1

Introduction

Kai J. Jonas and Thomas A. Morton

Seventy years ago, the world was in the midst of a global crisis: World War II. Against this backdrop, the newly formed Society for Psychological Study of Social Issues (SPSSI) produced its second yearbook. *Civilian Morale*, edited by Goodwin Watson (1942), gathered together almost all of the now famous social psychologists of that time to contribute their ideas, and their empirically based knowledge, to the pressing practical problem of maintaining morale at a time of war. Morale, it was argued, was a critical human resource that could contribute to Allied success, and undermining morale among the enemy was seen as equally crucial for their defeat. Each of the contributors to this volume considered the basis of civilian morale, including firm values, clear goals, and a balance between individual and collective will (Gordon Allport), and the forces that might contribute to individual morale at this time of crisis, including democratic structures and ideals (Allport again), group memberships (e.g., nationality, Gregory Bateson; race, Kenneth Clark; and religion, Otto Kleinberg), unemployment (Goodwin Watson), and individual differences, such as time perspective (Kurt Lewin). Finally, contributors considered a range of interventions that could increase or decrease morale in the population, including use of the media (Theodore Newcomb) and specific leadership trainings (Alex Bavelas).

In the intervening decades, the names of many of the contributors have retained currency, but the specific issue of civilian morale has faded from prominence in the social psychological literature (Johnson & Nichols, 1998). Although this volume may now represent little more

Restoring Civil Societies: The Psychology of Intervention and Engagement Following Crisis, First Edition. Edited by Kai J. Jonas and Thomas A. Morton.

than a moment of history, in many ways it is a closely related predecessor of this current book. Irrespective of the specific focus on questions of morale, Watson's volume can be seen as an attempt by social psychologists at the time to respond to a significant societal crisis occurring around them, and engaging with the tools of theory, research, and application to increase engagement with the positive ideals and values of society at that time. This broad theme was extended in the following yearbook, which drew together an expanded cast of prominent social scientists to respond to what would surely be the most pressing concern in the aftermath of this crisis: the challenge of coming to terms with war and creating peace (Murphy, 1945).

Seventy years later, SPSSI is home to a growing community of researchers committed to using psychology to understand, analyze, and, sometimes, intervene in significant social problems. Although wars on the global scale of the first half of the twentieth century now seem unlikely, our societies are by no means free from crisis or other threats to social cohesion and harmony. Hopefully, most readers of this book will be living in stable and safe environments. However, societies are often not as stable and safe as they seem at first glance. And to encounter conditions in which civil societies have broken down or ruptured, one does not have to travel very far. Within Europe, the war in the former Yugoslavia is a recent example of a – at first glance stable – society breaking up along ethnic, religious, and nationalist fault-lines, precipitating massacre, systematic rape, and genocide. It is easy to find further examples of societies around the world that are characterized by pervasive conflict and violence or the constant threat of this. Coupled with this, the current global context is dominated by discussions of both economic and environmental crisis. Indeed, at this particular point in time, it can sometimes appear that instability and social unrest are more prevalent than their opposites – exemplified, for example, by the tsunami and earthquake in Japan, the global "occupy" movement, the London riots, and the Arab spring that dominated the news of 2011.

All of the above phenomena – conflict, economic downturn, environmental change, and inequality and injustice – represent significant challenges for human relationships and individual and collective well-being. However, threats to civil society and social harmony are not limited to large-scale dramatic events. These things also occur on a smaller scale, happen frequently, and may be felt much closer to home. Forest fires threaten cities, floods necessitate relocation or immigration, and communities "die" because the primary source of employment closes down. Regardless of their scale, in the wake of such crises theoretical frameworks are needed that help us to analyze the crisis

moment and to identify possible pathways to reactivating the civic engagement of individuals and to reinstituting the basis of civil society. Such frameworks provide the basis for solid interventions that draw on accumulated knowledge and translate this into positive action. Exploring crisis in its many forms, and considering the potential of psychological interventions to address these, is the overarching aim of this volume.

