Portland State University

PDXScholar

Dissertations and Theses

Dissertations and Theses

1989

U.S.-Soviet interchange : an examination of the underlying assumptions of U.S. peace organizations sponsoring contact with Soviet citizens

Hyla Rosenberg
Portland State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/open_access_etds

Part of the [International and Intercultural Communication Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Rosenberg, Hyla, "U.S.-Soviet interchange : an examination of the underlying assumptions of U.S. peace organizations sponsoring contact with Soviet citizens" (1989). *Dissertations and Theses*. Paper 4105.
<https://doi.org/10.15760/etd.5989>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations and Theses by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF Hyla Rosenberg for the Master of Science in Speech Communication presented December 1, 1989.

Title: U.S.-Soviet Interchange: An Examination of the Underlying Assumptions of U.S. Peace Organizations Sponsoring Contact with Soviet Citizens.

APPROVED BY THE MEMBERS OF THE THESIS COMMITTEE:

Devorah Lieberman, Chair

Stephen A. Kosokoff

Milton Bennett

Mel Gurtov

The research focus of this study was upon U.S. peace organizations which sponsor face-to-face contact with Soviet citizens. Nine U.S. peace organizations were included in the study, the names of which were acquired through a publication produced by the Institute for Soviet-American

Relations. The researcher contacted approximately 28 organizations either by telephone or mail, requesting that organizational literature (program descriptions, newsletters, brochures, pamphlets) be sent to the researcher for the purpose of conducting a rhetorical analysis of such literature.

Organizational literature was analyzed in order to describe the basic assumptions of each organization regarding cultural similarity and/or relativity in relationship to U.S. and Soviet cultures, demonstrated in each organization's statement of purpose, and in additional organizational material. The basic precepts of cultural relativity were supported by a difference-based approach to intercultural communication, using Bennett's 1986 developmental model as a diagnostic tool in describing organizational assumptions. The model is processual in nature, and outlines the components which are present at various stages of intercultural sensitivity.

The results of the study revealed a general rhetorical tendency toward minimization of cultural relativity with regard to each of the nine organizations. Minimization was demonstrated via a universalized notion of "friendship" in the materials of three organizations. Other organizations demonstrated combinations of minimization and acceptance of intercultural difference in statements of purpose and additional organizational material. The nine organizations in the study make a vital contribution to U.S.-Soviet relations by offering programs which serve to

dispel the stereotypes which both cultures have held of each other.

However, research in a difference-based approach to intercultural communication suggests that it is important to move toward an understanding of cultural relativity, with regard to U.S.-Soviet relations. By employing the process of empathy, or assumption of difference, both Soviet and U.S. cultures are seen as fundamentally "right" and "logical" with regard to each nation's particular cultural reality. With the introduction of glasnost and perestroika into the Soviet Union, it appears that U.S.-Soviet face-to-face contact will expand, and it will be increasingly imperative that both cultures work toward an appreciation of cultural difference.

U.S.-SOVIET INTERCHANGE: AN EXAMINATION OF THE UNDERLYING
ASSUMPTIONS OF U.S. PEACE ORGANIZATIONS SPONSORING
CONTACT WITH SOVIET CITIZENS

by

HYLA ROSENBERG

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE
in
SPEECH COMMUNICATION

Portland State University

1990

TO THE OFFICE OF GRADUATE STUDIES:

The members of the Committee approve the thesis of
Hyla Rosenberg presented December 1, 1989.

Devorah Lieberman, Chair

Stephen A. Kosokoff

Milton Bennett

Mel Gurtov

APPROVED:

Theodore G. Grove, Chair, Department of Speech Communication

C. William Savery, Interim Vice Provost for Graduate Studies
and Research

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my deep appreciation to Dr. Lieberman for her highly valuable input and suggestions while I was in the process of writing this thesis. Additionally, the diverse perspectives of those on my thesis committee, Dr. Kosokoff, Dr. Bennett, and Mel Gurtov, aided in the creation of a more clearly focused final product. LaRay Barna encouraged me in pursuing my interest in intercultural communication, and consistently expressed her support.

In choosing a topic for this thesis, I struggled to find one which would reflect both my concerns for exploring the dynamics of "enemy" pairs such as the U.S. and Soviet Union, and one which would include information I had acquired through formal coursework. I am grateful to the organizations listed in this thesis which were generous in facilitating this exploration by sending me free materials. Additionally, I am grateful to the individuals, known and unknown, who are committed to deepening their own understanding of integrity in their daily lives.

The structure for this thesis emerged out of an inner sense of values which I hold, and the appreciation of cultural/personal/political diversity is one which I continue to explore and examine whenever I am engaged in the creative process. In particular, I have become acutely

aware that "peace" and "war" do not refer to simplistic, static concepts. Rather, these words refer to a much more complex weaving of human interactions--a weaving which is vital and everpresent.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
 CHAPTER	
I INTRODUCTION	1
Scope of the Research	4
Rationale for the Research	5
Definition of Terms	7
Literature Review	10
Research Questions	19
II METHODOLOGY	20
Description of the Developmental Model	23
Application of the Theoretical Framework	26
III INTRODUCTION TO THE ORGANIZATIONAL ANALYSIS	29
Beyond War	31
Statement of Purpose Additional Organizational Material	
Center for U.S.-U.S.S.R. Initiatives (CUUI)	34
Statement of Purpose Additional Organizational Material	
Citizen Diplomacy	36
Statement of Purpose Additional Organizational Material	

CHAPTER

PAGE

Direct Connection	40
Statement of Purpose	
Additional Organizational Material	
Fellowship of Reconciliation (FOR) . . .	42
Statement of Purpose	
Additional Organizational Material	
The Friendship Force	47
Statement of Purpose	
Additional Organizational Material	
Peace Links	49
Statement of Purpose	
Additional Organizational Material	
Project Raft	54
Statement of Purpose	
Additional Organizational Material	
World Peace Camp	57
Statement of Purpose	
Additional Organizational Material	
IV DISCUSSION OF THE ORGANIZATIONAL ANALYSIS . .	61
Discussion of Emphases and Contributions	
of Selected Peace Organizations . . .	63
Limitations of the Research	68
Implications for Further Research	69
Implications for Intercultural	
Training	72
World Peace Camp	
Peace Links	
Center for U.S.-U.S.S.R. Initiatives	
(CUUI)	

V CONCLUSION	82
------------------------	----

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	86
---------------------------------	----

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The United States and the Soviet Union have been engaged in a political, ideological power struggle for many decades. This struggle has been named "The Cold War," whereby each country has occupied a separate, seemingly opposite, political camp. Stein (1987) suggests that both the U.S. and Soviet Union have had an investment in maintaining the chasm:

We who would pursue peace must understand how all warriors decry bloodshed while courting and indulging it, and how the pursuit of war most often underlies (and undermines) the official pursuit of peace. To achieve peace we should pursue an understanding of why international hatred feels so compelling. Otherwise, those who "fight for peace" . . . will have as their historic adversary those compatriots who are fiercely nationalistic and militaristic, just as the larger nation has identified its current historic enemy the U.S.S.R. It is truly difficult to pursue peace without fighting someone (p. 190).

Although Soviets and U.S. Americans have a long history of hostility and contempt, tension between the two nations has been tempered by Gorbachev's presence in the Soviet Union. He has proposed a plan of glasnost, which literally means "openness" in Russian. Journalist Trewhitt (1988) quotes a statement made by Gorbachev in 1987:

Today further world progress is only possible through a search for universal human consensus as we move forward to a new world order. . . . Efforts to solve

global problems require a new . . . quality of interaction, regardless of ideological or other differences (p. 20).

Chaze (1987) identified the following changes in Gorbachev's vision of a new world order: streamlining bureaucracy, reducing state ministries' power, delegating more autonomy, and promoting initiative in plants and factories, as well as encouraging small private enterprises (pp. 39-40). The extent to which Gorbachev's novel approach to governing the Soviet Union will have a long-lasting effect upon U.S.-Soviet relations remains to be seen.

At the present time, it is evident that the nuclear warheads which have accumulated in both U.S. and Soviet stockpiles over the last several decades hold undeniable destructive power. Rapoport (1986) notes:

Extinction in the literal sense has now become a starkly visible prospect. Only a small fraction of the warheads piled up by the superpowers, if exploded over cities, will produce enough smoke to insulate our planet from the rays of the sun, and to usher in the so-called nuclear winter (p. 5).

The amount of money devoted to these warheads is staggering. According to The Defense Monitor (1988), the Reagan administration spent a total of 2.2 trillion dollars on the military during 1988 (p. 7). This same publication discloses that the U.S. can explode more than 16,000 nuclear weapons on the Soviet Union, while the Soviets can explode over 11,000 nuclear weapons on the U.S. (p. 1).

This vast collection of nuclear warheads in both the U.S. and Soviet Union holds enough capacity to achieve

overkill of the planet. Zuckerman (1987) points to this fact in exploring Gorbachev's new policy of glasnost:

Mikhail Gorbachev is changing the perception of the Soviet Union that has dominated for four decades by the enmities of the cold war. Given our capacity to destroy one another, war has been unthinkable; given our fear and mutual mistrust, peace has been unattainable (p. 57),

Some Americans have responded to the introduction of glasnost favorably, with the hope that Gorbachev may usher in the beginning of the end of the cold war. In a publication produced by The Institute for Soviet-American Relations, Surviving Together: A Journal on Soviet-American Relations (1988), optimism is noted with regard to U.S.-Soviet relations:

. . . the signature of an accord on elimination of medium and shorter-range nuclear missiles in 1987 has created a more favorable environment for relations between the two governments and for the contacts and cooperation that are expected to ensue. If this course is maintained, U.S.-Soviet exchanges and cooperation will enter a new era in 1988, thirty years after they began. In this new climate for exchanges, the number of Soviet citizens traveling to the United States is expected to rise dramatically (p. viii).

This same publication notes the Reagan-Gorbachev Summit in 1985, which included the signing of an accord which would increase people-to-people contacts in the private sector (p. 4).

