The dominance of fear over hope in the life of individuals and collectives

MARIA JARYMOWICZ[1] AND DANIEL BAR-TAL[2]*
[1]*Institute of Social Studies, University of Warsaw, Poland*
[2]*School of Education, Tel Aviv University, Israel*

Abstract

We address the question why fear dominates hope in the life of individuals and collectives on the basis of the accumulated knowledge in the psychology, neurology and sociology of emotions. This knowledge suggests that fear, as primary emotion, is grounded in the experienced present and based on the memorized past, processed both consciously and unconsciously, causes freezing and conservatism, and sometimes leads to pre-emptive aggression. Hope, in contrast, as a secondary emotion, involves cognitive activity, which requires anticipation and the search for new ideas and thus is based on complex processes of creativity and flexibility. Therefore, hope is often preceded and inhibited by spontaneous, automatically activated and faster fear. Fear and hope can each become a collective emotional orientation, and as such organize society's views and direct its actions. Societies involved in intractable conflict are dominated by a collective fear orientation. This orientation is functional for society's coping with the stressful and demanding situation—but it may serve as a psychological obstacle to any peace process, once it starts. The case of the collective fear orientation in the Jewish Israeli society is presented as an example. The article ends with a presentation of a particular approach, suggesting that individuals and collectives can overcome their fear with much determination, and establish an orientation of hope which allows change in situations dominated by fear. Copyright © 2006 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

We propose that—
While there is fear there is mindlessness and misery
While there is hope there is rationality and progress

Psychology has provided impressive evidence that primary and secondary emotions, as well as negative and positive emotions function differently due to their different origin and neuro-psychological basis (Cacioppo & Berntson, 1994; Cacioppo & Gardner, 1999; Czapinski 1985, 1988; Damasio, 2004; Ekman & Davidson, 1994; Le Doux, 1996; Peeters & Czapinski, 1990). These fundamental differences lead often to the domination of the primary emotions over secondary ones and

*Correspondence to: Daniel Bar-Tal, School of Education, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv 69978, Israel.
E-mail: daniel@post.tau.ac.il

of negative emotions over positive ones (e.g., Ito, Larsen, Smith, & Cacioppo, 1998; Le Doux, 1996). In accordance, fear, as a primary negative emotion, is also activated spontaneously, automatically and on a low level of the nervous system (Damasio, 2003, 2004). Therefore, it tends to override secondary, more complex, positive emotion of hope, which is based on piecemeal cognitive processes originating in the cortical structures.

The differential functioning of fear and hope is well demonstrated in a situation of perceived threat. Fear, an automatic emotion based on past and present affective experiences, is processed both unconsciously and consciously, while hope is an emotion based on the cognitive activity of deliberate thinking accompanied by positive affective components (Snyder, 2000a). In view of this different nature and functioning of fear and hope, it is often observed that in stressful situations fear overrules hope, causing distress and misery to both, individuals and groups (see examples in Antonovsky, 1979; Jacoby & Keinan, 2003). For instance, we sometimes witness sick individuals, who are crippled by fear when they need to uphold hope, in order to cope better with their curable sickness. On the collective level, we observe groups in a conflict situation engulfed by fear of the enemy, when hope is needed to engage in peace negotiations which are supposed to bring an end to the violence. In extremely stressful situations, natural automatic mechanisms help people adapt successfully to the new conditions and to achieve psychological comfort (e.g., Czapinski, 1992). But these processes are more efficient in the case of a one-time event than in chronic situations, and in individual cases rather than in collective situations, because in the latter cases the mal-adaptive functioning is often maintained and reinforced by social factors of mass influence.

The objectives of this article are multileveled. On the general level, the article intends to show how theories, conceptions, and empirical findings of individual psychology can be used and applied to the analysis of macro collective situations. This analysis reflects our opinion about the desirability of including the study of societal psychological phenomena within the scope of social psychology (Bar-Tal, 2004; Bar-Tal & Saxe, 2003). On more specific level, the goal of the article is to elucidate major emotional forces that play a determinative role in the dynamics of conflicts, in general, and in intractable conflicts, in particular. These emotional forces were relatively disregarded in theories of conflict, which paid attention mostly to perceptual and cognitive factors. Although we realize that various emotions play a role in intractable conflicts, we decided to focus on fear and hope. The vast theoretical and empirical literature about fear, one of the primary and basic human emotions, allows us to pinpoint the crucial role that it plays in the dynamics of intractable conflicts. Of special importance is its detrimental function in the development of badly needed hope, a very valuable secondary emotion in positive human functioning, especially during the phase of peace process.

In this article, we will present reasoning that suggests an answer to the cardinal question of why fear dominates hope in situations of threat and danger. The responses to this research question have significant implications for the well being of the individuals and collectives and therefore it is of importance to deal with it. We will draw on recent knowledge in psychology, neurology, and sociology since such integrative analysis helps to understand complex processes involved in dominance of fear over hope (Cacioppo, Berntson, Sheridan, & McClintock, 2000). We hope that although we do not provide direct supportive empirical data to the suggested explanation, we do contribute conceptual framework, stimulate conceptual discussion and suggest line of desirable research. The present article will first describe the nature of emotions, including the different foundations of negative and positive emotions, in general, and of fear and hope, in particular, along with their consequences. This part will refer to individual psychology. The resulting conception will be applied to the collective level in an attempt to understand the basis of society's collective emotional orientation. In this analysis, we will focus on the dominance of a collective fear orientation in societies involved in intractable conflict, taking Israeli society as an example. Finally, in the section about implications, primary ideas of the mechanisms that facilitate overcoming fear will be presented.

INDIVIDUALS' FEAR AND HOPE

In order to understand the functioning of fear and hope on both the individual and collective levels, it is necessary to first describe in general their individual emotional foundations.

The Nature of Emotions

Emotions, as fundamental psycho-physiological reactions to all kinds of stimulations, play a crucial role in human functioning. In essence, human emotions constitute a multifaceted phenomenon based on unconscious and conscious, biochemical, physiological, affective, cognitive, and behavioral processes (Cacioppo & Gardner, 1999; Damasio 2003; Ekman & Davidson, 1994; LeDoux, 2002; Lewis & Haviland, 1993; Manstead, Frijda, & Fischer, 2004; Wiley, 1990). They evolved for their adaptive functions in dealing with basic external challenges (Johnson-Laird & Oatley, 1992; Mandler, 1975), as modes of relating to the changing demands of the environment (Damasio, 1994, 2003; Lazarus, 1991). However, they can also lead to mal-adaptation by eliciting dysfunctional reactions in certain situations, characterized by irrationality and destructiveness. Their major role is to decode the meaning of stimulation, either unconsciously or consciously. This decoding occurs not only through subception or perception, but is based also on learning and memory, due to which individuals respond with the same emotional reactions when they encounter the same or similar events (Bandura, 1986; Christianson, 1992; Damasio, 2003; Oatley & Jenkins, 1996).

The basic processes leading to emotional reaction are biochemical and neurological in nature (Damasio, 2004). The functioning of primary emotions is spontaneous, fast, uncontrolled, and unintentional (Ekman & Davidson, 1994; Jarymowicz, 1997; LeDoux, 1996; Zajonc, 1980). In many cases emotional reactions are unconscious and come about through automatic information processing without perception and conscious experience (Killgore & Yurgelun-Todd, 2004). Furthermore, these processes directly activate effectors leading to behavior without mediation of cognitive appraisal (Damasio, 2003). Only under certain conditions does stimulation reaches cortical structures and generates conscious feeling (Buck, 1999; Damasio, 2004).

But, conscious processes are also automatic to a large extent (Bargh, 1997). Connected with people's appraisal of their environment (Frijda, 1986; Lazarus, 1991), these processes are strongly influenced by primary emotions. Emotions serve as mediators and as data for processes of feeling, judgment, evaluation, and decision making that may then lead to particular behaviors (Averill, 1980; Carver & Scheier, 1990; Elster, 1999; Frijda, 1986). More specifically, in conscious processes, emotions automatically guide attention to particular cues and information, influence the organization of memory schemes, give differential weight to specific stored knowledge, activate relevant associative networks in memory, influence the order of cognitive processing priorities, provide interpretative frameworks to perceived situations and on this basis pull toward certain objects, situations, individuals, or groups, while abstaining from others (Bargh, Chen, & Burrows, 1996; Berridge & Winkelman, 2003; Blaney, 1986; Bower, 1992; Cacioppo & Gardner, 1999; Clore, Schwarz, & Conway, 1994; Isen, 1984; Jarymowicz, 2002a; Murphy & Zajonc, 1993; Niedenthal & Kitayama, 1994; Öhman & Wiens, 2001; Ohme & Jarymowicz, 1999, 2001; Pochwatko, 2003; Schwarz, 1990; Wyer & Srull, 1989). As indicated, only some of the human emotional processes are part of the sequence of recognition and understanding (Zajonc, 1980). Evaluations based on an appraisal process related to deliberate thinking, intellectual operations, and use of cognitive evaluative standards are relatively independent of basic primary affective mechanisms (Jarymowicz, 2001c; Piaget, 1970; Reykowski, 1989). Such evaluations are linked with secondary emotions.

The work of LeDoux (1986) on fear is especially relevant to the distinction between automatic (including both unconscious and conscious) evaluation and deliberate ones. He discovered a synaptic link between thalamus and amygdala, which demonstrated the possible independence of the affective system from the cognitive one. Thus, the emotion may not be reflected in feelings or perception and as a result may not require updating of the conscious standards of evaluation (Damasio, 2004; Zajonc, 1980).

On the basis of this discovery, LeDoux (1995, 1996) made a distinction between two possible routes along which impulses might elicit emotions. The first, low road of shorter connections between receptors and the central nervous system, links the thalamus and amygdala without cortical interference, producing primary and purely affective reactions to an external stimulus- reactions of which individuals are unaware. The second, high road links the thalamus and amygdala with the cortex, where feelings and cognitive aspects of conscious emotional reactions (of which individuals are more or less aware) are formed. Obviously it should be noted that the above description does not imply that impulses have to travel along only one of these roads. In reality, some stimuli travel along both roads at the same time as a consequence of the same stimulation. But there is evidence indicating that in this case, the process of feeling, thinking, and reacting is subordinated, at least to some extent, to the primary affective reaction evoked earlier (Liddel et al., 2005).

Emotional processes are not dominated by primary affect in two cases. First, when stimulation does not carry important meaning for the low level of regulation and the primary affective response is weak; second, when stimulation occurs and emotions arise not as a result of an external stimulation, but as a consequence of cognitive activity such as recalling, analyzing, interpreting, evaluating, planning, and so on (Jarymowicz, 2001b). Activation of an affect in the second case is possible due to projection from the cortex to the limbic system and the amygdala with minimal input of the low road stimulation and the primary affective reactions. In order to appraise the complexity of human emotional functioning, one has to consider the 'low—high' distinction between subcortical (unconscious) and cortical (potentially conscious) reactions. This distinction is basic for understanding mechanisms of primary and secondary types of regulation and emotions (Buck, 1999; Damasio, 1994; LeDoux, 1996; Pavlov, 1930) and it indicates that the functioning of secondary emotions is based on cognitive appraisal of a situation.

But there is also another important distinction: the 'left—right' one, related to the brain's two hemispheres. Neuro-biological evidence suggests a different anatomic localization of the negative and positive emotions: the former are linked mainly with the right hemisphere and the latter with the left one (e.g., Grabowska, 1999; Heller, Nitschke & Miller, 1998; Karwowska & Kobylińska, in press; Ornstein, 1997). The functions of the two hemispheres in this respect are asymmetric (Baas, Aleman, & Kahn, 2004; Morris, Öhman, & Dolan, 1999; Springer & Deutsch, 1998), and described in a way that seems to be coherent with the robust psychological findings about the so-called positive—negative asymmetry (Cacioppo & Gardner, 1999; Czapinski, 1985, 1988; Peeters & Czapinski, 1990; Peeters, 1991).

