New York: Appleton Century Crofts.

Nicolson, H. G. (1952) . *Diplomacy.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Reich, W. (1986). *Massenpsychologie des Faschismus.* Koln: Kiepenhauer U. Witsch GmbH.

Richardson, James L.(1994). *Crisis Diplomacy.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rogow, A. A. (1969). *Politics, Personality and Social Science in the* xx *Century: Essays in honor of Harold Lasswell.* University of Chicago Press.