In response to the increasing opportunity for Soviet-American contact created by meetings between Soviet and American leaders, individuals in the U.S. have begun organizing groups which promote face-to-face contact between U.S. and Soviet citizens. The intent of these grassroots efforts

is to foster friendly relations with the Soviets, to break down barriers, and to reshape our relationship from one characterized by tension to one characterized by the openness which glasnost promises to foster.

In examining cooperation, Schleicher (1982) asserts:

No one society would long exist if individuals and groups could not agree on anything and were always in perpetual conflict. On the other hand, it is debatable whether progress would be as rapid or life as interesting if all were in complete agreement (p. 11).

Schleicher asserts that cooperation and opposition in a given social collective, needs to be at a point of balance. The United States and the Soviet Union appear to have lost this point of balance based upon a quantitative analysis of the number of nuclear warheads both countries have accumulated.

However, from the perspective of selected peace organizations which sponsor face-to-face contact between U.S. and Soviet citizens, such contact holds potential for promoting more harmonious relations between the U.S. and Soviet Union. The rhetorical assumptions of these organizations, as presented in their literature/brochures/pamphlets, within a difference-based intercultural perspective, constitutes the research focus of this thesis.

SCOPE OF THE RESEARCH

This thesis focuses upon U.S. peace organizations which sponsor contact between U.S. and Soviet citizens as a means of promoting peace between the U.S. and Soviet Union.

Brislin (1981) has noted the increase of face-to-face contact between individuals of cultural backgrounds, on a global scale. He asserts that for some individuals, this increased contact may not be preferred. However, due to technology, the media, and political factors, the increase is unavoidable (p. 1). The organizations which are included in this study acknowledge the need for a new vision of U.S.-Soviet relations, one which includes the recognition that through actual face-to-face contact it is possible to affect the historical tension which has existed between the U.S. and Soviet Union for decades.

Each organization takes a different approach to promoting this new vision of world order, and differences may exist in both the underlying philosophy of the organization, as well as in the more practical aspects of their programs (i.e., length of stay, whether or not Soviet citizens are brought to the U.S.). The binding commonality in all of the organizations is an intention of melting the cold war via face-to-face contact. Peace organizations chosen for inclusion in this study were analyzed within the theoretical framework of intercultural communication. This framework is defined and described in the section pertaining to the definition of terms.

RATIONALE FOR THE RESEARCH

U.S.-Soviet relations have a definite global effect. If these two superpowers are able to maintain stable

coexistence, the world may be saved from experiencing yet another Hiroshima, the consequences of which may be global annihilation. The cold war is showing signs of melting, marked by Gorbachev's political and economic reform. In an excerpt from his December 7, 1988 speech at the U.N., Gorbachev is quoted as saying:

It is obvious, in particular, that force or the threat of force can not longer be an instrument of foreign policy. This applies above all to nuclear arms, but not only to nuclear arms. . . . We are not abandoning our convictions, our philosophy, our traditions. But neither do we intend to be hemmed in by our values (Surviving Together, 1989, p. 2).

Thus, it is important to explore the impact of face-to-face contact between Soviets and Americans, and how such contact affects the balance of both sustaining one's traditions, and yet not being constrained by those very traditions.

Next, due to the largely unexplored link between peace research and intercultural communication, implications for further research are indicated. The perspective of intercultural communication posits that "reality" is relative to a specific culture, and thus, based upon the definition of culture, a difference-based approach to intercultural interchange is vital. Luce and Smith (1987) note the present state of global affairs and the importance of cross-cultural literacy:

Surely we have arrived at a time of more profound global consciousness raising in this country. Today an enlightened policy for international cooperation demands not only international negotiations and formal treaties; it requires the public's comprehensive awareness of and empathy for the variables of national

cultures as they move toward a single unitary global economy (pp. 3-4).

Gurtov (1988) confirms the importance of moving toward an expanded global consciousness, one which necessarily includes an examination of the war system, and not simply one country's militaristic power:

. . . alternatives to the arms race must address insecurity at several levels, including people's deep pessimism and fear that to reduce arms will invite attack, mistrust between national leaderships built partly on long-standing grievances . . . (p. 183).

The United States and Soviet Union have a history of long-standing grievances. This thesis will include an examination of one manner in which these grievances are being addressed--through face-to-face contact between American and Soviet citizens. This approach to U.S.-Soviet contact addresses the human, as opposed to the purely political, aspects of U.S.-Soviet conflict.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

The focus of this thesis is upon a difference-based approach to intercultural communication, and how this approach is reflected in U.S.-Soviet individual contact. Thus, the definition of terms necessarily excludes the political and economic factors which impact U.S.-Soviet relations.

Organizations which are presently involved in the peace movement may take many different approaches toward achieving their goal of world peace:

1. peace through deterrence of "strength" reflected in the current nuclear arms race;

2. peace through disarmament, which is a focus upon weapon reduction, and may or may not include an attempt to include attitudinal change to achieve such reduction; and

3. peace through attitudinal change, which includes human beings and their relationships.

J. B. Nielsen in a 1985 speech at the International People's College in Denmark, cites international youth exchange programs, home-stays, and intercultural activities as being indicative of this third approach to peacemaking. The scope of this research will only include those organizations which have an interest in shifting attitudes through U.S.-Soviet contact.

The third approach--that of actual contact between individuals of varying cultures--is directly linked with the field of intercultural communication. The following definitions clarify the basic precepts of intercultural communication, as well as concepts which are used to analyze peace organizations which are discussed in this thesis.

Samovar and Porter (1988) define culture as:

. . . the deposit of knowledge experiences, beliefs, values, attitudes, meanings, hierarchies, religion, timing, roles, spatial relations, concepts of the universe and material objects and possessions acquired by a large group of people in the course of generations through individual and group striving (p. 19).

Based upon this definition, each culture may vary with regard to those areas and therefore it is not possible to posit a "universal" cultural reality.

Intercultural communication then, is viewed by Samovar and Porter (1988) as "cultural variance in the perception of social objects and events" (p. 9). That is, when two individuals of different cultures meet in a face-to-face encounter, the communication transaction will be characterized by different perceptions of "reality."

Although these varying perceptions of "reality" may seem illogical to an individual from a different culture, the definition of intercultural communication suggests that there is no single "right" way to view the world.

Cultural relativity then, may be viewed as the existence of multiple perspectives, each inherently "logical" and expressed by individual cultures. Samovar and Porter (1988) note:

We have discussed eight cultural variables that are major sources of communication difficulty: attitudes, social organization, patterns of thought, roles and role expectations, language, space, time and nonverbal expression. Although they were discussed in isolation, we cannot allow ourselves to conclude that they are unrelated. They are all related in a matrix of cultural complexities (p. 23).

In order to more fully enter another person's perceptual world, Samovar and Porter confirm the importance of each party's willingness to view the other's world from a position of ethnorelativism, as opposed to a position of ethnocentrism.

Ethnocentrism is defined as "a tendency to view people unconsciously using our own group and our own customs as the standard for all judgments. We place ourselves, our racial

social, or ethnic group, at the center of the universe and rate all others accordingly" (Samovar and Porter, 1988, p. 10).

Ethnorelativism is the supposition that reality is a socially construed phenomenon, and therefore cultures are neither good nor bad, simply different.

Samovar and Porter (1988) note the difficulty which an ethnocentric perspective creates in international relations: "When a boundary, even a state or local line, is present, our allegiance to one group restricts our ability to accept another or to view them favorably" (p. 10).

A difference-based approach to intercultural communication indicates the perspective that each culture is inherently unique, valid, and "logical," it is therefore possible to view cultural difference in a favorable light, and such differences need to be actively sought in cross-cultural contact. The purpose of this thesis was to explore the relative degrees of a difference-based approach which the pamphlets/brochures/articles of selected U.S. peace organizations exhibited.

LITERATURE REVIEW

This literature review includes current research on peace, which deals with human communication as a vehicle for promoting friendly contact between hostile countries. Material which deals either with deterrence (peace through comparable military technology) or peace through disarmament

have not been included, for the reasons cited when defining terms. Material which presents the social and cultural aspects of peace has been included, as these aspects are important to examining the broader context in which human communication takes place.

Extensive literature from political science and anthropology has been excluded from the review, due to a general focus upon material which exists outside of a face-to-face examination of human communication. Literature from the intercultural communication field which deals specifically with U.S.-Soviet relations is sparse. Current literature appears to present more general trends in the intercultural field and/or studies which are culture-specific, but which do not include the cultures of the United States and the Soviet Union.

The tentative link between difference-based intercultural material and current peace research is noted by Broome (1986) who points out that although a wealth of books exists on war and peace issues, most of them focus on political organizations or advocating specific philosophical points of view. Few books deal with the underlying psychosocial principles of "making peace."

The intercultural communication field offers a framework with which to view the making of peace. This framework is founded on the principle of social relativity, that cultures are comprised of very different attitudes, belief systems, and value orientations. "Truth," then, cannot be

conceived of as an absolute, objectified reality. Berger and Luckman (1967) state:

What is "real" to a Tibetan monk may not be "real" to an American businessman. The "knowledge" of the criminal differs from the "knowledge" of the criminologist. It follows that specific agglomerations of "reality" and "knowledge" pertain to specific social contexts . . . (p. 3).

Larsen (1983) notes that at this time in history, it is especially important that we learn to be more flexible in our view of difference, that we begin to realize that no one culture has a monopoly on "truth." He cites moral absolutism, closed-mindedness, and rigid thinking as being the very processes which must be challenged at this precarious point in global affairs.

Johnson (1986) believes that it is not only vital that we examine our assumptions about universal realities, but that we also examine our use of language in describing our individual perceptions. He notes:

To survive in the twenty-first century, we will need new technologies to deal with an array of new challenges. . . . But we will also need new thinking skills, unshackled from primitive assumptions woven into the structure of our language. . . . We do not reduce conflicts, tensions, misunderstandings or disagreements by talking in absolutes (p. 359).

Scholars and researchers in the field of General Semantics are concerned with examining the misunderstandings and dangers which exist when language is no longer viewed as a symbolic process, but rather, a way in which to view the world in terms of absolute reality. Similarly, there exists potential for grave misunderstanding when individuals in two

different cultures come to believe that their cultural reality is not symbolic, but rather, reflects an absolute, universal reality.