Civil Societies in Crisis

What is actually lost when societies are threatened by crisis? Depending on its origins, a crisis can disrupt law and order, energy and power supply, or vital health services. But, over and above these things, the attribute of civility itself may also be lost and in dire need of restoration. Crises, whether of natural or human origins, affect the relationships between people. Somewhere within these relationships civility resides, for example in the ways we think about others or treat them in a time of need. This idea of civility is also a focus of this book. Specifically, we are interested in the thoughts, feeling, and actions of individuals that might contribute positively to civil functioning within groups, communities, and society as a whole, and the events or ideas that can threaten or challenge these.

Possible human responses to crises and other threats to civil society are manifold. Depending on the respective level of threat and its immediacy, saving one's life and safeguarding one's loved ones may be the dominant response. But even in extreme circumstances, individuals can look beyond their own self-interest and turn to others to take actions to protect the people or groups that they care about. In the face of instability, threat, and decline, individuals may also strive to uphold the values of the society that was once around them. These kinds of civic engagement imply a strong normative background: a commitment to shared values or morals, a rebuilding of a collective good, and its protection, or restoration. Thus civic engagement can be seen in the behavior of individuals or groups that are motivated by collective ideals. Likewise, the interventions that seek to foster civil engagement are motivated by a commitment to higher-order norms.

At the same time, by unsettling or disrupting the normal state of society, crises can illuminate injustices and inequalities and trigger associated attributions of responsibility or guilt. Thus, just as responses to crises can reflect moral concerns or collective ideals, crisis itself can be the product of these things. For example, when the disadvantaged or disenfranchised engage in collective action their aim is to challenge the

majority and the dominant model of society. In so doing, they create a crisis that must be resolved. More generally, this underscores the point that what is considered to be a crisis by some may be an opportunity, or a necessity, in the eyes of others. When considered in this way, both the processes that give rise to conflict or crisis, and those that are triggered by it, are relevant to understanding civil society and to interventions that have the intention of achieving this.

Variability in the meaning of a crisis, the specific reasons behind it, and the form it takes, inevitably make generalizations difficult. Especially given this diversity, theoretically-guided analyses of crisis and restoration are necessary. As general frameworks for understanding, theories enable us to locate specific events, and the likely responses to these, within their broader context. In so doing, theoretical frameworks contribute to learning from crisis. Without such broad learning, devising successful interventions to foster civic engagement and reinstitute the civil basis of society is impossible. At the same time, interventions directed toward one type of crisis may not readily translate to all other contexts. Even when faced with crises of seemingly similar origins, the specific features of the crisis as they relate to the communities affected may stand in the way of a generalized approach to intervention. Given this, it is crucial that theoretically-guided research is put to the test in practical applications, and reciprocally that practically-driven interventions are fully described and discussed in relation to theory. By acknowledging the synergies, or slippages, between theory and practice, we are best placed to identify the gaps in our understanding that need to be filled.

Reflection on Core Concepts

The topic of this book is likely to activate vivid examples of societal crisis in the mind of the reader, and possibly also the conclusion that societal crises and their restoration inevitably differ along many dimensions. Particularly because of the latter, in this introduction we want to reflect briefly on the core concepts of this book to provide some backdrop against which the subsequent chapters can be considered. In fact, each of the concepts used here has been the topic of considerable research, and often the subject of profound debate, across the social sciences: What defines crisis, civility, restoration, and society is by no means fixed. The central question of how to create, maintain, or restore civil societies is itself a discussion that runs through history. Ultimately, this is a concern that cuts across multiple disciplines.

Although we acknowledge the importance of interdisciplinary perspectives, we have chosen to limit the focus of this volume to a psychological one. More specifically, the assembled contributions explore the concepts of crisis, civility, society, and restoration through the lens of social psychological theory, research, and application. From this perspective, when defining these key concepts the focus is typically on individuals as actors, and on their relationships with other individuals and within groups. With this psychological perspective in mind, we briefly turn to each of the key concepts that are the focus of this book.