Thus, the functioning of the right hemisphere is presented in terms of intuitive and holistic modes of information processing, whereas the left hemisphere serves as a basis for specific human processes such as articulation and analytic thinking (Davidson & Fox, 1982; Grabowska, 1999; Ornstein, 1997). This differential localization seems to be consistent with psychological findings indicating that many negative emotions, of which fear is a prototypical example, tend to function in a way that is specific to the right hemisphere—that is without mediation of analytic conscious insight and appraisal (LeDoux, 1996). In contrast, the secondary, positive emotions, such as hope, are manifested with the involvement of conscious cognition (Snyder, 2000a), specific to the left hemisphere. This process includes an evaluation of the reality and future, anticipated states, sometimes based on abstract standards and ideas, which do not have a basis in past experiences.

A number of theorists (see Cacioppo & Gardner, 1999) postulate that evaluation and action are based on an input from two separate and specialized channels: one is related to negative information, and the other deal with positive information processing. The first one is threat-related, the second is appetitive. According to the model of evaluative space (Cacioppo & Berntson, 1994; Cacioppo, Gardner, & Berntson, 1997) 'the common metric governing approach/withdrawal is a single dimension at response stages, but is the consequence of two intervening metrics (i.e., evaluative channels)—the activation function of positivity and the activation function of negativity—at the inaugural affective processing stages.' (Cacioppo & Gardner, 1999, p. 201). The primary negativity–positivity dissociation may lead either to integration or to dominance of a particular type of activation. A line of research performed in the laboratory of the first author, based on the implicit priming procedure developed by Murphy and Zajonc (1993) and modified by Błaszczak (2001), showed specific effects of negative and positive affects in different situations (Jarymowicz, 2001a, 2001b; Piotrowska, 2001; Szczerbik, 2003). Also, the same line of research shows that the influence of the primary implicit, nonspecific affect is diffusive. That is, without being related to any visible stimulus on the conscious level, it has impact on the explicit judgments, self-evaluations, preferences, and automatic behavioral reactions (Jarymowicz & Błaszczak, 2000a; Pochwatko, 2003). Thus, from this and previously reported line of studies we can infer about the strength of primary emotions such as fear.

The Power of Primary Fear

Fear as a primary aversive emotion arises in situations of threat and danger to the organism (the person) and/or his/her environment (the society), and enables to respond to them adaptively (Gray, 1989; Öhman, 1993; Plutchik, 1980; Rachman, 1978). Threats and dangers, which can be detected in present situations or generalized from past experiences, can be related specifically to a particular individual (as stimulated by noise, darkness, a dog, or social rejection) or be evoked in collective situations (as for example political persecution, terror attack, or war). On the level of primary affect, fear is related to homeostasis. On the level of social emotions (Damasio, 2003), fear is a component of more complex reactions and feelings, such as panic, dread, anxiety, despair, caution, submission, guilt, shame, prudery, or cowardliness (Plutchik, 1980).

Fear constitutes combined physiologic and psychologic reactions with an objective to maximize the probability of surviving in dangerous situation. Reactions of fear may be also aroused through a conscious appraisal of the situation. But, in many cases they are activated automatically allowing unconscious processing, or dealing with danger in a routine way, regardless of intention or thinking (LeDoux, 1996). In fact it is possible to differentiate between two mechanisms of fear arousal: one via conscious appraisal and the other, primary fear, via automatic and unconscious reactions (Goleman, 1995; Oatley & Jenkins, 1996; Zajonc, 1980). The former is based on perception and evaluation of a situation as threatening and dangerous. The latter are based on either unconditioned or conditioned stimulus-reaction relations. It is important to note that the latter type can in turn be based on explicit or implicit processes of conditioning. Both types of conditioning extend the repertoire of objects, attributes and situations that indicate danger and threat and provide a basis for their further generalization. Fear thus reflects an adaptation mechanism that automatically protects homeostasis and life. At the same time it may operate irrationally and destructively because defensive reactions are not only evoked as a result of cues which directly imply threat and danger, but also by conditioned stimuli which are non-threatening in their nature (Cacioppo & Gardner, 1999; LeDoux, 1996; Mowrer, 1960; Öhman, 1993; Rachman, 1977).

In addition, as demonstrated by Grings and Dawson (1978), fear can be acquired by information received about certain objects, events, people, or situations that are supposed to threaten the person or his/her society (see Rachman, 1978). Once the information about threatening, or potentially threatening stimuli, is acquired through different modes of learning, it is stored as either implicit or explicit memory about emotional situations. Subsequently, both types of memory influence appraisal of a particular situation (Lazarus, 1991). The former type of memory is particularly resilient, exhibiting little fading with the passage of time. Furthermore, LeDoux (1996) pointed out how implicit affective memory unconsciously arouses reactions of fear in view of a particular cue. Fear is especially powerful when it is based on implicit memory. Its effect is stronger than that of explicit memory, because it arouses fear spontaneously and automatically, overcoming cognitive control, rationality, and logic. In fact, it dominates and controls thinking, because the connections from the limbic (affective system) to the cortical structures (cognitive system) are more numerous than those in the opposite direction, from the cognitive system to the emotional system (LeDoux, 1995, 1996). As a result, fear floods consciousness and leads to automatic behavior, preparing the individuals to cope with the threatening situation.

But fear may be retrieved and evoked by both types of memories (Lazarus, 1991; LeDoux, 1996). It is important to note that memories are never carbon copies of the information provided by learning. Rather they are biased, modified or reconstructed on the basis of stored and absorbed information (Smith, 1998; Wyer & Srull, 1989). All this means that fear may be evoked by a wide range of cues, many of which initially did not imply either threat or danger.

A prolonged experience of fear leads to a number of observed effects. It sensitizes the organism, and the cognitive system to certain threatening cues. It prioritizes information about potential threats and causes extension of the associative networks of information about threat. It causes overestimation of danger and threat. It facilitates the selective retrieval of information related to fear. It increases expectations of threat and dangers, and it increases accessibility of procedural knowledge that was effective in coping with threatening situation in the past (Clore, et al., 1994; Gray, 1989; Isen, 1990; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984; LeDoux, 1995, 1996; Öhman, 1993). It may also lead to repression and—as a consequence—to uncontrolled influence of unconscious affect on behavior (Czapinski, 1988).

Once fear is evoked, it limits the activation of other mechanisms of regulation, stalls consideration of various alternatives because of its egocentric and mal-adaptive patterns of reactions to situations that require creative and novel solutions for coping. The empirical evidence shows that fear has limiting effects on cognitive processing. It tends to cause adherence to known situations and avoidance of risky, uncertain, and novel ones; it tends to cause cognitive freezing, which reduces openness to new ideas, and resistance to change (Clore et al., 1994; Isen, 1990; Jost, Glaser, Kruglanski, & Sulloway, 2003; Le Doux, 1995, 1996; Öhman, 1993).

Finally, fear motivates defense and protection from events that are perceived as threatening. When defense and protection are not efficient, fear may lead to aggressive acts against the perceived source of threat (Bandura & Walters, 1959). That is, when in fear, human beings sometimes tend to cope by initiating fight, even when there is little or nothing to be achieved by doing so (Blanchard & Blanchard, 1984; Eibl-Eibesfeldt & Sutterlin, 1990; Jarymowicz, 2002b; Lazarus, 1991; Plutchik, 1990).

The Rationality of Hope

Taking Snyder's researched approach (Snyder, 2000b), we posit that hope arises when a concrete positive goal is expected (Stotland, 1969) and this even includes yearning for relief from negative conditions (Lazarus, 1991). Hope consists of the cognitive elements of visualizing and expecting, as

well as of the affective element of feeling good about the expected events or outcomes (Staats & Stassen, 1985). The affective component in the case of hope is secondary, a consequence of the cognitive elements. According to Snyder (1994, 2000a), the affective component of hope takes the form of subjective feelings based on goal-directed thinking, which combines goal-directed determination with planning to achieve this goal. Thus, the affective component is complex and may contain positive elements as well as negative ones, since individuals may realize that the achievement of their final goal may involve struggles, costs, and endurance. Therefore, in our view, hope can be metaphorically depicted as the light at the end of a dark tunnel. The implication is that the affective components, due to the operations of various cognitive components are inferred from the situation, are hierarchically ordered and are dominated overall by positive feelings.

As a complex syndrome, hope has not been associated with any specific physiological response leading to specific and concrete forms of behavior. It is based on higher cognitive processing, requiring mental representations of positively valued abstract future situations and more specifically, it requires setting goals, planning how to achieve them, use of imagery, creativity, cognitive flexibility, mental exploration of novel situations, and even risk taking (Breznitz, 1986; Clore, et al., 1994; Fromm, 1968; Isen, 1990; Lazarus, 1991; Snyder, 1994, 2000a).

Hope can be seen as a state of mind that requires development of new 'scripts': programs about future actions. According to Fromm (1968), hope requires conviction about the not yet proven, and courage to resist temptation to compromise one's view of present reality for a better future. Averill, Catlin, and Chon (1990) argued that hope: (a) should refer to an aspiration for achieving a concrete goal that has a likelihood of attainment; (b) should pertain to an aspired goal of vital interest, not a trivial one; (c) should reflect moral values, since people should not hope for socially unacceptable goals.

Since hope requires particular abilities individuals differ in their hope orientation, due to their specific personal development. Some have more of a disposition to hope than others (see Snyder et al., 1991). Review of the empirical literature indicates that individuals with high hope orientation are cognitively engaged in more positive events and in fewer negative events than individuals with low hope orientation. The former also spend more time thinking, and were found to perform better on cognitive tasks (Snyder, Sympson, Ybasco, Borders, Babyak, & Higgins, 1996). Also individuals with high hope orientation have greater problem solving ability and a rational problem solving style, use less wishful thinking, self-blame, and social withdrawal strategies in comparison to individuals with low hope orientation (Chang, 1998; Snyder, Cheavens, & Michael, 1999).

Between Fear and Hope

Fear and hope, in specific situations, usually are part of a more complex syndrome, that has both cognitive and behavioral aspects. The above analysis implies that there are major differences between the functioning of fear, as a negative primary emotion, and the functioning of hope, as a positive secondary emotion. Thus, two levels of explanation account for their differential functioning; one pertains to the differences between primary and secondary emotions and the other refers to the differences between negative and positive emotions. These two sets of differences complement each other and increase fear's possible dominance over hope.

From a biological perspective, threat leads to fear in a relatively immediate way, through processes that operate on the lower levels of the nervous system (i.e., mainly in the limbic system). In contrast, hope depends on processes based in the cortical mechanisms. On the level of psychological processes, fear can be processed unconsciously and evokes simple feelings, while hope is always based on

conscious piecemeal cognitive activity. In addition, whereas fear is activated automatically, without effort and cognitive control, hope always relies on thinking and requires various intellectual skills. On the behavioral level, fear may lead to defensive and/or aggressive behaviors, often already used in the past and based on memorized patterns of reactions, while hope requires conceiving new behaviors to achieve the desired, positively valued goal and attempts to realize it.