Hayakawa (1983) points out that language can never represent reality absolutely or directly and the "word 'communist' is an abstraction. The individual it stands for is an everchanging process, never the same from moment to moment" (p. 377). That is, a "capitalist," or a "communist" actually refers to a living, breathing being, not an objectified category.

In order to be aware of the way in which one uses language to describe the world, the individual enters into a symbolic limbo, whereby one's own semantic descriptions only partially capture the world "as it is." Korzybski (1948), famous for his rigorous examination of the false objectification of language, notes the difficulty in seeing the world as an everchanging process:

As words are not the things we are talking about, the only possible link between the objective world and the verbal world is structural. . . . If the two structures are not similar, then our predictions are not verified--we do not "know," we do not "understand." . . . we do not know what to do to adjust ourselves (p. 259).

Rapoport (1986) believes that in spite of the discomfort which arises from "not knowing" and "not understanding," it is important to heighten our awareness of how we use language to describe our experiences. He notes:

One concern of general semantics has been personal mental hygiene attained through the practice of language hygiene. . . . Another has been the improvement

of communication, again by inculcating awareness of how language tends to do our thinking for us, of how to reach other people by encouraging them to reach us, of how to be a better listener, and so on (p. 13).

Rapoport makes two assertions concerning the use of language to describe the world: (1) we need to raise our awareness of the limitations of language as a symbolic representation of our experience, and (2) we need to understand different perceptions of others. For example, it may be taken for granted that the notion of "peace" is a universal perception.

If it is true that reality and peace are processual, socially constructed phenomena, then it follows that war is a socially constructed phenomenon. Eckhardt (1988) challenges the perception that war is inevitable, and instead presents the possibility that war is a manifestation of our human perception, our "way of seeing." He writes:

It may well be that the problem of war is primarily a problem of perception. That is to say that conflicts, violence and war may all be functions not concerning differences among the facts themselves, but rather, concerning different perceptions of the facts. . . . Instead of looking for explanations and evaluations of human perceptions, what we may need is a theory of relative facts, a theory of social relativity (p. 184).

Eckhardt advocates an approach which includes an explicit, in-depth examination of relative experience, which may be what Rapoport refers to as mental hygiene, via language hygiene. Such an approach is absolutely necessary in examining the rich diversity which varying cultures embody.

In keeping with the concept of cultural relativity, Lopez (1985) believes that a systematic study of peace must include an in-depth examination of the roots of conflict between cultures. That is, integrating a difference-based approach must become a focus of peace research, rather than solely focusing on the actions of the leaders of the United States and Soviet Union.

One of the most difficult challenges of this difference-based approach is that, many times, when an individual encounters difference in a nonnative culture, the people in the culture are labeled bad or evil. This negative labeling is an example of an ethnocentric response to a different social construction of reality. Acknowledging differences can be enormously unsettling and threatening, as human beings need to have a certain degree of order and predictability in their environment. Singer (1987) notes the following with regard to the perspective of "us" versus "them":

Virtually every group perceives itself (and members of the group) as being essentially "good" "We" may recognize individual differences among ourselves and admit that not all of us are perfect, but by and large we consider ourselves trustworthy, loyal, helpful, friendly, courteous, kind, obedient, cheerful, thrifty, brave, clean and reverent. . . . Whoever we are, we tend to trust one of us more than we trust one of "them" (p. 170).

Lieberman, Kosokoff, and Kosokoff (1988) note that a collectively agreed-upon social construction of reality constitutes what may be perceived as universal "common sense." They note:

What appears to be common about common sense is that within any given culture, certain behaviors make (cultural) sense, whether or not they appear reasonable to an outsider. . . . As a result, the behavior chosen by each individual is not based upon "common sense," but rather upon "cultural perception," which is itself a subjective examination of an event (p. 16).

In examining international relations between the U.S. and Soviet Union, it becomes apparent that both countries have historically believed that the other lacked "common sense." When two cultures share a similar vision of such "objective" rationality, they are more likely to hold perceptions of affinity and goodwill.

Tims and Miller (1986) conducted a study of the determinants of attitudes toward foreign countries and concluded that perceived similarity indeed increases such feelings of goodwill between individuals of different nations. They note the following:

A fundamental issue in study of public opinion about international affairs is how the feeling of affinity for foreign countries develops and persists. Ninic and Russett . . . have suggested that perceptions of cultural similarity and perceptions of shared economic and security interests are strong determinants of attitudes towards foreign countries. Their argument is based on the notion that individuals strive for congruity between these perceived commonalities and their feelings of affinity (p. 471).

Therefore, perceived similarity equals predictability. Predictability equals a certain measure of perceived control, whereby an individual has a solid sense of the world "as it is." Control equals comfort and a sense of psychological survival. However, with regard to our Soviet neighbors, we are not apt to find a social construction of reality which mirrors the U.S. construction of reality.

For example, Brislin (1981) notes that Americans and Soviets have very different negotiation styles. The Soviets tend toward an axiomatic-deductive style.

In their thinking, people move from a general principle to particulars which can be easily deduced. . . . One reason for continual difficulties in negotiations between the U.S. and Soviet Union is that the general principles are so different: capitalism vs. communism, or decentralized vs. centralized governmental decision making. Further, the concept of "compromise" has a very negative connotation in the Russian language (p. 153).

Negotiation style is just one piece of the larger Soviet culture, one area where differences may exist between Soviets and Americans. Face-to-face contact is one way to engage more directly with Soviet culture, a medium which is not regulated by the media or some other removed vehicle of intercultural education. Direct contact between individuals of different cultures is a potent way to facilitate a more complete understanding of the possibilities for cultural diversity.

Brislin (1981) believes that with the increase of contact between people of different cultures during recent years, one type of intergroup contact may be useful in analyzing other types (p. 2). That is, one may be a scholar, a student, or a business person in a nonnative country, and there may be similar experiences which all three types of sojourners experience in coming in contact with a new culture.

It has only been in the last five to ten years that the effort to meet Soviet citizens face-to-face has become a

focus of organizations concerned with promoting peace.

Surviving Together: A Journal of Soviet-American Relations, published by The Institute for Soviet-American Relations, points to this increased interaction between Soviets and Americans:

Glasnost and the revolution of perestroika have already created dramatic changes in Soviet society; there seems to be a new tolerance of religion and political pluralism as unofficial groups are being allowed to meet . . . more people are being allowed to emigrate; Americans are more frequently allowed to stay in Soviet homes and Soviets in U.S. homes; and Soviet young people are being allowed study in the U.S. (1987, p. 1).

With the increased contact between Soviets and Americans, an opportunity exists for increasing understanding of the ways in which these two cultures organize reality differently. From an intercultural perspective, no two cultures hold identical realities, and thus it is important for Americans and Soviets to approach face-to-face contact with an awareness of their cultural differences.

Due to this difference-based approach, the field of intercultural communication offers a valuable addition to the current research in peace studies, action, and education. This thesis will begin to bring together current intercultural literature and material associated solely with peace research and education. Clearly, there needs to be more development in both peace research and intercultural communication which incorporates a difference-based approach and examines the exchange of U.S.-Soviet cultures on the basis of face-to-face contact.

The research questions have been formulated as a basis for discussion and exploration of the underlying assumptions of selected peace organizations, with specific regard to a difference-based approach to intercultural communication. The underlying assumptions have been examined with regard to the written content of each organization's literature, pamphlets, and/or brochures.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. To what extent do the statements of purpose of selected U.S. peace organizations reflect a difference-based approach in both organizational objectives and in relationship to the Soviet Union?
2. To what extent does additional organizational material--articles, newsletters, program descriptions--reflect a difference-based approach to Soviet culture? How is this approach presented in the rhetorical content of the literature?
3. To what extent do the organizations examined use a difference-based approach to U.S.-Soviet contact in programs/workshops/activities?
 - a. In what ways, if any, do these programs/workshops/activities reflect American values, beliefs, and norms?

CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

The research contained in this thesis explores and describes the underlying rhetorical assumptions of selected U.S. peace organizations, with regard to a difference-based approach to communication between Americans and Soviets. The grassroots peace movement has only gained momentum in the last decade, and is therefore a relatively new area of peace activism. There has been little published literature on the relationship between intercultural communication and U.S.-Soviet contact.

The thesis describes and explores the documents of selected U.S. peace organizations, a source of information which Bailey (1982) claims has been neglected by some researchers (p. 301). The documents, in this case, referred to solicited pamphlets/brochures/letters which each organization published for public use. Babbie (1983) suggests that one approach to social science research is conducted "to explore a topic, to provide a beginning familiarity with that topic. This purpose is typical . . . when the subject of study is itself relatively new and unstudied" (p. 72). Thus, this study is exploratory in nature, in that it describes U.S. peace organizations presently sponsoring programs with Soviet-American contact, a relatively new and

unstudied area. The names of the organizations were acquired through a publication entitled Surviving Together: A Journal of Soviet-American Relations, published by The Institute for Soviet-American Relations. The publication includes a broad overview of diverse organizations and individuals involved in U.S.-Soviet contact, and does not prescribe to any particular philosophy or ideological base. Listed organizations in the publications represented a thorough, broad sample of U.S. organizations involved in promoting U.S.-Soviet contact.

This researcher telephoned approximately 15 organizations requesting information, and wrote to approximately 13 additional organizations. All organizations contacted were listed as resources in the previously mentioned publication. The following organizations responded to either the telephone or mail contact:

1. American Collegiate Consortium for East-West Cultural and Academic Exchange
2. Beyond War
3. Center for Defense Information
4. Center for U.S.-U.S.S.R. Initiatives
5. Citizen Diplomacy
6. Citizen Exchange Council
7. Direct Connection
8. Educators for Social Responsibility
9. Fellowship of Reconciliation
10. The Friendship Force
11. Grandmothers for Peace

12. Institute for Soviet-American Relations
13. International Camp Counselor Program Abroad
14. International Peace Academy
15. The Kettering Foundation
16. Peace Links
17. Project Raft
18. State University of New York
19. World Peace Camp

This researcher used the following criterion in choosing specific organizations in this study.

1. The organization included Soviet-American face-to-face contact as a major part of its selected activities and organizational structure.

2. The organization had a specific ideological premise in promoting such contact, as was expressed and defined in its solicited literature/pamphlets/brochures.