Crisis

As should already be apparent, crisis can be interpreted very broadly. For the purposes of this volume, we take crisis to refer to any unstable or potentially dangerous individual, group-related or societal situation, especially those involving an impending abrupt change of a status quo or the threat of such change. While the prototypical crisis is a discrete event with a distinct aftermath, crises can vary considerably in their length and trajectory. A crisis can be seasonally reoccurring, like flooding after the monsoon rains in Southeast Asian countries, or unrest in Northern Ireland during each year's July marching season. A crisis can also be unfolding and involve a sequence of initially independent events that are somehow linked or lead into each other, for example when an economic crisis precipitates budget cuts, which in turn amplify the effects of an unexpected natural crisis due to the reduced availability of resources to combat this. Finally, crisis can also refer to some ongoing situation with a longer-term evolution and impact (e.g., so-called intractable conflicts), or something that continually threatens to disrupt the social order or reignite social conflicts (e.g., societies that are formally at peace, but with long histories of unresolved conflict).

Restoring

This denotes an endeavor by individuals, groups or institutions to return the current state of being back to a previous state. In many cases this previous state is associated with a positive valence: it is seen as better, superior or more desirable than the current state that has been compromised. This positive imagining of the past may, at times, be tinged by nostalgia and motivated by a desire to retreat from the challenges of the present rather than solve the specific problems

associated with the crisis. Alternatively, reflections on the past may be grounded in specific prescriptions, such as universal norms and values, that were violated during the crisis and must now be reaffirmed or reinstated. While both of these reactions involve restoration, the latter is more akin to the kind of *civil* restoration that is the focus of this book. Nonetheless, the other ways in which people might seek to achieve a sense of restoration, and the motivations that relate to this, are equally relevant for full understanding of the processes that might be triggered by a crisis. Although this discussion might suggest that restoration is always backward-looking, it is important to note that crises and their resolution can also be opportunities to move forward into the future. Indeed, in some situations – for example where there is no positive prior state – restoration may necessarily be forward-looking. In this sense, although we have used the term "restoring," we can also think of attempts to create civil societies in the first place.

Civil

Civil, or civility, refers to behavior between individuals and groups that conforms to some social norm or higher-order standard of appropriateness (in accordance with the civil society). In this sense, there may also be some moral dimension to the concept of civility: it can represent an ideal about how things should be and what is seen as ultimately right. Of course, in defining civility in this way, with reference to social norms or moral principles, we acknowledge that these higher-order standards can themselves be contested. Sometimes disagreement about what constitutes right and proper behavior, and which specific standards should be adopted and shared across society, is itself at the heart of crisis. The word "civil" also refers to a domain of non-governmental, non-market actors, and highlights that the scope of this book relates to non-military, non-police contexts. Thus, we are primarily concerned with the breakdown of "ordinary" behaviors and relationships rather than the failure (and restoration) of military organizations, for example. However, we also acknowledge that the latter can impact on a civil crisis or even create one, and thus there may be some interplay between the origins of crises outside the civic domain and where it is ultimately felt.

Society

In an early sociological sense, society is the goal-driven counterpart to the concept of primary community introduced by the sociologist

Ferdinand Tönnies (1887/1963). Nowadays, the concept of society used in sociology is broader and reflects decades of academic debate in sociology. As such, and maybe in a more social psychological sense, we use the term society to refer to a group of people who interact with each other framed by certain persistent and long-term relationships, goals, and norms. These relationships, goals, and norms may themselves be framed by social status, social roles, or social networks. As such, societies can be characterized by individuals who share norms, a distinctive culture or identity, or a specific set of institutions. Here it is important to note that the crises of interest to the current volume need not involve a society as a whole. Instead, crisis can be contained in specific parts of society, defined by social or geographical boundaries, whereas other parts remain unaffected.