The above comparisons clearly explain why fear tends to dominate hope. Fear operates fast—because the lower paths (along which the stimulus travels from receptors to amygdala and from amygdala to effectors) are shorter than those of conscious cognitive processing, including the process of stimulus recognition. In comparison, the formation of hope requires a complex cognitive process, which requires time and effort. As a result, fear has a more direct influence on behavior and once activated, it has a strong effect on thinking. In general, its dominance often reduces the probability that hope will be activated.

Fear and hope originate in different places and generate different dispositions. Whereas the necessary condition for fear is perception of threat (or activation of memorized past threat), hope is based on ability to imagine a not yet existing reality and on anticipation of future goals, as well as on intellectual capacity to construct a program of action. Therefore, we suggest that there may be more individual difference with regard to hope than to fear orientation. The latter emotion has a universal and phylogenetic basis grounded in primary affect that operates regardless of personal will, while the former emotion depends on the individual's cognitive skills and activity, which have a volitional basis.

Thus, as determinants of behavior, fear and hope are asymmetrical. As noted by Cacioppo and Gardner:

> Exploratory behavior can provide useful information about an organism's environment, but exploration can also place an organism in proximity to hostile stimuli. Because it is more difficult to reverse the consequences of an injurious or fatal assault than those of an opportunity unpursued, the process of natural selection may also have resulted in the propensity to react more strongly to negative than to positive stimuli (1999, p. 205).

In sum, fear is an evolutionary safeguard to ensure survival in view of potential threats and dangers. It is a component of a fundamental survival mechanism. But at the same time, because of classical conditioning or due to the irrational thinking evoked by fear, it often has extremely mal-adaptive consequences. From a logical point of view, in some situations of danger, hope has important advantages over fear because it constitutes a rational way of coping. In view of the above, an important task of thinking how it is possible to overcome irrational domination of fear by hope should be undertaken. Such overcoming may prevent individual and communal suffering, and therefore is a complex and challenging task. Indeed we witness cases when rational thinking vanquishes fear and psychology provides empirical evidence of this victory. We will deal with the above question in the final part of this article.

FEAR AND HOPE IN COLLECTIVES

Emotions can be shared and thus evoked more or less simultaneously in group members. We assume that like individuals, who may be characterized by a dominant emotion, societies too may develop a collective emotional orientation. The idea that a society, or specifically society's culture, shapes individuals' emotions is not a new one (see for example, Averill, 1980; Gordon, 1990; Harre, 1986; Kitayama & Markus, 1994; Lazarus, 1991; Mackie & Smith, 2002; Mesquita & Frijda, 1992; Smith, 1999). This process occurs as a result of particular common experiences, socialization, and conditions in a society, which include exposure to common information, discourses, symbols, models, epistemic

authorities, emphases, values, norms, narratives, beliefs, attitudes, influences, and learning. These factors affect the appearance of a particular emotion that then takes the form of a collective emotional orientation (Rime & Christophe, 1997; Stephan & Stephan, 2000). de Rivera (1992) differentiated among emotional atmosphere, climate, and culture. Emotional atmosphere refers to collective emotional reaction that a collective may manifest as a result of experiencing a particular event. Emotional climate characterizes a collective when an emotional durable orientation is related to underlying social structure and political programs. Finally, emotional culture is dynamically stable, as it is upheld by socialization practices, which change only when new generations transforms its cultural practices. Our conception of emotional collective orientation emphasizes the prolonged experiences that society members go through and which evoke an emotion. In addition, we emphasize the political, societal, cultural, and educational channels of communication and institutions which maintain the emotion. We believe that change of the experiences, as well as maintaining mechanisms, may change the emotional collective emotion.

Of special interest for advancing our reasoning about collective fear and hope is the work of Smith and his colleagues (Devos, Silver, Mackie, & Smith, 2002; Smith, 1993, 1999), which capitalized on the theorizing of Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Recher, and Wetherell (1987) about evolvement of group behaviors within the framework of their self-categorization theory. Smith and his colleagues proposed a theory of intergroup emotions on the basis of group members' feelings of social identity. According to the theory, individuals may interpret specific events or conditions as group members (i.e., when social identity is salient) and as a result may experience particular emotion that is derived from the situation, even if they did not attend the situation personally. That is, 'when appraisals occur on a group basis, emotions are experienced on behalf of the ingroup' (Devos et al., 2002, p. 113). Furthermore, the emotional reactions that follows from the cognitive appraisal of the situation is proposed to play an important role in shaping intergroup behaviors. An impressive line of research supports various hypotheses derived from the above described theory (see reviews of Devos et al., 2002; Yzerbyt, Dumont, Gordijn, & Wigboldus, 2002). All these studies show that people experience differential emotions on the basis of the situation confronted by their own group as a whole and/or other ingroup members.

Our assumption is that it is possible to extrapolate from accumulated knowledge on the individual's emotional functioning to collective functioning on societal level in situations of intractable conflicts. This latter assumption is based on the fact that although in the macro societal analysis the focus is on socially shared emotions, it is individuals who experience these emotions. However, the shared emotional orientation of society members does not amount to a mere addition of individual emotions, but indicates unique qualities of the society as a whole with serious social implications. Macro-social conditions allow the operation of various factors of social influence which are absent in the individual cases. Thus, the analysis of a collective emotional orientation cannot be limited to an understanding at the individual level.

The Foundations of Collective Emotional Orientation

A collective emotional orientation, based on shared sense of social identity, may have a number of origins. It can originate in the common direct and personal experience of society members as for example occurs in situations of war, conflict, natural disaster, or economic depression when society members experience threat and danger. In addition, without having personal experience, as indicated, society members may receive information that can trigger a collective emotional orientation. Of crucial importance to our analysis is the process of dissemination as underlying the formation of the collective emotional orientation. Dissemination occurs via biological, psychological and social processes, on both unconscious and on conscious levels.

On the unconscious level, an emotion may be transmitted via affective 'contagion' and behavioral imitation. These processes appear especially with all the primary emotions like fear, because they have clear expressive manifestations (Ekman, 1992, 1993) and defined patterns of behavior (for example, withdrawal and escape in the case of fear—see Plutchik, 1980). On this level, dissemination is an automatic and spontaneous emotional process, which does not resort to higher mental processes. The affective signals are generated by one person and assimilated by other individuals through unconscious interaction processes (e.g., Chen & Bargh 1997; Ohme, 2003). This may occur not only during interpersonal interactions, but also when many individuals come together. In addition, an emotional behavior may be unconsciously disseminated when society members who are in contact imitate emotional reactions. In this case, automatic behavioral processes are connected with basic processes of human learning that lead to habitual consequences (Bandura, 1977; Bandura & Walters, 1963; Bargh, 1994, 1997). It is well observed that in crowded places individuals tend to imitate each others' behavior, which then extends to become mass behavior (LeBon, 1947; Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987). Moreover, unconscious emotional dissemination, beyond direct interpersonal contact, may also occur via channels of mass communication as a result of widely publicized information and emotional expressions of its transmitters (see Rachman, 1978).

On the conscious level of cognitive processes, emotion can be disseminated in two ways. First, beliefs, which carry emotional meaning, as for example labels, slogans stereotypes, or myths, can be absorbed automatically, without deliberation. Second, the same beliefs can be absorbed via piecemeal cognitive processes of consideration, analysis and appraisal. In the former case emotion is evoked automatically on the basis of the association between cognition and affect (for instance, when hearing the words 'terror attack', or upon witnessing a peace agreement ceremony). In the latter case, emotion is an outcome of conscious processes and inference (as could be in the case of a threatening statement by the outgroup leader, or in the face of negotiations with an enemy), as well as of societal discourse, in which there is exchange of information and knowledge.

Processing information about the current situation is by no means the only cognitive input in the creation of emotional collective orientation; it is also based on various societal beliefs propagated in the society and especially beliefs related to collective memory and ethos. Such information is transmitted via mass media, educational, cultural, and social channels of communication, including various eprieistemic authorities such as leaders, parents, teachers, or priests.

When beliefs and reaction patterns are disseminated and widely shared, they constitute a major influence on the emotional functioning of society members. First of all, they evoke the particular emotion(s), then they supply the criteria and sensitivity necessary for the selection of information which, in turn, evokes emotion; they affect the interpretation and evaluation of situations in terms of particular emotions; signal what emotions are appropriate in general and especially in particular situations; direct how these emotions should be expressed and guide the behaviors performed in reaction to the emotions (Armon-Jones, 1986; Hochschild, 1983; Wallbott & Scherer, 1986; Zajonc, 1998).

Once a collective emotional orientation develops, it may become characteristic of a society or culture, it will be maintained by societal beliefs, and it may even become part of the society's ethos (Bar-Tal, 2000). Markus and Kitayama pointed out that:

> . . . every cultural group has some key ideas that have been traditionally and collectively held in place and that are used to select and organize their own socio-psychological processes. These *core cultural ideas* can influence the nature of the group's habitual emotional tendencies through constraining and affording particular, relatively culture-specific sets of immediate and everyday life realities, in which members of the cultural group are socialized or 'trained' to think, act, and feel in a more or less adaptive fashion (1994, pp. 341, 343).

Society members share central beliefs (see Bar-Tal, 2000) that provide the prism through which they view their world and relate to it. This prism not only organizes society's outlook or directs intentional forms of action, it also determines collective emotional orientation. A society may be characterized by sensitization to, evaluation and expression of a particular emotion. This shared emotion, thus reflects norms, values and expectations of the society (Smith-Lovin, 1990). Also, society members are socialized to acquire the socially approved emotional orientation from an early age. They learn what cues to attend in order to feel a particular emotion, how to appraise these cues, how to express the emotion, and how to behave in accordance with it (Averill, 1980; Lewis & Saarni, 1985; Saarni & Harris, 1989). This learning is also done, beyond the family setting, via political, educational and cultural mechanisms. For example, Paez and Vergara (1995) found differences in fear feelings among Mexican, Chileans, Belgians and Basque Spaniards. The Chileans were found to be characterized by the highest fear while the Mexicans by the lowest.

The salience of a particular emotion in a particular society does not necessarily imply that this society is characterized by the associated collective emotional orientation. Bar-Tal (2001) proposed the following criteria for identifying collective emotional orientation:

1. Society members widely experience the emotion.
2. The emotion appears frequently in the society's public discourse: it is expressed and discussed often in public debates by societal channels of communication.
3. The beliefs that evoke the particular emotion are widely shared by society members and are expressed by society's communication channels. Beliefs that imply potential threats and dangers and trigger fear can serve as an example.
4. Cultural products, such as books, films, or theatre plays, express the particular emotion and the beliefs that trigger it.
5. The educational system, through school textbooks, ceremonies, and teachers, transmit beliefs that reflect and evoke the particular emotion.
6. The emotion and the beliefs that evoke it are embedded in the society's memory.
7. Beliefs evoking the particular emotion play a role in decision making by society's institutions and influence policy or courses of action.

THE DOMINANCE OF COLLECTIVE FEAR ORIENTATION IN SOCIETIES INVOLVED IN INTRACTABLE CONFLICT

We assume that groups can be characterized by collective emotional orientations of fear and hope. For example, Bellah (1967) proposed that hope characterizes American society. In his view it is a central ingredient in what he called the 'civil religion' of the United States. But of special importance are groups dominated by fear because of its detrimental effect on the society. Corradi, Fagen, and Garreton (1992), for example, analyzed the formation of the collective emotional orientation of fear in four South American societies in the 1970s: Argentina, Brazil, Chile and Uruguay. In these cases, the collective emotional orientation of fear developed in reaction to certain threatening societal conditions: Members of these four societies were subjected to systematic and consistent terror, and as a result, they perceived the political system as the source of life-threatening dangers. This perception was shared by a substantial segment in each society, resulting in a 'fear culture,' as the researchers called it.