3. The organization defined itself as a "peace organization," that is, intentionally structured Soviet-American contact as a way to affect global affairs.

Based upon the completeness and depth of the written material sent from these organizations, this researcher chose the following organizations for inclusion in this study. Due to the fact that all but two of these organizations--Beyond War and Fellowship of Reconciliation--are primarily based in states other than Oregon, the researcher relied upon written material for understanding of each organizations' philosophy

and activism. The following organizations were examined in this study:

1. Beyond War
2. Center for U.S.-U.S.S.R. Initiatives
3. Citizen Diplomacy
4. Direct Connection
5. Fellowship of Reconciliation
6. The Friendship Force
7. Peace Links
8. Project Raft
9. The World Peace Camp

Each of the organizations listed above sent information regarding their programs, ranging from an extensive explanation of adjunct newsletters/publications, to a brief cover letter describing their activities.

Rhetorical analysis was conducted with regard to organizational statements of purpose, and additional material, in order to determine the relative degree of intercultural sensitivity which each organization presented. The language in each publication was analyzed from an intercultural communication perspective, using the fundamental perspective of a difference-based approach to such communication.

DESCRIPTION OF THE DEVELOPMENTAL MODEL

Textual analysis of organizational material included an exploration of the written content, based on its

difference-based orientation, using the following theoretical framework.

The model used for analysis in this study was developed by Bennett (1986). The model is processual in nature, and outlines a continuum of intercultural sensitivity, based on the experience of intercultural difference. Bennett's purpose in presenting the model is to provide a viable tool with which to explore the phenomenological experience of the learner. The model is not intended as a specific teaching method or strategy (p. 186). In examining the utility of a phenomenological approach, Casmir (1983) states:

The fundamental methodological principle of phenomenology is that no opinion can be accepted as philosophical unless it has been adequately established by observation of what is seen as itself . . . phenomenology is of concern to us because its central emphasis is communion (p. 312).

Bennett's model has an essential link to the communication experience of the learner, namely in defining degrees of intercultural sensitivity which an individual may hold in encountering difference in face-to-face contact. In describing the model, Bennett (1986) writes:

A developmental model is ideally based upon a key organizing concept, which must be internalized for development to occur. In the case of intercultural sensitivity, this concept is difference--that cultures differ fundamentally in the way they create and maintain world views (p. 1).

The model consists of the following six identified stages.

1. Denial of difference: at this stage, one's own view rests in the center of the universe. The "issue" of difference is not a relevant one to an individual at this stage.

2. Defense against difference: at this stage, a hostile reaction results from confrontation of difference. The expression of hostility may manifest in negative stereotyping and/or presumed cultural superiority of one's own cultural background. Both Defense and Denial represent overt expressions of the position of assumed cultural superiority.

3. Minimization of difference: at this stage, difference may be acknowledged, but the core theme is "we may have differences, but they are trivial compared to our commonalities." At this stage of Minimization, there are two assumptions of commonality which may be made: (1) physical universalism, which posits that our behavior is innate, bound by similar physical laws, and (2) Minimization may occur through transcendent universalism. Statements such as, "We are all one," or "We are all in the world to just be ourselves," are indicators of culturally-formed perceptions, applied on a universal scale.

Bennett (1986) comments on the Minimization phase:

In both forms of minimization, cultural difference is recognized and tolerated to some degree. However, such difference is seen as either superficial or even obstructive to the pursuit of communication. . . . While this stage is the most sensitive of the ethnocentric positions, it cannot fulfill the potential for intercultural understanding often claimed for it by its adherents (p. 184).

The shift from Minimization to the next stage, that of Acceptance, marks a paradigmatic shift from ethnocentrism to a position of ethnorelativism.

4. Acceptance of difference: at this stage, difference is acknowledged and respected. It is even preferred. There are no evaluations of difference, whether it exists on a behavioral level (nonverbal communication), or on a level of accepting underlying cultural value difference. At this stage, individuals are able to move from seeing culture as a "thing" to viewing it as a changing, growing process.

5. Adaptation: at this stage, empathic interchange between individuals of different cultures becomes possible. Empathy involves the assumption of difference, of being able to view the world as another views the world. This may manifest itself in either an intellectual understanding of a different view, or behavioral expression of appropriateness in a nonnative culture.

6. Integration of difference: Bennett describes this phase in the following manner:

The integration of difference is the application of ethnorelativism to one's own identity. At this stage of integration, the lack of any absolute cultural identification can be used for constructive purposes. . . . As the culmination of intercultural sensitivity, the stage of integration suggests a person who experiences differences as an essential, joyful aspect of all life (1986, p. 186).

APPLICATION OF THE THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Textual material was analyzed in order to determine the emphases of intercultural sensitivity, as presented by selected peace organizations. Organizational literature was analyzed for the presence of Minimization, Acceptance,

Adaptation, or Integration of difference. This researcher assumed that none of the chosen organizations would present Denial and/or Defense of difference. All the organizations are actively engaged in promoting more "peaceful" relations between Americans and Soviets, a position which assumes neither complete ignorance of different cultures (Denial), nor assertion of hostility toward perceived differences (Defense).

Rhetorical indicators of Minimization include: absolutist language when referring to the world and/or Soviet culture--"We are all one," "We all want peace," "The Soviets love their children just like we do," "We are all children of God." Another indicator of Minimization includes language which fuses cultural boundaries into one value system--"Honesty is the way to peace," "If we are just ourselves, we will get along," "If we just accept people the way they are, we will achieve world peace."

Indications of Acceptance, Adaptation, or Integration of difference include a process-orientation to the Soviets' way of valuing, perceiving, and interpreting their reality, and programs which included an active embrace of conflict between Soviets and Americans as a source of richness and potential growth.

Due to the descriptive nature of the model, and its absence of pedagogical prescriptions, it acts as an effective tool in examining and describing the perspectives of those organizations chosen for inclusion in this study. The

following chapter contains the analysis of selected peace organizations, and the rhetorical indications of Minimization, Acceptance, Adaptation, and Integration of a difference-based approach to U.S.-Soviet contact.

CHAPTER III

INTRODUCTION TO THE ORGANIZATIONAL ANALYSIS

Nine organizations were included in this study. Each organization was analyzed within the framework of intercultural communication, using Bennett's (1986) model as a tool of analysis.

The statement of purpose which each of the nine organizations asserts was rhetorically examined in regard to indications of Minimization and Acceptance of intercultural difference. Emphasis was placed on degrees of such indications, rather than rigid definitions of these two positions of intercultural sensitivity. Bennett noted that the shift from Minimization to Acceptance of difference marks a shift from ethnocentrism to ethnorelativism, and is therefore a key consideration in analyzing each organization. Minimization of difference is marked by the following components:

1. the trivialization of difference, whereby differences are seen as insignificant when compared with perceived cultural similarity. The belief in a universal notion of "friendship," or "love" is one such example of the trivialization of intercultural difference;

2. transcendent universalism, whereby all human beings are affected by one or more transcendent principles, such as "We are all God's children," or "We all want love and truth";

3. physical universalism, whereby all humans are thought to share an innate, common pattern of behavior. An individual who takes this position believes that an understanding of such patterns will insure effective communication.

Acceptance of intercultural difference is marked by the following elements:

1. an acceptance of diversity as being a source of rich information concerning different realities of varying cultures. The individual who accepts difference perceives conflict as a potential source of creative growth;

2. the realization that people do not have values. People value. Bennett notes that when an individual makes a shift from Minimization of difference to Acceptance of difference, there is also the understanding that culture is not a "thing," not an object. In this way, "people are seen as dynamic co-creators of their realities" (1986, p. 185). This processual understanding of culture is fundamental in making the shift from an ethnocentric position to an ethno-relativistic one.

Following the analysis of each organizational statement of purpose, additional organizational material was analyzed, in order to determine Minimization and/or Acceptance of difference.

Finally, where applicable, organizations' use of special workshops/programs/games was also examined.

Bennett's model represents a continuum of intercultural sensitivity, with specifically defined boundaries which

differentiate one point on the continuum from the next. In practice, it is conceivable that one or more organizations may fall within a range of explicit Minimization of intercultural difference, to explicit Acceptance of intercultural difference. Some organizations may present Minimization of intercultural difference in one section of their literature, while presenting Acceptance in a different section. It is useful to think in terms of degrees of intercultural sensitivity, rather than rigidly bound distinctions between such positions. The ensuing analysis allows for flexibility with regard to these boundaries. The organizations examined are:

1. Beyond War
2. Center for U.S.-U.S.S.R. Initiatives (CUUI)
3. Citizen Diplomacy
4. Direct Connection
5. Fellowship of Reconciliation (FOR)
6. The Friendship Force
7. Peace Links
8. Project Raft
9. World Peace Camp

BEYOND WAR

Statement of Purpose

1 The goal of Beyond War has not changed; it is still to
 2 build a world in which the way people think and act is
 3 based on the reality that "We are One" . . . to fulfill
 4 the purpose and vision upon which this nation was
 5 founded, we must change our understanding of the prin-
 6 ciple, "Out of Many, One," to include the whole earth
 7 and all life. Power comes from individuals who are

8 connected to universal principles and who are working
 9 together to build new agreements. The power of this
 10 nation has come from the involvement of the people in
 11 the unfolding of our founding principles. We have
 12 always agreed that such involvement is not the exclu-
 13 sive right of the elite. Truth is self-evident; it is
 14 available to all (from a Beyond War introductory bro-
 chure).

Beyond War's statement of purpose contains language indicative of a position of the Minimization of intercultural difference. The statement "We are One" (line 3) correlates with Bennett's description of transcendent principles typical of a position of Minimization. Additionally, Beyond War suggests that individuals be guided by universal principles (lines 7,8) which assumes a position that such principles may be applied identically to all cultures. While Beyond War does acknowledge that out of "Many" emerges "One" (line 6), the statement of purpose does not suggest that this organization clearly embraces "Many" as cultures guided by varying "universal principles."