In its composite form, the specific idea of *civil society* has been defined in many ways (Kocka, 2007). It dates back to Aristotelian thinking (*societas civilis*) and received its most complete elaboration in the works of Tocqueville (Cohen & Arato, 1992). Traditionally, in political theory a distinction is made between state, family, market, and civil society, although in practice the boundaries between the four fields are often complex, blurred, and negotiated (Foley & Edwards, 1996). Whereas some of these fields are characterized by relatively institutionalized relationships, civil society defines a more informal space in which actors can engage in permeable, fluid relations with each other. From a performative perspective of making a society work, civil society refers to the arena of uncoerced collective action around shared interests, purposes, and values. Thus, when we think of restoring civil society we may also think of empowering organizations such as registered charities, non-governmental development organizations, community groups, gay or women's organizations, faith-based organizations, professional associations, trade unions, self-help groups, social movements, and advocacy groups.

Actors and Targets for Intervention

In describing crises, it is important to consider who the relevant actors are in that situation, how they relate to each other, and who, or what, is the appropriate agent for change or intervention in response. Crisis, even when experienced at the individual level, inevitably involves multiple actors. These actors could be individuals, groups, or social organizations/institutions. There may also be some dynamic between these different types of actors, for example as individuals are located by

loosely connected supporters, or cohere into groups that together take action, or different identities become salient that structure individual relationships. In response to a crisis, the ideal targets for intervention may be any of these actors, and the desired outcome of intervention may be changes in specific individual or collective behaviors; the endorsement of and commitment to certain norms or values; or shifts in the relationships that define those involved in the crisis (e.g., from conflict to cooperation). Regardless of the specific outcome, features of the individual or group being targeted have implications for how they are likely to respond to any intervention.

In the context of crisis, actors may be (or may see themselves as) victims who are suffering in the situation, or they may be (or be seen by others as) perpetrators who have some responsibility for the events. Individuals or groups who are neither victims nor perpetrators, but instead occupy some external position and have the potential to provide help, assistance, or intervention, can also be relevant actors in a crisis situation. Each of these positions, however, has implications for individual motivations and for the scope of their possible actions.

The behavior of immediately affected actors (i.e., direct victims or perpetrators) is often driven by their most proximal needs – for example for safety and security. However, the needs people experience in response to a crisis can also be symbolic (e.g., for respect, recognition, or empowerment). And these symbolic needs can be shared by those who are not directly affected by the crisis but nonetheless feel some connection to those who are (e.g., via perceived similarity, empathy, or shared identity). In this way, those who are not directly affected can also be driven to act. However, rather than being a consequence of their own personal interests, their actions are likely to be driven by specific norms and other collective concerns. These actions, in turn, might exacerbate the crisis (e.g., when people retaliate on behalf of harm inflicted on another) or be relevant to its resolution (e.g., when people provide help and support).

In addition to guiding individual motivations to respond to a crisis, different actor positions are also likely to influence how people interpret interventions designed to help. For example, the recipients of assistance can be either the subject or object of an intervention: they may receive help in an unsolicited manner (object) or they may be actively soliciting help from others (subject). These different roles can color how assistance is interpreted and whether it is received as intended. As surprising as this may seem initially, there are many examples of individuals, or even nation states, refusing help from others to maintain pride and status despite apparent need. This is because asking for help, although it

increases the likelihood of receiving it, can entail a loss of status and agency by rendering people the object rather than subject of assistance.

The type of help offered, even when it is welcome, can also vary in its implications for the recipient. Help can be offered in an interdependent way and involve actions that keep the recipient in a dependent relationship with the actor (e.g., delivery of food during a famine). Alternatively, help may be offered in an independent way and have the aim of making the recipient self-reliant again (e.g., delivery of knowledge or irrigation devices to avoid a future famine). These variations in the type of help being offered have implications for the recipients' ability to resolve the crisis on their own terms and therefore how it is likely to be received (see Nadler & Fisher, 1986, for a more complete discussion).