Recently, the event of terror attacks in United States on September 11, 2001 demonstrated the emergence of collective fear orientation. The situation of unexpected loss of lives and destruction,

together with uncertainty and potential additional attacks caused to evolvement of large scope fear that characterized collectives (e.g., Huddy, Khatid, & Capelos, 2002; Skitka, Bauman, Mullen, 2004). Similarly, Bar-Tal, (2004) reported that the eruption of the Al Aqsa Intifada which included numerous terror attacks and especially suicidal bombing in public places caused to the appearance of collective fear orientation in the Israeli Jewish society.

We will discuss intractable conflict as a situation that elicits chronic collective fear orientation and in doing so we will focus on Israeli society which is involved in the Arab-Israeli conflict. This analysis can serve to illustrate what happens when collectives are dominated by a fear orientation. We assume that this is typical orientantion of societies involved in intractable conflict, as such situations are usually characterized by threat and danger to society members and to society as a whole (Bar-Tal, 2005). Intractable conflicts involve physical violence in which soldiers and civilians are killed and wounded, civil property is destroyed, refugees suffer and often atrocities are carried out; such conflicts are perceived as irreconcilable, since attempts to resolve them fail; vast military, economic, and psychological investments in their continuation are made; they are perceived as being of zero sum nature; and since they involve existential and basic needs or values, they preoccupy society members continuously (Bar-Tal, 1998, 2005; Kriesberg, 1993). Of special importance is the fact that intractable conflicts cannot be won by one of the sides and therefore last for many decades, in spite of the fact that there are society members who believe that they can win by means of violence. This 'hope' is unrealistic, as time shows.

The prolonged experience of violence affects the personal life of society members and marks their behavior. We realize that the conditions and the experiences of intractable conflicts evoke a number of negative emotional collective orientations such as fear, anger, or hatred (see for example, Bar-Tal, 2005; Baumeister, & Butz, 2005; Petersen, 2002; White, 1984), but we want to focus in this article on fear only, as a representative of negative emotions, because of its basic effects on the well being of society members and the broad knowledge that was accumulated about its functioning. Analyses of real conflicts provide unequivocal strong evidence for the emergence of fear in conflict situations (Brubaker & Laitin, 1998; Horowitz, 2001; Kelman & Fisher, 2003; Lake & Rothchild, 1996, 1998). In such stressful situations, society members tend to process information selectively, focusing on the evil and mal-intentional acts of the adversary, which are threatening and full of dangers. These experiences become embedded in the collective memory, get incorporated into cultural products and then are disseminated via society's channels of communication (Bar-Tal, 2003; Paez, Basabe, & Gonazales, 1997; Ross, 1995). Eventually, they serve as a fertile ground for the formation of the collective fear orientation (Bar-Tal, 2005).

In addition to the dissemination of beliefs and projection of dangers, fear, in situations of intractable conflict, also spreads via social contagion as group members empathetically absorb the fearful reaction of their co-patriots. Finally, we may assume that fear is also disseminated through behavioral patterns, as group members influence each other via modeling and imitation in various public situations. In sum, fear in situations of intractable conflict relates to concrete threats and dangers such as the possibility of losing one's life, being injured, losing property, becoming a refugee, having severe economic hardship, and so on. It is evoked and disseminated in collectives relatively easily, fast, and mostly automatically.

Of course, the formation of a collective fear orientation in cases of intractable conflict is inevitable due to the impact of real threats, dangers, and other negative emotional information on the human mind. Accumulated evidence in psychology shows that negative events and information are well attended and remembered and that they have determinative influence on evaluation, judgment and action tendencies (see reviews by Cacioppo & Bernstson, 1994; Christianson, 1992; Peeters & Czapinski, 1990; Rozin & Royzman, 2001 and studies by Lau, 1982; Pratto & John, 1991; Wagenaar & Groeneweg, 1990). This negativity bias is an inherent characteristic of the negative motivational system, which operates automatically at the evaluative-categorization stage. The negative motivational

system is structured to respond more intensely than the positive motivational system to comparable levels of motivational activation. This tendency reflects adaptive behavior, since negative information, especially related to threats, may require an immediate defensive reaction.

A collective fear orientation cuts deeply into the psychic fabric of society members and becomes linked with a social ethos of conflict. The collective fear orientation becomes embedded in the societal ethos simply because fear is basically functional and adaptive. Fear prepares society members for better coping with the stressful situation on the very primary level (Collins, 1975; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). This preparation is achieved in a number of ways: (a) it mobilizes constant readiness for potential dangers against unwished surprises; (b) it directs attention and sensitizes society to cues that signal danger and to information that implies threat; (c) it increases affiliation, solidarity, and cohesiveness among society members in view of the threat to individuals and to society at large; and (d) it mobilizes society members to act on behalf of the society, to cope with the threat, to act against the enemy and defend the country and society.

But in addition to the above noted functions of the collective fear orientation, there are also other consequences. It may lead to a collective freezing of beliefs. A society in intractable conflict tends to stick to certain beliefs about the causes of threat, about the conflict, about the adversary and about ways of coping with the dangers. It has difficulty to entertain alternative ideas, solutions or courses of actions. As Maslow (1963) noted 'all those psychological and social factors that increase fear cut impulse to know' (p. 124). This line of behaviors in the context of threat was also demonstrated in experimental social psychological research (e.g., Corneille, Yzerbyt, Rogier, & Boudin, 2001; Mackie, Devos, & Smith, 2000; Rothgerber, 1997)

Furthermore, the collective fear orientation tends to limit society members' perspective by binding the present to past experiences related to the conflict, and by building expectations for the future exclusively on the basis of the past. This seriously hinders the disassociation from the past needed to allow creative thinking about new alternatives that may resolve the conflict peacefully. A society over-sensitized by fear tends to misinterpret cues and information as signs of threat and danger, searching for the smallest indication in this direction, even in situations that signal good intentions. The fear also causes great mistrust and delegitimization of the adversary (Bar-Tal, 2004). In addition, line of political research showed that fear leads people to increased ethnocentrism and intolerance towards outgroups (Feldman & Stenner, 1997; Marcus, Sullivan, Theiss-Morse, & Wood, 1995). Finally, the collective fear orientation is a major cause of violence. A society in fear tends to fight when it copes with threatening conditions. Fight is a habituated course of action, based on past experience, and thus, again a society fixates on coping with threat in a conflictive way, without trying new avenues of behavior that can break the cycle of violence (see Brubaker & Laitin, 1998; Lake & Rothchild, 1998; Petersen, 2002).

In sum, the presented analysis suggests that a society in intractable conflict tends to develop a collective fear orientation as a result of threatening experiences of violence. It is a functional development, as fear in times of dangers and threat facilitates appearance of behaviors that enable coping with the situation. At the same time, the collective fear orientation feeds the continuation of the intractable conflict, creating a vicious cycle of fear, freezing, and violence. This feeding is powerful because the collective orientation of fear is not only maintained by the experiences of society members, but is usually also reinforced by society's channels of communication and its institutions.

When the rivaling societies embark on the road of peace, the collective fear orientation plays a hindering role in this process. Being deeply entrenched in the psyche of society members, as well as in the culture, it inhibits the evolvement of the hope for peace by spontaneously and automatically flooding the consciousness. Society members then have difficulty freeing themselves from the domination of fear to construct hope for peace. Hope for peace includes yearning for relief from the terrible situation of intractable conflict and expecting achievement of conflict resolution. It is based

on realistic and concrete goals and directed thinking with pragmatic ways how to achieve it. It liberates people from their fixating beliefs about the irreconcilability of the conflict to find creative ways to resolve it. It enables to imagine a future that is different from the past and present and motivates society members to change their situation by acts that were unthinkable for a long time, such as for example to negotiate with the enemy, make compromises, see the enemies as human beings who are also victims of the conflict, and so on. Without hope for peace it is impossible to embark successfully on the road to peace. Hope has to override pre-dominant fear.

Fear and Hope in Israel Society

The violent confrontations in the Middle East, in Northern Ireland, in Kashmir and the Balkans are all instances of intractable conflict. In all of these cases fear has been identified as an important motivating force, both in their severe violence and in the continuous resistance to their resolution (see for example, Heskin, 1980; Volkan, 1997; White, 1996).

Bar-Tal (2001) analyzed the case of collective orientation of fear in the context of Israeli society. He suggested that collective fear orientation and insecurity have been dominant forces in the psyche of Israeli society, playing a determinative role in policy making, decision making and in the actions taken by the Israeli government (Aronson, 1978; Bar-Tal, Jacobson, & Klieman, 1998; Brecher, 1975; Rabinovich, 1998, Yaniv, 1987; Zafran & Bar-Tal, 2003).

In support of this claim, Bar-Tal (2001) described Israeli collective memory, which focuses on the traumatic, fear-inspiring experiences of Jews throughout their history, especially on the Holocaust, on Arab anti-Israeli rhetoric and violent actions in the context of the Arab-Israeli conflict. In addition he presented examples from literature, school textbooks, and the press which reflect and disseminate beliefs perpetuating collective fear orientation. Finally he reported attitudes and beliefs of the Israeli public that express the domination of fear orientation.

The analysis found a collective emotional orientation of fear during the years of intractable conflict (e.g., Bar-On, 1995; Shalit, 1994). But when the Israeli society embarked on a peace process this emotional orientation has become a major psychological obstacle to peace making. With the Egyptian-Israeli peace treaty signed in 1979, the intractable nature of the Arab-Israeli conflict began to change. The long road toward peace started, including different agreements such as the Oslo agreement with the PLO in 1993 and the Peace Treaty with Jordan in 1994. But the collective fear orientation has served as a stumbling block to progress of the peace process and the present violence between Israelis and Palestinian further feeds it (Bar-Tal & Sharvit, in press). Israeli society has great difficulty in developing an emotional orientation of hope. Such development would imply the formation of new goals of living in peaceful coexistence and cooperation with yesterday's enemy. It also requires selecting new ways to achieve these goals by means of negotiation, mediation, compromise, concession, sensitivity to the other party's needs, and reciprocity. But the dangers and threats are still very much alive for Israeli society, as hostile and aggressive acts continue on both sides. In such a reality, when collective experiences and memories of intractable conflict are salient and other collective memories elicit fear (as for example the Holocaust), the collective fear orientation continues to have a powerful hold on the psyche of Israeli society.

Studies by Zafran and Bar-Tal (2002) are unique as they investigated antecedents and effects of collective fear and hope. The results showed that so-called hawks, who object to the compromises required by the peace process due to mistrust of Arabs, are characterized by a higher collective fear orientation than doves, who support the compromises required by the peace process and are ready to try peaceful relations with the Arabs. The former are more fearful regarding the fate of the Jewish

people and Israel than the latter. They also are more preoccupied than doves with collective memories implying fear and less preoccupied with collective memories implying hope. In contrast, doves are characterized more by collective hope orientation than hawks. That is, they express more positive feelings regarding various peaceful goals for the future that indicate resolution of the Arab-Israeli conflict. Also, the study found that preoccupation with collective memory is an important predictor of fear and hope orientations independent of the political orientation. High preoccupation with collective memory implying threat and fear leads to high collective fear orientation, while low preoccupation leads to high collective hope orientation. Finally, the study showed that doves and hawks have different ways of processing information drawn from collective memory implying fear and hope and learn different lessons. Specifically, it found that hawks reported that events in Jewish history related to fear (such as pogroms of Jews, Holocaust, Israeli-Arab wars, or Arab terror) influenced their personal life more than it did for doves. In contrast, doves reported that events in Jewish history associated with hope (such as peace making with Egypt or Jordan) had affected their personal life more than did hawks. In addition, hawks thought that events in Jewish history related to fear should affect the decisions of the Israeli government more than did doves. In contrast, doves thought more than hawks that events representing hope should have more impact on the decision of the Israeli government.