Additional Organizational Material

Beyond War's material contains both indications of Minimization of intercultural difference, and the potential for Acceptance of such difference. This potential is demonstrated in the following statements:

It may well be that we never eliminate conflict between individuals or nations However, an overriding identification with the whole earth will enable us to restore conflicts by discovering solutions that befit all. Diversity will no longer be a cause of war. When we change our mode of thinking, diverse points of view will become a source of creative solutions (from a Beyond War introductory brochure).

The last statement, that of diverse points of view being a source of creative solutions, reflects a potential position of Acceptance of difference. The statements suggest that the very points of contention and tension, such as those which have existed between Americans and Soviets, hold the capacity for increasing our creative potential as human beings. As such, diversity might even be preferred, as Bennett has suggested in the examination of Acceptance of difference.

Beyond War also seeks to examine "human modes of thinking," thereby suggesting that individuals in this organization recognize to some degree that "reality" is not an objectified truth, but an experience which has arisen out of our ways of perceiving reality.

Bennett suggests that in order to move toward an ethno-relativistic Acceptance of intercultural difference, one must be willing to embrace diversity, as well as to view culture as socially construed: "The . . . construal of cultural relativity as consensual and mutable is essential to ethno-relativism and necessary for further development of intercultural sensitivity" (1986, p. 185).

In view of Bennett's developmental model and its description of different phases of intercultural sensitivity, it appears that Beyond War's literature contains rhetorical/semantic indications which suggest both Minimization and potential Acceptance of difference.

CENTER FOR U.S.-U.S.S.R. INITIATIVES (CUUI)

Statement of Purpose

1 CUUI fosters broad citizen participation in both
2 countries, believing that governments alone cannot
3 provide the leadership needed to bring about coopera-
4 tion between the two nations. Our programs are
5 designed to dispel stereotypes, encourage citizen par-
6 ticipation, and create projects involving Soviet and
7 American citizens (from a CUUI introductory letter
and explanation).

CUUI's statement of purpose does not contain explicit rhetorical markers which might indicate either Minimization and/or Acceptance of difference. While its programs "are designed to dispel stereotypes" (lines 4,5), the specific strategy in order to achieve this change of perception is not clearly presented in the statement of purpose. Further analysis of additional organizational material presents a position of Minimization of intercultural difference.

Additional Organizational
Material

CUUI's motto is "When the people lead, eventually the leaders will follow." The organization appears to place a strong emphasis upon the notion of citizen diplomacy in the myriad of activities it sponsors. In defining citizen diplomacy, one article reads:

. . . [citizen diplomacy] is going to the USSR to "experience" the Soviet people, to learn first-hand how they live and what they think. It is listening with new ears, seeing with new eyes. It is . . . daring to drop our unconscious stereotypes and trying to see the Soviets as they see themselves (CUUI, 1988-89, p. 1).

Although this statement seems to suggest an intention of empathizing with the Soviets, that is, seeing the Soviet world from Soviet eyes, CUUI literature consistently universalizes the concept of "friendship." This universalization seems to be the main emphasis in the literature, thereby suggesting that the intention for empathy is contradicted with a Minimization of the possibilities for a culturally-relative understanding of "friendship."

Most of the literature from CUUI refers to the Soviets as friends: "Celebrate May Day with Soviet Friends," "Our local friends will take you around their beautifully restored cities," "You will never forget sharing the late summer with your new Soviet friends." etc.

Barna (1976) notes the following regarding the false universalization of "friendship":

There are many viewpoints regarding the practice of intercultural communication, but a familiar one is that "people are people," basically pretty much alike; therefore increased interaction through travel, student exchange programs, and other such ventures should result in more understanding between nations. Others take quite a difference view . . . they do not equate contact with communication, do not believe that the simple experience of talking with someone insures a successful transfer of meanings and feelings (p. 291).

Although CUUI's literature does not explicitly state "we are all alike underneath," their emphasis upon making Soviet friends, in a relatively short period of time, suggests an emphasis on a U.S. American perception of friendship. Gudykunst and Kim (1984) note the following with regard to the differences between American and Soviet perceptions of "friendship":

Because their friendships are usually formed around an activity, North Americans tend to form friendships that are not as "deep" as friendships in some other cultures. For example, Russians form deep bonds with others, and once such a bond is formed they feel an obligation of almost constant companionship, and the rejection of any reticence or secretiveness among friends. Russians . . . tend to embrace the whole person rather than selected parts of the person, as is often the case in North American . . . [friendships] (p. 80).

Thus, CUUI asserts that it is possible to "make friends" with the Soviets in one or two weeks, whereas the Soviets are apt to be more cautious in proclaiming that they have indeed "befriended" their short-term guests.

Neither the structure of CUUI's programs, nor the articles which report on visits to the Soviet Union, seem to indicate crossing the paradigmatic barrier between ethnocentrism and ethnorelativism. As the statement of purpose notes, the benefit of the programs may be to encourage participants to move from Defense against difference (stereotyping) to a place of Minimization. Both of these positions reflect an ethnocentric perspective, with Minimization pointing to a higher degree of intercultural sensitivity.

CITIZEN DIPLOMACY

Statement of Purpose

1 Citizen Diplomacy is a non-profit organization dedi-
 2 cated to personal and cultural exchanges with the
 3 Soviet Union. Citizen Diplomacy promotes personal con-
 4 tacts between Americans and Soviets, art exchanges, and
 5 joint education projects. Through personal contacts
 6 and cultural appreciation, international security and
 7 understanding can be achieved. The seeds of Citizen
 8 Diplomacy were planted in 1983 when a traveler visited

9 Leningrad, as an afterthought on a Scandinavian vaca-
10 tion. It was the first day of school and he saw the
11 Russian parents bringing their children to school. He
12 was surprised to find some Russians that spoke English
13 and he was amazed that the Russians were so much like
14 us! (from a Citizen Diplomacy introductory brochure,
back page).

Citizen Diplomacy's statement of purpose contains an explicit position of Minimization of intercultural difference. This organization sponsors personal contacts, as well as other projects which aid Soviets and Americans in gaining some insight into the other culture. Citizen Diplomacy's claim that through personal contacts and cultural appreciation, international security can be achieved (lines 5,6,7) is contradicted by the following statement in which a traveler in Leningrad was "amazed that the Russians were so much like us!" (lines 13,14).

While the art projects (line 4) may serve as a vehicle for individual cultural expression of Soviets and Americans, it appears that Citizen Diplomacy places its greatest emphasis upon Minimization of intercultural difference.

Additional Organizational Material

In a brochure which contains information and a registration form for a 1989 tour to the Soviet Union, the following quotations are included:

If everyone had a friend in the Soviet Union, war would be impossible. They are beautiful people and very friendly. We have to get beyond this silly war business and get on with the serious business of life (Michael Mattock, The RAND Corp.).

The whole trip was amazing. It really put to rest a lot of misconceptions that I had about the Soviet Union. I found people with the same concerns, the same virtues and values as Americans. I made friends and I want to visit them again (Bill Matz, Architect, San Diego).

Both of these quotations, written by satisfied participants, reflect positions of the Minimization of difference.

Michael Mattock believes that friendship between Soviets and Americans is the way to avoid war. Bill Matz perceives that Soviets and Americans are essentially the same with regard to virtues and values. Both individuals place a similar emphasis upon the alleged transcendent principle of "friendship" as the basis for their positive experience in the Soviet Union. It may be assumed that these two individuals reflect the intention of Citizen Diplomacy, as their quotations have been chosen for inclusion in the organization's literature.

Within the framework of Bennett's model, the emphasis upon friendship, as the key to world peace, is misleading. What happens when my Soviet "friend" acts in a way which I find to be irrational, or inconceivable? Such an event is very likely to occur. For example, Brislin (1981) notes that the word "compromise" has a negative connotation in the Russian language. Imagine that a U.S. and Soviet citizen, two "friends," are in conflict about where to travel on a particular day. The U.S. citizen, believing in the benevolent

powers of compromise, suggests such an arrangement in order to resolve the conflict. The Soviet reacts negatively, and is perhaps insulted.

The attempt to transform enemies into "friends," who share similar virtues and values, is apt to disintegrate eventually. As Bennett notes:

The minimization of difference is most obviously indicated by statements such as "in other countries, you just have to be yourself," . . . The [former] statement betrays a belief that cultural difference is mainly superficial and that one's "basic humanity" will shine through if only one is simply sincere (1986, p. 190).

Citizen Diplomacy advocates the position that personal contact will bring about international security and understanding.

Perhaps the distinction to be made is the degree of consciousness, or awareness of social relativity, which accompanies such personal contact. Personal contact, in and of itself, is achieved through the strategic arrangements of activities which bring American and Soviet citizens together. The question is, what is the nature of the contact? What are the basic assumptions which underlie the contact? Are participants guided through a systematic structure in order to expand their understanding of cultural relativity?

Citizen Diplomacy's claim that through personal contacts and cultural appreciation, international security and understanding can be achieved, does not correlate with the elements necessary in Acceptance and appreciation of intercultural difference.

DIRECT CONNECTION

Statement of Purpose

1 Direct Connection US-USSR Youth Communications Ini-
2 tiative was founded in the spring of 1984 . . . on the
3 premise that communication is the key to survival; that
4 communication will lead to understanding and under-
5 standing eventually to peace, and that creative effec-
6 tive communication between young people . . . is espe-
7 cially critical now in the development of a new vision
8 for our species and for the planet as a whole. Direct
9 Connection's objective is nothing less than to empower
10 our children with the knowledge--born from their own
11 experience--that they are not subject to some abstract,
12 inhuman process beyond their control, but that they can
13 take part with inspiration and guidance in shaping our
14 common destiny on this threatened planet for the good
15 of all sentient beings (from a Direct Connection intro-
ductory brochure).

Direct Connection cites the process of communication as being the key to survival. The organization goes a step beyond merely naming communication as being important, and adds that communication must be "creative and effective" (lines 5,6).

The reference to empowering children with the knowledge "that they are not subject to some abstract, inhuman process beyond their control" (lines 11,12) suggests that individuals in Direct Connection recognize culture as processual, and reality as socially and culturally construed. Culture is born of human perception and human processes, and therefore children have some power in influencing these processes.

Bennett notes that the position of Acceptance of intercultural difference is one in which the individual may participate in being a "co-creator of reality." This capacity

for realization of individual power naturally follows the awareness that culture is neither objective nor stagnant.