Together, these issues of perspective and meaning underscore the political dimensions of crisis and intervention. For interventions to be effective in the long term, the perspectives of the various actors involved need to be somehow aligned, and the form of help being offered must be consistent with the needs being expressed or experienced by the recipient. In the absence of these things, there is always the danger that intervention will leave some people feeling compromised, or that intervention itself will become a source of conflict and thereby contribute further to the unfolding crisis.

Content and Structure

When we began to conceptualize this book, it quickly became obvious to us that we would need to fuse two types of contributions. First of all, we needed to select those theories and approaches that lend themselves for the topic of restoration of civil societies (independent of their specific application). Second, to avoid producing a rather dull theoretical volume, we aimed to document psychological analyses and interventions that arose in the context of real crises. Therefore this book has two main foci: theoretical foundations, themes, and contexts, and then actual examples and best practice intervention applications.

Theory-Based Chapters

Part I deals with theoretical approaches that are relevant to the task of restoring civil societies. This part starts with perspectives focused at the individual level and investigates some very basic determinants of civic

engagement. The theoretical line begins with an analysis of the trait of justice sensitivity by Baumert, Thomas, and Schmitt (Chapter 2). As these authors argue, the adherence to justice principles provides a resource for the stability of social life, and the maintenance or restoration of societal institutions especially in the aftermath of crises. As a core concept, justice sensitivity captures the propensity of the individual to perceive injustice and the cognitive, emotional, and behavioral responses to the unjust situation. More than this, justice sensitivity has been found to predict willingness to cooperate with others around common goods, and readiness for actions relevant to civic engagement. In another individual-level approach, Rutjens, van der Pligt, and van Harreveld (Chapter 3) elaborate on the ability of the individual to deal with crises in the absence of normative guidance. They introduce a self-control approach to explain fundamental differences in self-regulation and goal-attainment given uncertainty, and consider how these bolster different types of beliefs that serve as a compensation mechanism. These belief systems provide a coping or compensation mechanism, to reduce the negative effects of the experienced threat, essentially by affirming the world as an orderly place.

After these initial chapters, the book turns to approaches that locate the individual actor more firmly within their social context. Jonas (Chapter 4) bridges the two sections by placing prosocial behavior and its underlying motives into larger social situations, for example as determined by group membership. He first reviews individual motives for morally courageous bystander interventions and then argues that individual help and support behaviors in crisis contexts are embedded in larger social frameworks that provide further protagonistic and antagonistic determinants. Taking a contextualized developmental perspective, Cummings, Taylor, and Merrilees (Chapter 5) investigate how far individual resilience can be systematically described and engaged in post-crisis political settings. Drawing on a broader social ecological framework, and using examples of research from Northern Ireland, they describe the psychological processes that contribute to children's risk and resiliency in communities plagued by conflict. Their analysis highlights the intersecting layers of family, community, and societal conflict that shape emotional security in children and youth. Next, Omoto, Snyder, and Hackett (Chapter 6) present a model of volunteering behavior. Here, special attention is paid to the differences between general volunteering and volunteering after a crisis. They argue that an analysis of motivations underlying volunteerism in everyday contexts can be successfully applied to crisis contexts and helps us to understand when, how, and why people volunteer, both on a personal and collective level.