IMPLICATION: OVERCOMING FEAR

The presented analysis suggested that although fear functions as an important adaptive mechanism it also may play a detrimental role in various individual and collective situations, especially when hope is needed for changing a situation that causes misery.

Fear often dominates hope. We tried to answer the question why and how this happens, by using accumulated interdisciplinary knowledge. The next question then should be about the possibility of overcoming fear. This is an important problem that requires a serious consideration of knowledge accumulated in psychology. Clinical psychology, dealing with pathological fears, has long since been challenged with this question (e.g., Barlow, 1988; Marks, 1987; Meichenbaum & Cameron, 1974). But we are more interested in an answer that pertains to non-pathological functioning on both the individual and collective levels. In this last part of the article we will briefly sketch a number of ideas we have about mechanisms that overcome fear. Hopefully we shall be able to further elaborate them in the near future. At present our objective is to provide ideas that can stimulate intellectual debates and lines of research. There is a great need for studies that investigate collective fear and hope in societies engulfed by intractable conflict and especially ways of how hope can overcome fear.

The psychology of hope refers to higher mental processes involving anticipation, creative imagination, setting goals, planning and consideration of alternatives—all of which require openness and flexibility, as well as tolerance of uncertainty, which is especially difficult to achieve in a situation of fear. These processes rely on the reflective activities of thinking and evaluation. They have to overcome the automatic emergence of fear, which is an evolutionary system that generates time and energy saving reactions, as a natural preference to maximize outcome with minimum effort. Individuals therefore often act automatically and involuntarily by natural preference, even when the results may be detrimental. Thus, in order to construct a strong basis for hope, human beings must develop skills and abilities of reflexive deliberation and motivational mechanisms for this type of functioning.

A fundamental difficulty in the above described challenge resides in the fact that fear and hope are two 'response channels' that belong to biologically and psychologically different regulatory systems. Thus, while, as argued, fear impedes the emergence of hope, the reduction of fear does not imply an

appearance of hope. Hope orientation can be induced only as a function of particular dispositions and ego-involvement.

Different lines of studies in psychology provide some answers to the question about overcoming automatic reactions (Bargh, 2001). They are related to the basic distinction between two personality systems of regulation: experiential and rational (Epstein, 1991, 1994; Epstein, Pacinin, & Denes-Raj, 1996). Accumulated knowledge can serve as a base for understanding the development of the abilities, skills and motives underlying the evolvement of hope. For example, the development of critical thinking (as 'reasonable and reflective thinking concerned with what to do or believe'—Norris & Ennis, 1989, p. 3) offers one direction. Another direction is implied by the study of adaptation to conflict situations which requires learning to manage interpersonal conflicts (Shantz & Hartup, 1992). The immense literature about the development of morality can also provide suggestions as to how develop foundations for reflective thinking as a basis for evaluative processes (see for example, Berbeau, Rest, & Narvaez, 1999; Kohlberg, 1984; Rest, 1986; Weinreich-Haste, & Locke, 1983). It suggests that reasonable solutions in stressful situation require rather intellectual capacities than emotional involvement. All these works, well known in psychological circles, contribute to the answer to the above question. We decided to focus on a less known approach, developed by Polish psychologists (Czapinski, 1985, 1988; Golab, 1978; Jarymowicz, 2001c; Jarymowicz & Kobylinska, in press; Reykowski, 1989; Rutkowska, 2003; Trzebinska, 1998; Wojciszke, 1988).

According to this approach, reflective evaluation, as a basis for the evolvement of hope, has to be founded on articulated cognitive standards (Golab, 1978; Golab & Reykowski, 1985; Reykowski, 1989) derived from abstract concepts of right and wrong, generated by intellectual operations (Jarymowicz, 2001b). These concepts are necessary for understanding and differentiating between what is good and bad, since there is a fundamental difference between 'to feel what is pleasant or unpleasant' and 'to understand what is right and wrong.' The former differentiation is based on affective preference, while the latter requires different abilities—and among them abilities of moral reasoning (Kohlberg, 1984), which are preceded by the development of intellectual skills (Piaget, 1970).

In other words, we distinguish between two systems generating evaluation and motivation: (1) a primary, non-verbal system, which is based on spontaneous, automatic affective reactions, and (2) a reflective system, which is based on intentional intellectual operations and articulated standards (see Reykowski, 1989; Jarymowicz, 2001b,c). There are reasons to assume that each of the systems has a different neurophysiological basis: whereas the former is connected mainly with subcortical and right-hemisphere processes, the latter needs mainly prefrontal left hemisphere processes. The latter system allows constructing large-scale evaluative dimensions, which are necessary for relative evaluations, to maintain a certain detachment from self (own characteristics, states and emotions) and to take the perspective of others.

The reflective system, in contrast to the affective system, enables to evaluate one's own situation in comparison with that of others, or with abstract personal standards. These evaluative standards and dimensions facilitate an alternative perception of the stressful situations caused by fear. Individuals who use them become sensitive not only to signals of threat, but also to the complexity of the situation and to the different perspectives that are involved in it. For instance, in the case of interpersonal conflict, such a person is more likely to perceive not only the violence of the other, but also his or her own aggressiveness and thus to realize that an escalation of reciprocal aggression is useless. This perception may facilitate initiating negotiation with the rival in order to resolve the conflict.

Moreover, the evaluative standards can serve as general principles of evaluation that are used inclusively in the judgment of the ingroup as well as of outgroups. This process occurs when intellectual capacities enable the construction of the concept 'We' as an abstract category (for example 'We – optimists,' or 'We – people,' Jarymowicz, 1994). This leads to the extension of the social

categories and inclusion of the outgroup members in the common 'We' category that make an important difference from the motivational point of view.

Evaluative standards guide behavior, only if they are based on evaluative concepts related to social ideals. As they are internalized, these ideals become a source of motivation. Reality is compared with values and discrepancy leads to motivational tension. In addition, with their intellectual and moral roots, the evaluative standards and dimensions are heuristics that guide social life in situations of uncertainty, when a person searches to anchor her or his own behavior. These heuristics, however, consist only of general prescriptions (for example, be a good person, have peace, or have democracy). In order to guide behavior, a person has to connect mental principles with their concrete manifestations.

The direction of the evaluative standards' influence depends on the personal and/or collective interpretation of these prescriptions (for example, what does it mean—'to be a good person' or 'to have peace'). It is important that these definitions be specific, complex, and inclusive. Only then can they lead to the reflective thinking that is required for hoping. In encountering a situation of fear, a person able of reflection will be capable of evaluation it, judge its functionality and, if needed, to establish hopeful new and creative goals to overcome the threat.

The above described conception identifies particular personal capacities and motivations that are needed for overcoming fear. This is only the first step in the analysis of the conditions that allow overcoming fear. The next step is to specify how to foster the development of these personal capacities and motives through education and socialization. This task is beyond the scope of the present contribution. But one of our goals is to apply the accumulated knowledge in individual psychology about fear and hope to the analysis of societal processes in intractable conflicts. This is a major challenge for social psychology, if it strives to be relevant to real life, as was envisioned by its founding fathers.

Overcoming fear in collectives is an even more complicated challenge than overcoming it in the individual case. On the basis of the discussed example of intractable conflict we may assume that in societies that embark on the road of peace, fear orientation plays an inhibitory role. It overflows conscious, rational thinking, reactivates stored beliefs, and ideas about past threats and dangers, and triggers habituated courses of action. The result is mistrust, reliance on past assumptions and conceptions, and adherence to the ethos of conflict, which feeds the continuation of the conflict. Societies involved in intractable conflict, like Israeli society, know how to cope with violent conflict, with threats and dangers, but feel insecure in the new situation of peace making. In this new situation, and often even while the intractable conflict is still going on, the conflictive-aggressive strategies do not reduce insecurity, as security is best achieved in a state of peace. But peace-making strategy requires the construction of hope, which demands new solutions to the new situation. This is a real challenge for a society that embarks on the road of peace. Society members have difficulty in overcoming their fear and thus cannot even think about new goals, new planning, new means (all of which project uncertainty, ambiguity and require risk taking).

The construction of a strong hope orientation on the collective level thus requires a number of steps which are aimed to overcome the fear orientation. In line with the above analysis, what is required is the formation of a value system that feeds higher mental activity and forms the motivation to engage in such activity. First of all societies involved in a peace process have to construct a well-justified ideology of peace. This includes the presentation of peace as a supreme value and goal, the formation of beliefs that provide a clear and strong rationale for this goal, the outlining of realistic ways and means how to achieve it, and of the required compromises (which meet the minimal requirements of the rival). These beliefs should be specific and concrete, also stipulating the costs and sacrifices for achieving peace and not only the expected rewards and gains. The road to peace has to take into consideration dangers, coming for instance, from rejectionist groups that may resort to various means, including violence, to try and stop the peace process.

In order to reinforce the ideology of peace a set of different beliefs is necessary. This pertains to the personalization and legitimization of the enemy after years of delegitimization. These new beliefs present the former enemy as a human being with whom it is possible to make peace. Through legitimization members of the adversary group come to be seen as humans after years of denial. It allows viewing the opponent as belonging in a the category of acceptable groups (i.e., 'We are all human beings'), with whom peaceful relations are desirable and who have legitimate needs and goals. Personalization enables to see members of the rival group as human individuals, who have their personal lives and needs and who can be trusted. As a result of these changes the other group can then be thought of as a victim of the conflict as well, since its members also suffered in its course (Bar-Tal & Teichman, 2005; Kelman, 1987). The new beliefs require the reduction of egocentrism, ethnocentrism and xenophobia, as they make place for a perspective that includes the other, a new sensitivity to the other's needs and, correspondingly, a critical perspective, on the own group.

An important condition for developing these new beliefs is the formation of a new outlook on the past, that is, a revision of the collective memory that fed the fear orientation during the conflict. This requires an exposure to hitherto suppressed aspects of the past of the own group, which often consist of the own contribution to the outbreak of the conflict and its continuation and own misdeeds. At the same time, there is a new exposure to the previously unheard past of the other group. This requires faithfulness to agreed facts and the omission of myths and unfounded stories. Eventually the new set of beliefs allows the evolvement of a new collective memory that is compatible with the peace making process (see Bar-Tal & Bennink, 2004; Salomon, 2004).

These new beliefs can form a basis for the ethos of peace which must substitute the ethos of conflict if the peace process is to succeed. This long and difficult process of social change begins usually with a transformed minority that tries to influence a majority. Later leaders may join this process trying to initiate conflict resolution but they have to persuade their society members in the necessity of peace. This process must get support from the elites and institutions of the society and eventually must be shared by at least a substantial portion of society (see for example, Bar-On, in press; Bar-Siman-Tov, 2004; Knox & Quirk, 2000; Weiner, 1998). Of special importance is the role of mass media and other societal channels of communication and institutions that can first buttress the formation of hope orientation, and next transmit and disseminate the new system of beliefs among the society members. This system of beliefs (providing the goals, plans, information, images, considerations, arguments, and justifications for constructing hope for peace) should be repeatedly presented in order for them to be well comprehended and internalized. They eventually should form a new prism for understanding the reality and processing new information.