Direct Connection's statement of purpose suggests that this organization recognizes the relative nature of reality, and therefore approaches intercultural communication from a position of Acceptance, rather than Minimization of intercultural difference. This researcher finds that there is nothing in this initial statement which suggests a contradictory message of Minimization/Acceptance of difference, and therefore Direct Connection's statement of purpose presents a relatively highly developed position of intercultural sensitivity.

Additional Organizational Material

Direct Connection cites a number of programs which are part of its vision for the future. Among these programs are: a US-USSR Youth World Service Corps which provides training and employment opportunities in social and environmental projects in both countries; US-USSR Youth Environmental Camps; and the development of a joint Soviet-American history/current events text "which honestly states both differences and agreements for use in schools in both countries" (Direct Connection, introductory brochure).

Based upon Direct Connection's statement of purpose, it would appear that the intention to develop a text for use in Soviet and American schools would include an overall Acceptance of historical/ideological differences between the U.S.

and Soviet Union, but it is not clear whether the underlying cultural differences will be addressed. Other activities, such as the US-USSR Youth Environmental Camps, do not suggest either Minimization or Acceptance of difference. As stated previously, simply bringing Soviets and Americans together does not ensure "effective" or "creative" communication. Watzlawick, Bavelas, and Jackson (1967) note one of the basic axioms of communication, "one cannot not communicate" (p. 48). Thus, an activity such as the camp will ensure communication of some sort, but there is no guarantee that the participants will leave with a more developed understanding of cultural relativity.

FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION (FOR)

Statement of Purpose

1 The Fellowship of Reconciliation is composed of women
 2 and men who recognize the essential unity of all humanity
 3 and have joined together to explore the power of love
 4 and truth for resolving human conflict. While it has
 5 always been vigorous in its opposition to war, the
 6 Fellowship has insisted equally that this effort must be
 7 based on a commitment to the achieving of a just and
 8 peaceful world community, with full dignity and freedom
 9 for every human being (from a FOR statement of purpose,
 p. 1).

The Fellowship of Reconciliation demonstrates a position of Minimization in its statement of purpose, in its naming of "love and truth" (lines 3,4), as its guiding philosophical principles. There is no universal definition of love and truth, and therefore these highly abstract concepts may not be applied cross-culturally. The use of "love" and

"truth" as guiding principles correlates with Bennett's description of falsely universalized concepts in the phase of Minimization of intercultural difference.

The literature review of this thesis references several researchers (Korzybski, 1948; Johnson, 1986; Lopez, 1985; and Hayakawa, 1983) who note the illusion which exists in believing that by speaking in absolutes ("We all want to find truth"), we may further harmonious relations between hostile nations. FOR's statement of purpose contains other words which may be problematic in terms of finding a definition, and in using as a basis for assumption of intercultural similarity. Words and phrases such as "full dignity and freedom" (line 8), "just and peaceful world" (lines 7,8), tend to elude definition, or hold complex connotations for different individuals. Thus, it appears that in its statement of purpose, FOR takes a stance of Minimization of intercultural difference. Additional material suggests both Minimization and potential for shifting toward Acceptance of difference.

Additional Organizational Material

Due to its broad philosophical foundation, the participants in FOR's programs are drawn from a variety of sources. Participants write short articles which are published in Fellowship, a monthly publication with a variety of information concerning FOR's activities. As might be expected, the individuals who participate in FOR's programs represent a

spectrum of both Minimization and potential Acceptance of intercultural difference. The following samples of this spectrum include only those articles which have been written by participants who are active members in FOR. Brief biographies noted at the end of each article aided in determining such individuals.

1. Richard Bagget Deats, Executive Secretary of FOR:

"Reflections on a Journey for Peace"

1 We left the Soviet Union with many newly-found
2 friends, with perceptions changed and horizons wid-
3 ened. More than anything, our hearts were stirred by
4 the people we had met--Tanya and Victor, Sasha and
5 Boris, Olga and Igor. Over and over again, we had
6 been delighted by unexpected moments of generosity
7 and warmth . . . the best way to deal with the
8 "enemy" is to treat the nation and the people as
9 friends. For too long we have let the doomsayers
10 and haters set the agenda. Always imagining the
11 worst, we as a people have been locked into a self-
12 fulfilling prophecy that has brought decades of
13 enmity and fear (Fellowship, n.d., back page).

The passage from this article indicates movement from Defense against difference (stereotyping, viewing the Soviets as the "enemy"), to a Minimization of difference. Deats asserts that we must learn to treat the Soviet Union and its people as "friends" (lines 7,8,9). The article does not contain any indication of recognition of the possibilities for cultural diversity, including the subjective understanding of what it means to befriend another. Additionally, Deats suggests that after a relatively short period of time (three weeks), Americans left the Soviet Union with "newly-found friends" (lines 1,2). As noted previously, in the analysis of CUUI, Gudykunst and Kim (1984) suggest that Soviets and Americans

have different experiences of friendship, based upon varying value orientations.

2. Bobbie Stewart, Washington, D.C.

"News of the Fellowship"

1 I was among a group of more than 500 Americans and
2 Soviets who participated in a peace walk from Lenin-
3 grad to Moscow June 15-July 8, 1987. We were seeking
4 an end to the arms race and a lessening of fear between
5 our two countries through person-to-person contact.
6 . . . As we walked, people gave us armfuls of carna-
7 tions, pansies, sweet peas, wildflowers. Another
8 impression I had was that the Soviets are cold, and
9 generally shabby dressers. In fact, they were warm,
10 genuinely friendly, hospitable; their dress neat and
11 colorful. . . . We made human contacts and friends,
12 discovered commonalities and examined things from our
13 different perspectives. We participated in programs
14 where both Russians and Americans spoke of hope for
15 the world, of the need to focus more on human issues,
16 less on defending ourselves. . . . We were the first
17 Americans many of the people had ever seen (Fellowship,
1987, p. 23).

Stewart's description of the trip to the Soviet Union suggests that the peace walk acted as a vehicle with which to move from Defense against difference to Minimization of difference. Stewart had the impression that the "Soviets are cold, and generally shabby dressers" (lines 8,9), indicating a position of stereotyping, a position aligned with Defense against intercultural difference. The fact that the Soviets were actually found to be "warm, genuinely friendly, hospitable; their dress neat and colorful" (lines 9,10,11) suggests that Stewart discovered that the Soviets were more similar to Americans than anticipated.

Additionally, Stewart notes that "we made human contacts and friends" (line 11), reinforcing the assumption of

a universal understanding of friendship. The fact that "we were the first Americans many of the people had ever seen" (lines 16,17) suggests the Soviets who had indeed never seen an American prior to the walk, had the opportunity to move from complete lack of contact with Americans, to a person-to-person encounter. Overall, Stewart's description of the trip to the Soviet Union suggests Minimization of difference, a necessary step in departing from Defense against such difference.

3. "FOR's Philosophy in US/Soviet Relations"

1 We are engaged in a grassroots movement of world
 2 citizens who are not content to leave the fate and the
 3 face of the world to governments. There is a profound
 4 truth in President Eisenhower's assertion that "when
 5 the people lead, the leaders will follow." We are
 6 taking upon ourselves the role of crossing barriers and
 7 learning firsthand what it is that separates us and how
 8 we can change the situation. Our goal is to build trust
 9 in place of fear, suspicion, hostility and misunder-
 10 standing. Without minimizing the serious differences
 11 between East and West, we must be sure that the slow,
 12 patient work of trust building undergirds everything we
 13 do (Fellowship, 1986, p. 19).

This statement contains an explicit reference to differences which exist between Soviets and Americans: "Without minimizing the serious differences between East and West, we must be sure that the slow, patient work of trust building undergirds everything we do" (lines 10-13). Presumably, those differences are acknowledged as existing on a number of levels, including historical/ideological/cultural. It is not discernible as to what the "slow, patient work of trust building" (lines 11,12) refers. The actual face-to-face work of trust building is not described in FOR's literature.

FOR does not appear to hold a processual view of culture, and yet some of the literature suggests that individuals within the organization are willing to examine and acknowledge differences between Soviets and Americans.

THE FRIENDSHIP FORCE

Statement of Purpose

1 Throughout the world, Citizen Ambassadors of The
2 Friendship Force are now embarking on visits of good-
3 will, their goal to befriend whomever they encounter
4 in their host countries. Though they and their hosts
5 share no common language, and find one another's cul-
6 ture quite different, these recruits to The Friend-
7 ship Force will discover what a million people around
8 the world have already learned; when strangers want to
9 become friends, the barriers of culture, language,
10 geography, and ideology seem insignificant (excerpt
from The Friendship Force introductory brochure).

The Friendship Force clearly states that its purpose and intention is to foster friendship on a global scale (lines 2,3,4). According to the suppositions of intercultural communication, friendship is a culturally relative term, and is not necessarily automatically derived from a perceived recognition of similarity. In the statement of purpose, it is written that "when strangers want to become friends, the barriers of culture, language, geography, and ideology seem insignificant" (lines 8,9,10). Thus, this particular organization assumes that difference is cause for tension between people of different cultures, and that the diversity of cultures, etc., is seen as a barrier. This position clearly denotes one of Minimization, according to Bennett's model.

Additional Organizational Material

It appears that participants in this organization's programs are given little formal training, but instead are invited to answer a series of questions framed as a "light-hearted approach to measuring one's potential success as a Friendship Force ambassador" (Friendship [pamphlet], 1988, inside cover). Among the questions are: (1) I sincerely do not want to offend others; (2) I like people and accept them as they are; and (3) I am sensitive to the feelings of others and observe their reactions when I am talking. While each of these questions seems to indicate the need for "sensitivity" on the part of The Friendship Force participant, the questions do not specifically indicate a focus upon intercultural sensitivity, as noted by Bennett. The questions appear to indicate a focus upon the overall "sincerity" and "sensitivity" of potential participants, as these concepts are understood within the boundaries of U.S. culture.

The acceptance of people "as they are" presupposes an understanding of the components which affect an individual's perception of reality, of which culture plays a potent part. The Friendship Force does not appear to offer any structured guidance which might aid participants in moving toward an Acceptance of difference. This organization also places a great emphasis upon "making friends" (note the title of the organization) with the Soviets, a false universalization of value orientation.