Following on from these explorations of individual and group approaches, the next chapters move on to a consideration of truly group or collective approaches. Van Zomeren, Postmes, and Spears (Chapter 7) focus on the topic of collective action. Collective action denotes a behavior of a threatened or mistreated group of people that joins forces to decrease the threat or change the mistreatment to the better. This behavior particularly relates to contexts in which crises are imminent and still can be avoided, or in which particular groups are seen to be excluded from civil society. They explore the role of group membership in guiding actions intended to address perceived injustices and reduce social inequality and consider the relationships among group-based identity, cost benefit analyses, emotion, and morality as predictors of this form of civic engagement. Next, Dovidio, Gaertner, Ditlmann, and West (Chapter 8) explore how the basic social categorizations that often shape interactions that occur across group lines are also set within a broader historical context. As evidenced by the empirical work that they review on race relations in the United States, this historical context shapes the goals and motivations that individuals bring to their interactions with each other. They argue that these different goals increase the likelihood that individuals entering into cross-racial interactions will leave with diverging perspectives. These diverging perspectives, in turn, can become something that can stand in the way of the development of a common identity to replace historical divisions. Finally, to round off the theoretical section, Morton, Hornsey, and Postmes (Chapter 9) also discuss the relevance of histories of conflict to contemporary intergroup relations. Specifically, they acknowledge the potential for a sense of common humanity to repair historical wounds between groups and overcome negative intergroup orientations. However, they also highlight how this common framework can be complicated by specific identity-based motivations and by the meaning attached to such common categories. Ultimately, they argue that whether or not recognizing our common humanity with others is a force for restoration and peace depends on what we think it means to be human and how we interpret the harmful intergroup actions in relation to this.

Application and Intervention-Based Chapters

Part II deals more squarely with the issues of application and intervention in specific contexts. The contexts covered by authors in this part represent a broad range of cultural and geographical locations. The

crises considered vary from community-level concerns to ongoing national and international conflicts, and take in outcomes related to physical and mental health and well-being to prosocial action to intergroup reconciliation. Some of these examples are already furnished with interventions, while others simply deal with the analysis of the crisis and its consequences.

First, Rimé, Kanyangara, Paez, and Yzerbyt (Chapter 10) describe the process of so-called "Gacaca" tribunals in Rwanda that bring victims and perpetrators in a social ritual together. Contrary to popular notions of such truth and reconciliation procedures as being cathartic, they argue that these can, in fact, reactivate negative emotions among those involved. However, as their evaluations of Gacaca participants demonstrate, in order to understand the consequences of these emotions, it is important to appreciate their shared nature, and more specifically how shared emotional experiences shape individual orientations within broader society. Linked to this theme, Shnabel and Noor (Chapter 11) also explore forgiveness processes between victims and perpetrators of societal conflict. Their analysis focuses on Israelis and Palestinians, a situation of intractable conflict where the lines between victim and perpetrator are blurred. Drawing on examples from this context and on their own theoretically-guided research, they argue that reconciliation requires symbolic exchange transactions in which the majority group empowers the minority and the minority group accepts the majority. Only then can a competition over the exclusive role of the "true" victim be resolved and the path for a harmonious civil society be laid.

Next, Muldoon and Lowe (Chapter 12) critically explore the notion of post-traumatic stress, drawing on research conducted in Northern Ireland and elsewhere. More specifically, these authors contrast individual models of psychopathology with their alternative group-based account, which focuses on the role of social identity in shaping the meaning of potentially traumatic events. Through this discussion, they highlight the limits of individualized accounts and discuss the practical and policy implications of their perspective for the rehabilitation and reintegration of those traumatized by social conflict. Although working within a very different context – the global threat of terrorism – Blackwood, Hopkins, and Reicher (Chapter 13) also critique individual-based accounts of social problems and highlight the importance of considering a group-level perspective when addressing these. More specifically, their chapter argues that current individualized responses to the threat of terrorism may have the consequence of particularizing certain groups and through this contribute to their alienation and disengagement from civil society.

In a next step we move away from intergroup conflict and toward processes relevant to the formation of group-level responses. Set within the context of HIV/AIDS, Stürmer and Siem (Chapter 14) analyze collective action phenomena in response to this public health crisis. Specifically, they draw on a social representation approach to consider the dominant meanings attached to this disease in public discourse, and how these meanings shape individual and collective responses to it. Dovetailing with this chapter's focus on community engagement and collective action, McGarty, Lala, and Thomas (Chapter 15) elaborate on the processes through which interactions between individuals can become the basis for meaningful identities that propel people toward positive social action. Specifically, they highlight the power of opinion-based groups to span the divide between individual thoughts and feelings and broader social change.