The evolvement of the new cognitive system leads to a new type of emotion. But in order for this to endure it must be reinforced by current affective experiences. That is, hope orientation should be (a) boosted by the positive experiences that a peace process brings and (b) omission of experiences which feed into fear. The former provide gains and rewards of peace to the society members, for example economic growth, investment, improvement in personal economic situation. The latter provide security, tranquility, and safety as a result of the cessation of violence. These new experiences create the positive affect that becomes associated with the peace process.

We realize that the evolvement of hope is a very difficult undertaking. Although during the peace process the conflict may stop being intractable, it still continues to exist and still has violent expressions such as terror attacks on civilians, military encounters, aggressive rhetoric, or agitation. Such dangers and threats are still very much alive for the Israeli and the Palestinian societies, as they are also, for instance, for Protestants and Catholics in Northern Ireland. Hostile and aggressive acts do not stop at once, but usually continue for years, with a downward slope. And even when an orientation of hope evolves, the roots of fear are not eliminated. The collective memories associated with fear are well organized in the memory system and are automatically activated when threats, real or symbolic,

are perceived. Thus, the orientation for hope needs not only to inhibit the automatic activation of memories associated with fear, but also to replace these memories with new beliefs and behaviors. These new beliefs must be attended, comprehended, accepted, learned and practiced, before they can serve as an alternative to the automatically activated fears. When signs of conflict still occur, this is a challenging task. In such a situation the reaction of leaders and the media to the threatening cues is crucial. When they frame the events in support of the fear orientation, then hope has very low chances to evolve. But, when in contrast, the leaders and media on both sides explicitly condemn the acts and their perpetrators, when they minimize their importance, reassure the public, and repeat their commitment to peace goals, then the chances are high that the hope orientation will survive and gain momentum.

In sum, we believe that individuals and collectives are not condemned to suffer from fear, but have the ability to overcome it and develop an orientation of hope. Nevertheless this struggle can be won only if people will use the rationality, logic and intellectual skills that characterize them as human beings and do not yield to the automaticity and spontaneity of fear, which also characterizes lower species. Human beings should use the best of their capabilities and should not allow circumstances, conditions, leaders, or media to push them to their natural tendency to be dominated by fears. It is up to them to overcome these fears. As Fromm (1968) pointed out in his book, *The Revolution of Hope*:

> "Those whose hope is weak settle down for comfort or for violence; those whose hope is strong see and cherish all signs of new life and are ready every moment to help the birth of that which is ready to be born" (p. 9)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

REFERENCES

Antonovsky, A. (1979). *Health, stress, and coping*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Armon-Jones, C. (1986). The social functions of emotions. In R. Harre (Ed.), *The social construction of emotions* (pp. 57–97). Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Aronson, S. (1978). *Conflict and bargaining in the Middle East: An Israeli perspective*. Baltimore; Johns Hopkins University Press.

Averill, J. R. (1980). A constructivist view of emotion. In R. Plutchik, & H. Kellerman (Eds.), *Theories of emotion* (pp. 305–340). New York: Academic Press.

Averill, J. R., Catlin, G., & Chon, K. K. (1990). *Rules of hope*. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Baas, D., Aleman, A., & Kahn, R. S. (2004). Lateralization of amydgala activation: A systematic review of functional neuroimaging studies. *Brain Research Reviews, 45*, 96–103.

Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action. A social cognitive theory*. Enlewood Cliffs NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bandura, A., Walters, R. H. (1959). *Adolescent aggression*. New York: The Ronald Press.

Bandura, A., & Walters, R. H. (1963). *Social learning and personality development*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Bargh, J. A. (1994). The four horsemen of automaticity: Awareness, efficiency, intention, and control in social cognition. In R. S. Weyer, Jr., & T. K. Srull (Eds.), *Handbook of social cognition* (2nd ed., pp. 1–40). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Bargh, J. A. (1997). The automaticity in everyday life. In R. S. Weyer, Jr., & T. K. Srull (Eds.), *Advances in social cognition*, 10 (pp. 1–61). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Bargh, J. A. (2001). Caution: Automatic social cognition may not be habit forming. In R. K. Ohme (Ed.), *Polish psychological bulletin*—special issue *32*, 1–8.

Bargh, J. A., Chen, M., & Burrows, L. (1996). Automaticity of social behavior: Direct effects of traits construct and stereotypes activation on action. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71*, 230–244.

Barlow, D. H. (1988). *Anxiety and its disorders: The nature and treatment of anxiety and panic.* New York: Guilford.

Bar-On, D. (1995). *Fear and hope: Life-stories of five Israeli families of Holocaust survivors, three generations in a family.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bar-On, D. (in press). Empirical criteria for reconciliation in practice. *Interventions*

Bar-Siman-Tov, Y. (Ed.). (2004). *From conflict resolution to reconciliation.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bar-Tal, D. (1998). Societal beliefs in times of intractable conflict: The Israeli case. *International Journal of Conflict Management, 9*, 22–50.

Bar-Tal, D. (2000). *Shared beliefs in a society.* Thousands Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bar-Tal, D. (2001). Why does fear override hope in societies engulfed by intractable conflict, as it does in the Israeli society? *Political Psychology, 22*, 601–627.

Bar-Tal, D. (2003). Collective memory of physical violence: Its contribution to the culture of violence. In E. Cairns, & M. D. Roe (Eds.), *The role of memory in ethnic conflict* (pp. 77–93). Houndmills, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bar-Tal, D. (2004). The necessity of observing real life situations: Palestinian-Israeli violence as a laboratory of learning about social behavior. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 34*, 677–701.

Bar-Tal, D. (2005). *Societal-psychological foundations of intractable conflicts.* Manuscript submitted for publication.

Bar-Tal, D., & Bennink, G. (2004). The nature of reconciliation as an outcome and as a process. In Y. Bar-Siman-Tov (Ed.), *From conflict resolution to reconciliation* (pp. 11–38). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bar-Tal, D., Jacobson, D., & Klieman, A. (Eds.). (1998). *Security concerns: Insights from the Israeli experience.* Stamford, CT: JAI Press.

Bar-Tal, D., & Saxe, L. (2003). The societal perspective in social psychology. In J. Laszlo, & W. Wagner (Eds.), *Theories and controversies in societal psychology* (pp. 13–31). Budapest: New Mandate.

Bar-Tal, D., & Sharvit, K. (in press). Psychological foundations of Israeli Jews' reactions to Al Aqsa Intifada: The role of the threatening transitional context. In V. M. Esses, & R. Vernon (Eds.), *Why neighbours kill: Explaining the breakdown of ethic relations.* Montréal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Bar-Tal, D., & Teichman Y. (2005). *Stereotypes and prejudice in conflict: Representations of Arabs in Israeli Jewish society.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Baumeister, R. F., & Butz, J. (2005). Roots of hate, violence and evil. In R. J. Sternberg (Ed.), *The psychology of hate* (pp. 87–102). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Berbeau, M. J., Rest, J. R., & Narvaez, D. (1999). Beyond the promise: A perspective on research in moral education. *Educational Researcher, 28*, 18–25.

Bellah, R. (1967). Civil religion in America. *Daedalus, 96*, 1–21.

Berridge, K. C., & Winkelman, P. (2003). What is an unconscious emotion: The case of unconscious 'liking'. *Cognition and Emotion, 17*, 181–211.

Blanchard, R. J., & Blanchard, D. C. (1984). Affect and aggression: An animal model applied to human behavior. In R. J. Blanchard, & D. C. Blanchard (Eds.), *Advances in the study of aggression* (Vol. 1, pp. 1–62). New York: Academic Press.

Blaney, P. H. (1986). Affect and memory: A review. *Psychological Bulletin, 99*, 229–246.

Błaszczak, W. (2001). Seeking for the implicit self: The influence of the implicit affective priming on the self reference effects. In M. Jarymowicz (Ed.), *Between affect and intellect: Empirical studies* (pp. 95–106). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo IP PAN (in Polish).

Bower, G. H. (1992). How might emotions affect learning? In S. A. Christianson (Ed.), *The handbook of emotion and memory: Research and theory* (pp. 3–31). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Brecher, M. (1975). *Decision in Israel's foreign policy.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Breznitz, S. (1986). The effect of hope on coping with stress. In M. H. Appley, & R. Trumbull (Eds.), *Dynamics of stress: Physiological, psychological and social perspectives* (pp. 295–306). New York: Plenum.

Brubaker, R., & Laitin, D. D. (1998). Ethnic and nationalist violence. *Annual Review of Sociology, 24*, 423–452.

Buck, R. (1999). The biological affect: A typology. *Psychological Review, 106*, 301–336.

Cacioppo, J. T., & Berntson, G. G. (1994). Relationship between attitudes and evaluative space. A critical review, with emphasis on the separability of positive and negative substrates. *Psychological Bulletin, 115*, 401–423.

Cacioppo, J. T., Berntson, G. G., Sheridan J. F., & McClintock M. K. (2000). Multilevel integrative analysis of human behavior: Social neuroscience and the complementing nature of social and biological approaches. *Psychological Bulletin, 126*, 829–843.

Cacioppo, J. T., & Gardner, W. L. (1999). Emotion. *Annual Review of Psychology, 50*, 191–214.

Cacioppo, J. T., Gardner, W. L., & Berntson, G. G. (1997). Beyond bipolar conceptualizations and measures: The case of attitudes and evaluative space. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 1*, 3–25.

Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. F. (1990). Origins and functions of positive and negative affect: A control-process view. *Psychological Review, 97*, 19–35.

Chang, E. C. (1998). Hope, problem-solving ability, and coping in a college student population: Some implications for theory and practice. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 54*, 953–962.

Chen, M., & Bargh, J. A. (1997). Nonconscious behavioral confirmation processes: The self-fulfilling consequences of automatic stereotype activation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 33*, 541–560.

Christianson, S. A. (1992). Remembering emotional events: Potential mechanisms. In S. A. Christianson (Ed.), *The handbook of emotion and memory* (pp. 307–340). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Clore, G. L., Schwarz, N., & Conway, M. (1994). Affective causes and consequences of social information processing. In R. S. Wyer, Jr., & T. K. Srull (Eds.), *Handbook of social cognition* (2nd ed., Vol. 1, pp. 323–417). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Collins, R. (1975). *Conflict sociology: Toward an explanatory science*. New York: Academic Press.

Corneille, O., Yzerbyt, V. Y., Rogier, A., & Boudin, G. (2001). Threat and the group attribution error: When threat elicits judgments of extremity and homogeneity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 27*, 437–446.

Corradi, J. E., Fagen, P. W., & Garreton, M. A. (Eds.). (1992). *Fear at the edge: State terror and resistance in Latin America*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Czapinski, J. (1985). *Positive inclination: On the nature of optimism*. Wroclaw: Ossolineum (in Polish).

Czapinski, J. (1988). *Negativity effect: On the nature of realism*. Wroclaw: Ossolineum (in Polish).

Czapinski, J. (1992). *Psychology of happiness*. Warszawa: Akademos (in Polish).

Damasio, A. R. (1994). *Descartes' error: Emotion, reason, and the human brain*. New York: Putnam.

Damasio, A. R. (2003). *Looking for Spinoza: Joy, sorrow and the feeling brain*. New York: Harcourt.

Damasio, A. R. (2004). Emotions and feelings: A neurobiological perspective. In A. S. R. Manstead, N. Frijda, & A. Fischer (Eds.), *Feelings and emotions. The Amsterdam Symposium* (pp. 49–57). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Davidson, R. J., & Fox, N. A. (1982). Asymmetrical brain activity discriminates between positive versus negative affective stimuli in human infants. *Science, 218*, 1235–1237.

de Rivera, J. (1992). Emotional climate: Social structure and emotional dynamics. In K. T. Strongman (Ed.), *International review of studies on emotion* (Vol. 2, pp. 199–218). New-York: John Wiley.