In examining false universalization of culture,

Bennett writes:

Physical universalism is most likely to be exhibited by empiricists, meaning most Americans. . . . The Western valuing of individuality and direct openness exacerbates this tendency, since such values imply that people should be accepted for "who they are" if they are honest about it (1986, p. 190).

Thus, the position of "liking people and accepting them as they are" is both a reflection of U.S. American culture and a Minimization of intercultural difference. The Friendship Force advocates the position that "A World of Friends is a World of Peace" (from a Friendship Force pamphlet, 1986, inside cover), a position which is ethnocentric. This organization's statement of purpose, as well as subsequent organizational material suggests a definite position of Minimization of intercultural difference.

PEACE LINKS

Statement of Purpose

1 Peace Links is a nationwide network of citizens who
2 are reaching and activating an entirely new constit-
3 uency of people, many of whom have not been active in
4 the political process. Peace Links seeks to deal with
5 conflict resolution via the principles of affirmation,
6 communication and cooperation. Peace Links is founded
7 on the belief that in a democracy, we the people share
8 the responsibility for helping our leaders determine
9 public policy. Solutions to the nuclear dilemma will
10 be found when enough of us put peace at the top of our
11 agenda (from Peace Links statement of purpose).

Peace Links identifies the principles of "affirmation, communication and cooperation" (lines 5,6) as being key to this organization's approach to conflict resolution. The

statement of purpose does not explicitly suggest either an ethnocentric and/or ethnorelativistic approach to face-to-face contact with the Soviets. Rather, the emphasis in this statement is upon activating members of the U.S. culture to become involved in the political process. As additional organizational material demonstrates, Peace Links' definition of "affirmation, communication, and cooperation" suggests an approach which may be beneficial for U.S. citizens, but may lack utility when applied to conflict resolution with the Soviets.

Additional Organizational Material

Among Peace Links' activities are a joint U.S./Soviet Women's Exchange, and a delegation of sixty grassroots women and five young members of Future Homemakers of America who traveled to the Soviet Union "to continue people-to-people efforts to build mutual understanding" (from a Peace Links pamphlet, *Women Against Nuclear War*, p. 1).

In addressing the conflicts which may arise between Americans and Soviets, a description sheet of the principles of affirmation, communication, and cooperation reads:

We cannot eliminate conflict, nor would we want to. But people can choose how they will deal with conflict. The possibilities include not only our instinctual responses of fight or flight, but also a wide range of responses that can be learned (Peace Links, "Affirmation, Communication, and Cooperation," p. 1).

The demonstration of Minimization of intercultural differences, according to Bennett's model, is exhibited in

Peace Links' approach to conflict resolution. The three principles of affirmation, communication, and cooperation, as defined from a U.S. American cultural perspective, represent but one cultural view of the possibilities for such resolution.

In the ongoing description of conflict resolution, a Peace Links description sheet reads that in affirming we need to communicate this both verbally and nonverbally. "A hug is an affirmation." As for communication, "each of us needs to learn, sooner or later, to talk straight--to communicate facts and feelings accurately and in a way that leaves others free to respond constructively" (p. 1).

It may not be taken for granted that, in all cultures, a hug is viewed as an affirmation. There are specific norms which dictate when and where a hug is an appropriate gesture, as well as considerations of age, gender, and cultural status. Likewise, the notion of "talking straight" is exemplary in U.S. culture, but lacks utility in assuming the connotation is identical in Soviet culture. Oliver (1962) notes the difficulty in intercultural communication which arises out of the Western Aristotelian view that human beings are free, rational creatures with the capacity for factual and sound reasoning (pp. 77-78). There is no universal law of rationality, nor the concomitant "straight talk."

Lieberman et al. (1988) support the contention of an illusory universal rationality in the following statement:

Can common sense be a universal trait that individuals possess or lack to varying degree The trouble can be more clearly seen if we debate how wide a scope the term common has. If by common one means common to all humans, we are left with a transcendental trait called common sense. But if common sense is taken as "patterns of language . . . activity and behavior that act as models for both common adaptive acts and styles of communication . . . in a society" then what the term common sense connotes is as relative as musical preference or phoneme choice (p. 15).

Thus, Peace Links offers workshops which may be quite beneficial for members of American culture, but will not hold the same "common sense" for members of Soviet or other cultures.

In describing face-to-face contact with Soviet women during a Peace Links trip, the organizational literature reads:

1 In truth, each of us loves her children . . . each of
 2 us tries to bear her burdens with grace . . . and each
 3 of us fears for the future. . . . We need to educate
 4 ourselves and our communities about the Soviet Union
 (Peace Links, "Taking Each Other into account," p. 1).

This quotation contains contradictory messages from the perspective of intercultural communication and Bennett's model. The first several lines indicate moving toward Minimization of difference, of using transcendent concepts such as "love" and "grace" (lines 1,2) to describe Soviet women and their relationship with their children. Yet, the final statement suggests the need for more education about the Soviet Union, which could conceivably include an appreciation of intercultural difference. The reference to need for further education is explained as the following:

1 What we can learn about the Soviet Union shows not
 2 only a different history, but different values. But
 3 if we can tolerate differences between us and the
 4 Chinese--or for that matter, the Japanese, the Boliv-
 5 ians, the French--why not "the Russians"? It is easy
 6 to criticize a society different from ours, but to
 7 survive, we need to look for mutual interests we share
 8 with the Soviets in opposing the common enemy:
 9 nuclear war (Peace Links, "Taking Each Other into
 Account," p. 1).

An important word in this suggestion for seeing the nuclear threat as the common enemy is "tolerate" (line 3). Peace Links is suggesting that we need to learn to tolerate our cultural differences, in order to get onto the important work of addressing the real enemy, in this case, the nuclear threat. According to Bennett's model, this is indication of Minimization of difference. He notes that while difference may be tolerated to some degree, it is seen as superficial to the "real" issue. It appears that Peace Links perceives "nuclear war" (line 9) as the "real issue," and the "common enemy" (line 8).

While Peace Links offers a more ideologically developed program than might be found in an organization such as The Friendship Force, much of its literature suggests a position of Minimization of intercultural difference. Its literature clearly acknowledges the role of individuals in shaping our external reality, and yet the stated aims of the organization appear to be toleration, rather than Acceptance of cultural diversity.

PROJECT RAFT

Statement of Purpose

1 White water rafting provides an ideal environment
2 for people to learn to solve problems under pressure.
3 When a group of people step into a paddle raft above
4 a seething rapid, they must set aside differences of
5 culture, language, and ideology. They must, for the
6 moment, forget everything except for the common goal
7 of survival. . . . Like the rapids of a turbulent
8 river, the challenges of today's world constantly
9 change their appearance. The Youth Exchange par-
10 ticipants--tomorrow's leaders . . . will need to
11 look carefully at the obstacles ahead, take every
12 safety precaution, communicate effectively, and work
13 together when it really counts (from a Project Raft
introductory brochure, p. 1).

Project Raft's statement of purpose demonstrates a
Minimization of difference in the following areas:

1. the programs are structured in such a way that participants must "set aside" differences of culture and ideology (lines 4,5), thus suggesting that the organization views these differences as being insignificant to the task at hand, i.e., being in a raft together;

2. in this setting "survival" is the common goal (lines 6,7), and yet the statement of purpose does not address the possibility that Soviets and Americans will view dealing with the goal in different ways; and

3. effective communication (line 12) is noted as being important for tomorrow's leaders, and yet it appears that effective communication passes over cultural differences, which may indeed be the very processes which are interfering in the overall ability of Soviets and Americans to coexist nonviolently.

Project Raft's statement of purpose explicitly shows Minimization of differences, further supported by additional material.

Additional Organizational Material

The director of Project Raft is quoted as saying, "When you're going through the river rapid together, it doesn't matter if you speak the same language, think the same or even like one another. If you don't paddle together, you'll both end up in the water" (from a Project Raft introductory brochure, p. 1).

Project Raft differs from organizations such as The Friendship Force or CUUI, in that the programs are not structured with the end goal of Soviets and Americans becoming "friends." Rather, the goal is to learn to work together, and not be concerned with issues such as language and/or cultural difference.

Project Raft takes the stance that the real problems in the world have more to do with nuclear stockpiles, environmental destruction, and overpopulation, rather than the tension which has accompanied U.S.-Soviet differences. Thus, these differences must be "set aside" as well as those of language and ideology.

According to Bennett's model, Project Raft takes a definite, explicit stance of Minimization of differences between U.S. and Soviet cultures: "The state of minimization represents development beyond denial and defense,

because, at this stage, cultural difference is overtly acknowledged . . . [and] is trivialized" (1986, pp. 183-184).

Project Raft points to other attempts to foster friendly relations between Soviets and Americans, but sees these efforts for contact as omitting one important point: they fail to recognize that as Soviets and Americans, we are all at risk.

In recent years, many good and important "citizen diplomacy" initiatives . . . have allowed Americans and Soviets to meet and learn about one another. While these initiatives provide very important contacts, they often do not focus on a critical aspect of our relationship--that we are at risk together (from a Project Raft introductory brochure, p. 1).

Thus, Project Raft differs from other organizations included in this study, due to its unique approach to promoting contact between American and Soviet citizens. This organization prefers a focus on the common risks we now face, with the hopes that through a recognition of such risk, we will learn to work together. Learning to "like" one another may occur, but Project Raft contends that liking one another is not compulsory to dealing with current global problems.

Project Raft's river rapid programs also reflect American emphasis upon "doing" and "achieving," in this case, actively engaging with natural challenges, and "succeeding" in meeting these challenges. In examining the "doing" cultural orientation, Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961) note:

Its most distinctive feature is a demand for the kind of activity which results in accomplishments that are measurable by standards conceived to be external to the acting individual. . . . What does the individual do? What can he or will he accomplish? These are

almost always the primary questions in the American's scale of appraisal of persons (p. 17).

In the case of Project Raft, the participants in the program are engaged in a "doing" relationship with the river rapids, their end goal being the victorious mastery of nature. Action and hard work produce the desired effects, in this case, improved relations between the Soviets and Americans.