Finally, two contributions consider specific tools that might be used as interventions to promote civic-minded behavior and restore civility in society. Brandstätter and Jonas (Chapter 16) describe principles behind intervention trainings designed to foster moral courage by individuals and evidence for the effectiveness of these, while Paluck (Chapter 17) discusses the potential for media to be a tool for rebuilding peace in post-conflict societies and summarizes research that has tested the effectiveness of media-driven interventions in the Democratic Republic of Congo. Based on established theoretical principles, and the findings from her own research, she offers specific guidance to the design of media-based interventions.

How Should This Book Be Read?

The experienced reader will most likely immediately dive into the chapter that is most relevant to his or her interest. For readers without a psychological background, or who are less familiar with psychological theorizing, it may be advisable to start with one of the chapters in the second section of the book. Here we have assembled examples of real world crises and psychological analyses or interventions that have been brought to bear on these. In doing so, we hope the reader gets an idea about both the perspectives offered by psychology, and the methods of psychological analysis and intervention, while at the same time having a concrete real-world example in the background to connect these ideas with.

We have also tried to provide each applied chapter with a corresponding theoretical approach. Those links are not limited to a

one-to-one correspondence between theoretical and applied chapters, but instead are manifold. For example the theoretical chapter on collective action by van Zomeren and colleagues (7) connects to the more applied pieces by McGarty and colleagues (15) and by Stürmer and Siem (14), and also further intersects with the theoretical chapters by Omoto and colleagues (6) and by Jonas (4). Similarly, the chapter by Shnabel and Noor (11) discusses forgiveness processes in the Israeli-Palestinian intractable conflict. Theoretically relevant chapters from the first section are those by Dovidio and colleagues (8), explaining key challenges posed by interactions that occur across intergroup divides, and by Morton and colleagues (9), who discuss theory and research relevant to processes of intergroup forgiveness and reconciliation. Where relevant, these cross-chapter linkages have been highlighted within the chapters themselves.

Conclusion

Unlike the situation faced by Goodwin Watson and his contributors in 1942, war is not the only crisis faced by society. Morale is also unlikely to be seen as the crucial ingredient to maintaining or restoring civil societies. Nonetheless, like our predecessors, we believe that psychology can contribute to the restoration of civil societies, when they rupture or break. Seventy years ago, Watson concluded that not everything is known about morale, but was convinced that his volume could improve the understanding, maintaining, and fostering of morale in the United States. Like our predecessors, we do not pretend that this volume represents everything we know about questions of crisis and civil restoration. Nonetheless, we do believe that these are important issues for theory, research, and application. By assembling relevant contributions from each of these domains, we hope that we will inspire more work in this area and contribute to discussions across the theory–practice divide that is necessary to traverse if we are ultimately to arrive at any understanding of the tools we have for creating, restoring, or maintaining civil societies.

References

Cohen, J. L., & Arato, A. (1992). *Civil society and political theory*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Foley, M., & Edwards, B. (1996). The paradox of civil society. *Journal of Democracy*, *7*, 38–52.

Johnson, B. T., & Nichols, D. R. (1998). Social psychologists' expertise in the public interest: Civilian morale research during World War II. *Journal of Social Issues*, *54*, 53–77.

Kocka, J. (2007). Civil society in a historic perspective. In J. Keane (Ed.), *Civil society: Berlin perspectives* (pp. 37–50) New York: Berghahn.

Murphy, G. (1945). *Human nature and enduring peace*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Nadler, A., & Fisher, J. D. (1986). The role of threat to self-esteem and perceived control in recipient reaction to help: Theory development and empirical validation. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 19, pp. 81–121). New York: Academic Press.

Tönnies, F. (1887/1963). *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Watson, G. (Ed.) (1942). *Civilian morale*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.