Devos, T., Silver, L. A., Mackie, D. M., & Smith, E. R. (2002). Experiencing intergroup emotions. In D. M. Mackie, & E. R. Smith (Eds.), *From prejudice to intergroup emotions: Differentiated reactions to social groups* (pp. 111–133). Philadelphia, PA: Psychological Press.

Eibl-Eibesfeldt, I., & Sütterlin, C. (1990). Fear, defense and aggression in animals and man: Some ethological perspectives. In P. F. Brain, S. Parmigiani, R. J. Blanchard, & D. Mainardi (Eds.), *Fear and defense* (pp. 381–408). London: Harwood.

Ekman, P. (1992). An argument for basic emotions. *Cognition and Emotion, 6*, 169–200.

Ekman, P. (1993). Facial expression and emotion. *American Psychologist, 48*, 384–392.

Ekman, P., & Davidson, R. J. (Eds.). (1994). *The nature of emotion: Fundamental question*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Elster, J. (1999). *Alchemies of the mind. Rationality and the emotions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Epstein, S. (1991). Cognitive-experiential self-theory: An integrative theory of personality. In R. C. Curtis (Ed.), *The relational self. Theoretical convergences in psychoanalysis and social psychology* (pp. 11–137). New York: The Guilford Press.

Epstein, S. (1994). Integration of the cognitive and the psychodynamic unconscious. *American Psychologist, 49*, 709–724.

Epstein, S., Pacini, R., Denes-Raj, V. (1996). Individual differences in intuitive-experiential and analytical-rational thinking styles. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71*, 390–405.

Feldman, S., & Stenner, K. (1997). Perceived threat and authoritarianism. *Psychological Psychology, 18*, 741–770.

Frijda, N. C. (1986). *The emotions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fromm, E. (1968). *The revolution of hope*. New York: Bantam.

Godfrey, J. J. (1987). *A philosophy of human hope*. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Martinus Nijhoff.

Golab, A. (1978). Genesis of evaluative processes. In J. Reykowski (Ed.), *Theory of personality and prosocial behavior* (pp. 31–57). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo IFIS PAN (in Polish).

Golab, A., & Reykowski, J. (1985). *Studies on development of evaluative standards*. Wroclaw: Ossolineum (in Polish).

Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books.

Gordon, S. T. (1990). Social structural effects on emotions. In T. D. Kemper (Ed.), *Research agendas in the sociology of emotions* (pp. 145–179). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Grabowska, A. (1999). Lateralisation of emotions in the brain—experimental and clinical data. In A. Herzyk, & A. Borkowska (Eds.), *Neuropsychology of emotions* (pp. 59–79). Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS (in Polish).

Gray, J. A. (1989). *The psychology of fear and stress* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Grings, W. W., & Dawson, M. E. (1978). *Emotions and bodily responses: A psycho-physiological approach*. New York: Academic Press.

Harre, R. (Ed.). (1986). *The social construction of emotions*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Heller, W., Nitschke, J. B., & Miller, G. A. (1998). Lateralization in emotion and emotional disorders. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 7*, 26–37.

Heskin, K. (1980). *Northern Ireland: A psychological analysis*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Hochschild, A. R. (1983). *A managed beast*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Horowitz, D. L. (2001). *The deadly ethnic riot*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Huddy, L., Khatid, N., & Capelos, T. (2002) Trends: Reactions to the terrorism attacks of September 11, 2001. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 64*, 90–105.

Isen, A. M. (1984). Toward understanding the role of affect in cognition. In R. S. Wyer, Jr., & T. K. Srull (Eds.), *Handbook of social cognition* (Vol. 3, pp. 179–236). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Isen, A. M. (1990). The influence of positive and negative affect on cognitive organization: Some implications for development. In N. L. Stein, B. Leventhal, & T. Trabasso (Eds.), *Psychological and biological approaches to emotion* (pp. 75–94). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Ito, T. A., Larsen, J. T., Smith, N. K., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1998). Negative information weighs more heavily on the brain: The negativity bias in evaluative categorizations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75*, 887–900.

Jacoby, R., & Keinan, G. (Eds.). (2003). *Between stress and hope: From a disease-centered to a health-centered perspective*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Jarymowicz, M. (1994). On different forms of the WE concept and information processing about OTHERS. In M. Jarymowicz (Ed.), *Beyond the egocentric perspective of perception of the self and the external world* (pp. 189–212). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo IP PAN (in Polish).

Jarymowicz, M. (1997). Questions about the nature of emotions: On unconscious and not spontaneous emotions. *Czasopismo Psychologiczne, 3*, 153–170 (in Polish).

Jarymowicz, M. (2001a). The self in implicit information processing. In R. K. Ohme, M. Jarymowicz, & J. Reykowski (Eds.), *Automaticity of information processing* (pp. 103–120). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo IP PAN (in Polish).

Jarymowicz, M. (2001b). Affective reactions and evaluative judgments. In R. K. Ohme (Ed.), *Polish Psychological Bulletin*—special issue *32*, 39–43.

Jarymowicz, M. (Ed.). (2001c). *Between affect and intellect: Empirical studies*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo IP PAN (in Polish).

Jarymowicz, M. (2002a). On the benefits from research on implicit affective information processing. T. Maruszewski (Ed.), *Polish Psychological Bulletin*—special issue, *33*, 5–11.

Jarymowicz, M. (2002b). Human aggressiveness in the light of knowledge about human emotions. In S. Amsterdamski (Ed.), *Human beings and aggression* (pp. 173–189). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo *SIC!* (in Polish).

Jarymowicz, M., & Błaszczak, W. (2001a). *The self-reference effect in implicit processing. Poster presented at the Annual Meeting of SPSP* (San Antonio, Ferbuary 1–3).

Jarymowicz, M., & Błaszczak, W. (2001b). *Implicit nonspecific affect and explicit the self-reference effect. Poster presented at the Amsterdam Conference on Feelings and Emotions* (June 13–16).

Jarymowicz, M., & Kobylinska, D. (in press). A review of studies on the relationship between implicit affect and reflective judgements. *Studia Psychologiczne* (in Polish).

Johnson-Laird, P. N., & Oatley, K. (1992). Basic emotions, rationality and folk theory. *Cognition and Emotion, 6*, 201–223.

Jost, J. T., Glaser, J., Kruglanski, A. W., & Sulloway (2003). Political conservatism as motivated social cognition. *Psychological Bulletin, 129,* 339–375.

Karwowska, D., & Kobylińska, D. (in press). Effects of lateral exposures of implicit affective primes: The metaanalysis. In R. K. Ohme (Ed.), *Secrets of implicit affect*. Gdańsk: Gdańskie Wydawnictwo Psychologiczne (in Polish).

Kelman, H. C. (1987). The political psychology of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict: How can we overcome the barriers to a negotiated solution? *Political Psychology, 8,* 347–363.

Kelman, H. C., & Fisher, R. J. (2003). Conflict analysis and resolution. In D. O. Sears, L. Huddy, & R. Jervis (Eds.), *Oxford handbook of political psychology* (pp. 315–353). New York: Oxford University Press.

Killgore, W. D. S., & Yurgelun-Todd, D. A. (2004). Activation of the amygdala and anterior cingulate during nonconscious processing of sad versus happy faces. *NeuroImage, 21,* 1215–1223.

Kitayama, S., & Markus, H. R. (Eds.). (1994). *Emotion and culture: Empirical studies of mutual influence*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Knox, C., & Quirk, P. (2000). *Peace building in Northern Ireland, Israel and South Africa: Transition, Transformation and reconciliation*. London: Macmillan.

Kohlberg, L. (1984). *The psychology of moral development: Essays on moral development*. (Vol. 2). San Francisco: Harper & Row.

Kriesberg, L. (1993). Intractable conflict. *Peace Review, 5,* 417–421.

Lake, D. A., & Rothchild, D. (1996). Containing fear: The origins and management of ethnic conflict. *International Security, 21,* 41–75.

Lake, D. A., & Rothchild, D. (Eds.). (1998). *The international spread of ethnic conflict: Fear, diffusion, and escalation.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Lau, R. R. (1982). Negativity in political perception. *Political Behavior, 4,* 353–377.

Lazarus, R. S. (1991). *Emotion and adaptation*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, appraisal, and coping*. New York: Springer.

LeBon, G. (1947). *The crowd: A study of the popular mind*. London: Ernest Benn.

LeDoux, J. (1986). Sensory systems and emotion: A model of affective processing. *Integrative Psychiatry, 4,* 237–248.

LeDoux, J. E. (1995). Emotion: Clues from the brain. *Annual Review of Psychology, 46,* 209–235.

LeDoux, J. E. (1996). *The emotional brain: The mysterious underpinnings of emotional life*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

LeDoux, J. (2002). *Synaptic self. How our brains become who we are*. New York: Viking Penguin.

Lewis, M., & Haviland, J. M. (Eds.). (1993). *Handbook of emotions*. New York: Guilford.

Lewis, M., & Saarni, C. (Eds.). (1985). *The socialization of emotions*. New York: Plenum.

Liddell, B. J., Brown, K. J., Kemp, A. H., Barton, M. J., Das, P., Peduto, A., Gordon, E., & Williams, M. L. (2005). A direct brainstem—amygdalal—cortical 'alarm' system for subliminal signals of fear. *NeuroImage, 24,* 235–243.

Mackie, D. M., Devos, T., & Smith, E. R. (2000). Intergroup emotions: Explaining offensive actions in an intergroup context. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 79,* 602–616.

Mackie, D. M., & Smith, E. R. (Eds.). (2002). *From prejudice to intergroup emotions: Differentiated reactions to social groups*. Philadelphia, PA: Psychological Press.

Mandler, G. (1975). *Mind and emotion*. New York: Wiley.

Manstead, A. S. R., Frijda, N., & Fischer, A. (Eds.). (2004). *Feelings and emotions. The Amsterdam Symposium*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Marcus, G. E. (1991). Emotions and politics: Hot cognitions and the rediscovery of passion. *Social Science Information, 30,* 195–232.

Marcus, G. E., Sullivan, J. L., Theiss-Morse, E., & Wood, S. L. (1995). *With malice toward some: How people make civil liberties judgments*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Marks, I. M. (1987). *Fears, phobias and rituals.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1994). The cultural shaping of emotion: A conceptual framework. In S. Kitayama, & H. R. Markus (Eds.), *Emotion and culture: Empirical studies of mutual influence* (pp. 339–351). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Maslow, A. H. (1963). The need to know and the fear of knowing. *Journal of General Psychology, 68,* 111–125.

Meichenbaum, D., & Cameron, R. (1974). The clinical potential of modifying what clients say to themselves. *Psychotherapy theory, Research and Practice, 11,* 103–117.

Mesquita, B., & Frijda, N. H. (1992). Cultural variations in emotion: A review. *Psychological Bulletin, 112,* 179–204.

Morris, J. S., Öhman, A., & Dolan, R. J. (1999). A subcortical pathway to the right amygdala mediating 'unseen' fear. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 96*, 1680–1685.

Mowrer, O. H. (1960). *Learning theory and behavior*. New York: Wiley.

Murphy, S. T., & Zajonc, R. B. (1993). Affect, cognition, and awareness: Affective priming with optimal and suptimal stimulus exposures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 64*, 723–739.

Niedenthal, P. M., & Kitayama, S. (1994). *The heart's eye: Emotional influences in perception and attention*. San Diego, CA: Academic.

Norris, S., & Ennis, R. (1989). *Evaluating critical thinking*. Pacific Grove, CA: Critical Thinking Press and Software.

Oatley, K., & Jenkins, J. M. (1996). *Understanding emotions*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Öhman, A. (1993). Fear and anxiety as emotional phenomena: Clinical phenomenology evolutionary perspectives, and information-processing mechanisms. In M. Lewis, & J. M. Haviland (Eds.), *Handbook of emotions* (pp. 511–536). New York: Guilford.

Öhman, A., & Wiens, S. (2001). *The concept of an evolved fear module as a challenge to cognitive theories of anxiety. Keynote paper presented at the Amsterdam Conference on Feelings and Emotions*, June 13–16.

Ohme, R. K. (2003). *Subliminal mimic infromation*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo IP PAN & SWPS (in Polish).

Ohme, R. K., & Jarymowicz, M. (Eds.). (1999). Influence of implicit affect on cognitive processes: Selected methods of research. *Studia Psychologiczne*—special issue, 37(1) (in Polish).

Ohme, R. K., & Jarymowicz, M. (2001). *Implicit cues change explicit preferences, choice and behavior. Poster presented at the Amsterdam Conference on Feelings and Emotions*, June 13–16.

Ornstein, R. (1997). *The right mind. Making sense of the hemispheres*. New York: Harcourt Brace & Company.

Paez, D., & Vergara, A. I. (1995). Culture differences in emotional knowledge. In J. A. Russell, J. M. Fermandez-Dols, A. S. R., Manstead, & J. C. Wellenkamp (Eds.), *Everyday conceptions of emotion: An introduction to the psychology, anthropology and linguistics of emotion* (pp. 415–434). Boston: Kluwer.

Paez, D., Basabe, N., & Gonzalez, J. L. (1997). Social processes and collective memory: A cross-cultural approach to remembering political events. In J. W. Pennebaker, D. Paez, & B. Riml (Eds.), *Collective memory of political events: Social psychological perspectives* (pp. 147–174). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Pavlov, I. P. (1930). A brief outline of the higher nervous activity. In W. C. Murchison (Ed.), *Psychologies of 1930*. Worcester, MA: Clark University Press.

Peeters, G. (1991). Evaluative influence in social cognition: The roles of direct versus indirect evaluation and positive-negative asymmetry. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 21*, 131–146.

Peeters, G., & Czapinski, J. (1990). Positive-negative asymmetry in evaluations: The distinction between affective and informational negativity effects. *European Review of Social Psychology, 1*, 33–60.

Petersen, R. G. (2002). *Understanding ethnic violence: Fear, hatred, and resentment in twentieth-century Eastern Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Piaget, J. (1970). Piaget's theory. In P. H. Mussen (Ed.), *Carmichael's handbook of child psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 703–732). New York: Wiley.

Piotrowska K. (2001). Activation of the egocentric or nonegocentric perspectives and influence of implicit affect on explicit evaluations. *Studia Psychologiczne, 39*, 161–171 (in Polish).

Plutchik, R. (1980). *Emotion. A psychoevolutionary synthesis*. New York: Harper & Row.

Plutchik, R. (1990). Fear and aggression in suicide and violence: A psychoevolutionary perspective. In P. F. Brain, S. Parmigiani, R. J. Blanchard, & D. Mainarcli (Eds.), *Fear and defense* (pp. 359–379). London: Harwood.

Pochwatko, G. (2003). *Implicit affect and approach—avoidance behaviour*. In R. K. Ohme, & M. Jarymowicz (Eds.), *Automaticity in psychological regulation: New perspectives* (pp. 89–96). Warszawa: IP PAN & SWPS (in Polish).

Pratto, F., & John, O. P. (1991). Automatic vigilance: The attention—grabbing power of negative social information. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 61*, 380–391.

Rabinovich, I. (1998). *The brink of peace: The Israeli-Syrian negotiations*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Rachman, S. (1977). The conditioning theory of fear acquisition: A critical examination. *Behavior Research and Therapy, 15*, 375–387.

Rachman, S. J. (1978). *Fear and courage*. San Francisco. W.H. Freeman.

Rest, J. R. (1986). *Moral development: Advances in research and theory*. New York: Praeger.

Reykowski, J. (1989). Dimensions of development of moral values. In N. Eisenberg, J. Reykowski, & E. Staub (Eds.), *Social and moral values: Individual and societal perspectives* (pp. 23–44). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Rime, B., & Christophe, V. (1997). How individual emotional episodes feed collective memory. In J. P. Pennebaker, D. Paez, & B. Rime (Eds.), *Collective memory of political events: Social psychological perspectives* (pp. 131–146). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Ross, M. H. (1995). Psychocultural interpretation theory and peacemaking in ethnic conflicts. *Political Psychology, 16*, 523–544.

Rothgerber, H. (1997). External intergroup threat as an antecedent to perceptions of in-group and out-group homogeneity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 73*, 1206–1211.

Rozin, P., & Royzman, E. B. (2001). Negativity bias, negativity dominance, and contagion. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 5*, 296–320.

Rutkowska, D. (2003). Influence of activation of automatic vs. reflective evaluative systems on axiological concepts processing. *Przeglad Psychologiczny, 46*, 161–177 (in Polish).

Saarni, C. I., & Harris, P. (Eds.). (1989). *Children's understanding of emotions*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Salomon, G. (2004). A narrative-based view of coexistence education. *Journal of Social Issues, 60*, 273–287.

Schwarz, N. (1990). Feelings as information: Informational and motivational functions of affective states. In E. T. Higgins, & R. M. Sorrentino (Eds.), *Handbook of motivation and cognition: Foundations of social behavior* (Vol. 2, pp. 527–561). New York: Guilford.

Shantz, C. U., & Hartup, W. W. (Eds.). (1992). *Conflict in child and adolescent development.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shalit, E. (1994). The relationship between aggression and fear of annihilation in Israel. *Political Psychology, 15*, 415–434.

Skitka, L. J., Bauman, C. W., & Mullen, E. (2004). Political tolerance and coming to psychological closure following the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks: An integrative approach. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 30*, 743–756.

Smith, E. R. (1998). Mental representation and memory. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (5th ed., Vol. 1, pp. 391–445). Boston: McGraw Hill.

Smith, E. R. (1993). Social identity and social emotions: Toward new conceptualizations of prejudice. In D. M. Mackie, & D. L. Hamilton (Eds.), *Affect, cognition, and stereotyping: Interactive processes in group perception* (pp. 297–315). San Diego: Academic Press.

Smith, E. R. (1999). Affective and cognitive implications of a group becoming part of the self: New models of prejudice and of the self concept. In D. Abrams, & M. A. Hogg (Eds.), *Social identity and social cognition* (pp. 183–196). Oxford: Blckwell.

Smith-Lovin, L. (1990). Emotion as the confirmation and disconfirmation of identity: An affect control model. In T. D. Kemper (Ed.), *Research agendas in the sociology of emotions* (pp. 238–270). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Snyder, C. R. (1994). *The psychology of hope*. New York: Free Press.

Snyder, C. R. (2000a). Hypothesis: There is hope. In C. R. Snyder (Ed.), *Handbook of hope: Theory, measures, & applications* (pp. 3–21). San Diego: Academic Press.

Snyder C. R. (Ed.). (2000b). *Handbook of hope: Theory, measures, & applications*. San Diego: Academic Press.

Snyder, C. R., Cheavens, J., & Michael, S. T. (1999). Hoping. In C. R. Snyder (Ed.), *Coping: The psychology of what works* (pp. 205–231). New York: Oxford University Press.

Snyder, C. R., Harris, C., Anderson, J. R., Holleran, S. A., Irving, L. M., Sigmon, S. T., Yoshinobu, L., Gibb, J., Langell, C., & Harney, P. (1991). The will and the ways: Development and validation of an individual-differences measure of hope. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60*, 570–585.

Snyder, C. R., Sympson, S. C., Ybasco, F. C., Borders, T. F., Babyak, M. A., & Higgins, R. (1996). Development and validation of the state Hope Scale. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70*, 321–335.

Springer, S. P., & Deutsch, G. (1998). *Left brain—right brain. Perspectives from cognitive neuroscience* (5th ed.). New York: W. H. Freeman and Company.

Staats, S. R., & Stassen, M. A. (1985). Hope: An affective cognition. *Social Indicators Research, 17*, 235–242.

Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. W. (2000). An integrated threat theory of prejudice. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *Reducing prejudice and discrimination* (pp. 225–246). Hillsdale, NJ: Elrbaum.

Stotland, E. (1969). *The psychology of hope*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Szczerbik, S. (2003). *Depressiveness and influence of implicit affect on the self-reference effect.* Unpublished MA thesis. Warsaw: Faculty of Psychology, University of Warsaw (in Polish).

Trzebinska, E. (1998). *Two images of own person.* Warszawa: Wydawnictwo IP PAN. (in Polish).

Turner, J. C., Hogg, M. A., Oakes, P. J., Reicher, S. D., & Wetherell, M. S. (1987). *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Volkan, V. (1997). *Bloodlines; From ethnic pride to ethnic terrorism*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Waganaar, W. A., & Goreneweg, J. (1990). The memory of concentration camp survivors. *Applied Cognitive Psychology, 4*, 77–88.

Wallbott, H. G., & Scherer, K. S. (1986). The antecedents of emotional experiences. In K. S. Scherer, H. G. Wallbott, & A. B. Summerfeld (Eds.), *Experiencing emotion: A cross-cultural study* (pp. 69–83). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Weiner, E. (Ed.). (1998). *The handbook of interethnic coexistence*. New York: The Continuum Publishing Company.

Wenreich-Haste, H., & Locke, D. (Eds.). (1983). *Morality in the making*. Chichester: Wiley.

White, R. K. (1984). *Fearful warriors: A psychological profile of U.S.-Soviet relations*. New York: Free Press.

White, R. K. (1996). Why the Serbs fought: Motives and misperceptions. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology, 2*, 109–128.

Wiley, J. R. (1990). Emotions as related to systems of behavior. In N. L. Stein, B. Leventhal, & T. Tabasso (Eds.), *Psychological and biological approaches to emotion* (pp. 385–404). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Wojciszke, B. (Ed.). (1988). *Studies on evaluative processes*. Wroclaw: Ossolineum (in Polish).

Wyer, R.S., Jr., & Srull, T. K. (1989). *Memory and cognition in its social context*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Yaniv, A. (1987). *Deterrence without the bomb: The politics of Israeli strategy*. Lexington, MA: Health.

Yzerbyt, V. Y., Dumont, M., Gordijn, E., & Wigboldus, D. (2002). Intergroup emotions and self-Categorization: The impact of perspective-taking on reactions to victims of harmful behavior. In D. M. Mackie, & E. R. Smith (Eds.), *From prejudice to intergroup emotions: Differentiated reactions to social groups* (pp. 67–87). Philadelphia, PA: Psychological Press.

Zafran, A., & Bar-Tal, D. (2002, July). *The dominance of fear over hope in situations of intractable conflict: The Israeli case. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Society of Political Psychology*, Berlin.

Zafran, A., & Bar-Tal, D. (2003). Holocaust memory and its implications for peace process: The influence of fear and self-image as a victim on the Israeli security beliefs. In M. Al-Haj, & U. Ben-Eliezer (Eds.), *In the name of security: The sociology of peace and war in Israel in changing times* (pp. 329–367). Haifa: Haifa University Press. (in Hebrew).

Zajonc R. B. (1980). Feeling and thinking: Preferences need no inferences. *American Psychologist, 35*, 151–175.

Zajonc, R. B. (1998). Emotions. In D. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (4th ed., Vol. 1, pp. 591–632). Boston: McGraw-Hill.