WORLD PEACE CAMP

Statement of Purpose

1 We are dedicated to fostering international coopera-
2 tion, understanding and communication between fami-
3 lies and communities in the Soviet Union and the
4 United States. Through education, the media, and
5 youth exchange projects we have played a role in dis-
6 pelling the stereotypical myths about our two nations
 (from a World Peace Camp introductory brochure).

The World Peace Camp's stated objective is too brief to suggest a specific position of intercultural sensitivity. Language such as "cooperation, understanding and communication" (lines 1,2) is too abstract to suggest a definite stance of Minimization and/or Acceptance of intercultural difference. Additional background information and organizational literature suggests both Minimization and potential Acceptance of intercultural difference.

Additional Organizational Material

The World Peace Camp grew out of a mother's commitment to carrying out her daughter's wish for world peace. In December, 1982, Samantha Smith wrote a letter to then

Soviet Premier Yuri Andropov, saying, "I have been worrying about the Soviet Union and the United States getting into a war. Are you going to have a war or not?" (from a Samantha Smith Center brochure).

Andropov responded by inviting Samantha Smith to the Soviet Union during the summer. Three years later she died in a plane crash. Her mother, Jane Smith, formed the Samantha Smith Center, and more recently, the World Peace Camp. The objective of the center is "dedicated to fostering international cooperation, understanding and communication between families and communities in the United States and the Soviet Union" (World Peace Camp introductory brochure).

The World Peace Camp offers a variety of programs to its participants, among which are workshops of Citizen Diplomacy, Russian Life, Leadership Training, World Issues Forum, and Conflict Resolution. One of the highlights of the camp is "The World Game," a simulated exercise in which individuals are encouraged to experience the struggles of the globe in a concrete manner.

A description of the game is as follows:

- 1 With 100 participants, each person will represent 1%
- 2 of humanity--50 million people--and will experience
- 3 this planet from a new and empowering perspective.
- 4 Participants will compete with real world leaders to
- 5 see if they can do better at meeting the needs of the
- 6 world. They will be involved in role-playing and will
- 7 witness the devastation of nuclear war. After this
- 8 moving experience, players will develop their ideas of
- 9 what they want their future to be and explore innova-
- 10 tive ways of making their visions come true. . . . The
- 11 World Game is an exciting introduction to our planet,
- 12 its resources, problems and prospects--and what the

13 individual can do to make a difference (from a World Peace Camp introductory brochure).

The World Peace Camp intentionally includes workshops which focus upon Russian language, and ways of life, as well as involving Russian and American youth in The World Game, as described above.

The workshops may address aspects of Russian culture, but it is not clear whether the processual nature of culture in general, is addressed in these workshops. One of the criteria for Acceptance of intercultural difference, according to Bennett's model, is that people do not have values. People value. The difference is not one of "mere" semantics, as the latter suggests an understanding of the complex nature of cultural relativity, while the former may entail a "listing" of seemingly objectified values.

The World Game, as a tool for increased communication and problem solving between Soviets and Americans, is effective in encouraging interaction between these two cultures. However, as noted previously, communication in and of itself does not guarantee heightened intercultural sensitivity. The World Game was created by Buckminster Fuller, out of the boundaries of American culture. Within these boundaries, the following elements are noted as being integral to the structure of the World Game.

1. The World Game encourages participants to experience the planet from "a new and empowering perspective" (line 3). Part of this process of empowerment is the opportunity to

"compete with real world leaders to see if they can do better at meeting the needs of the world" (lines 4,5,6).

Stewart (1979) notes the following with regard to competition:

Competition is the primary method among Americans of motivating members of a group, and some have seen it as a basic emphasis in American culture. . . . Americans, with their individualism and achieving, respond well to this technique . . . (p. 14).

Based on this information which targets competition as a primary motivator among Americans, it is conceivable that the World Game may or may not appeal to persons from other cultures as a method of dealing with the world's problems.

2. The World Game also places an emphasis upon the individual having the capacity for impact upon the world, for envisioning the future, and making his/her vision a reality. Stewart (1979) notes the following with regard to temporal orientation:

The American's concepts of work and action are attached to his orientation towards the future. . . . [These] differences in temporal orientation as distinguishing marks of cultures are very important since time is a major component in any constellation of values. For Americans, as an illustration, the orientation toward the future and high value placed on action yield the principle that one can improve upon the present (p. 9).

Once again, The World Game may be a highly effective tool for participants who share the above assumptions regarding temporal orientation, and individual power to impact external reality.

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION OF THE ORGANIZATIONAL ANALYSIS

As noted in the introduction to the organizational analysis, each organization falls within a flexible range of Minimization and/or Acceptance of intercultural difference. Bennett's (1986) model offers a working guide for conceptualizing each organization's rhetorical presentation of ethnocentrism, ethnorelativism, or a combination thereof.

Organizations were analyzed with specific regard to the following three areas:

1. the organization's statement of purpose;
2. additional organizational material (newsletters, articles, program descriptions, etc.);
3. workshops/games/special programs.

This third area was analyzed using Bennett's model, determining whether or not the workshops exclusively reflected U.S. ways of perceiving and constructing reality. Determination was made through an analysis of the basic value assumptions of each of these special organizational activities.

With regard to the statements of purpose, approximately one-half (5) of the nine organizations demonstrated some degree of Minimization of difference. The other three organizations, with indiscernible positions of intercultural

sensitivity, exhibited combinations of Minimization and Acceptance in subsequent organizational material.

Approximately one-half (4) of the nine organizations exhibited explicit Minimization of intercultural difference in additional organizational material. Three organizations all minimized via an emphasis on "friendship" as an alleged, transcendent, universally definable concept ("Celebrate May Day with Your Soviet Friends," "I found people with the same concerns, the same virtues and values as Americans. I made friends and want to visit them again," "A world of friends is a world of peace"). Of the eight organizations with sufficient data available for analysis, none exhibited an explicit Acceptance of intercultural difference, which would be demonstrated by an understanding of the processual nature of reality, without contradictory demonstration of Minimization in either statement of purpose or additional organizational material. One organization, Direct Connection, appeared to demonstrate Acceptance of difference in the statement of purpose, while additional organizational material did not provide sufficient data for a more complete analysis.

It appears that the overall emphasis in the nine organizations studied is upon Minimization, rather than Acceptance of intercultural difference. The following section includes a discussion of two questions: (1) what might be the reason(s) for a general emphasis on Minimization of intercultural difference, as presented by these nine organizations?

and (2) what contributions do these organizations make to the strengthening of peaceful relations between the Soviet Union and United States?

DISCUSSION OF EMPHASES AND CONTRIBUTIONS OF SELECTED PEACE ORGANIZATIONS

As noted in the introduction to this thesis, the United States and Soviet Union have been engaged in a "Cold War" for many decades. This war has included little, if any, contact, and hostile perceptions of the other nation. This relationship can best be described as one of Defense against difference, whether it be ideological, political, or cultural. The increased contact between Soviet and U.S. leaders is evidence of a shift from complete Defense against difference, to willing, cautious interaction. One of the first steps in resolving the cold war is to shift the focus from one of Defense against difference, to willing and "friendly" interaction between U.S. and Soviet citizens. More "friendly" interaction between the leaders of both countries has been influenced by the introduction of glasnost in the Soviet Union, demonstrated by Reagan's meeting with Gorbachev in 1987, as well as increased contact between U.S. and Soviet citizens.

Each of the nine organizations offers a structure in which to facilitate such interaction. As Bennett (1986) notes in the description of shifting from Defense to Minimization:

Overall, developmental movement out of Defense is facilitated by emphasizing the commonality of cultures, particularly in terms of what is "good" in all cultures. While this seems antithetical to the cultural relativity necessary for successful intercultural communication, it is a necessary stage of development that must precede a subsequent emphasis on difference (p. 189).

Bennett warns that attempting to move too quickly to Acceptance or Adaptation of intercultural difference is apt to backfire into an eventual strengthening of the position of Defense (p. 189).

Thus, Bennett asserts that it is important to move from Defense to Minimization gradually, in order to avoid a regression into a stronger position of Defense. The emphases and contributions of peace organizations included in this study support a gradual shift from Defense to Minimization, and can be understood on two premises.

First, the emphasis upon minimizing cultural difference in these organizations is logical, based upon the perspective that it is necessary to first move through Minimization of difference, before one can arrive at Acceptance of such difference.

Second, the organizations which minimize intercultural difference to some degree, make a vital contribution to the furthering of Soviet-American relations by virtue of offering programs in which participants can move from Defense against difference to Minimization of difference. These organizations provide programs which aid in bridging the shift from ethnocentrism to eventual ethnorelativism. By emphasizing

concepts such as "universal friendship," participants have the opportunity to perceive the "good" of all humanity, all cultures, including the previously despised Soviets. Based on the years of silence which have accompanied the cold war years between Soviets and Americans, increased contact, even that of minimized difference, is a novel occurrence.

While the Minimization of difference indicates an ethnocentric perspective of intercultural communication, it is also a common phase through which many individuals pass. Damen (1987) asserts the following:

. . . to embrace the concept of cultural relativity is to recognize that the cultural patterns within a given culture function as parts to the whole and exhibit a general consistency at a given point in time. . . . Ethnocentrism, or the adherence to a given set of cultural options adjudged right, is a natural and necessary human attitude. It is the source of cultural and personal identity (p. 214).

Thus, the peace organizations in this study which emphasize Minimization of difference, and thereby ethnocentrism, also provide a reinforcement of the "cultural and personal identity" which is so common to human experience. Organizations which include a combination of Minimization and Acceptance of intercultural difference may provide a different perspective on "reality" to their participants; namely, that it is possible to both maintain one's own cultural identity, while simultaneously appreciating a different cultural identity. As Damen (1987) notes, "To understand another set of rules for living does not necessarily mean that old patterns are wrong, and to be rejected. To do so may mean a loss of cultural identity" (p. 214).

The awareness that one's own cultural identity is relative to a specific, processual, social reality holds the potential for increasing one's own creative experience of the world in encountering different cultures. In the case of the Soviet Union and United States, a new creative mode of coexistence is indicated, in order to ensure the survival of the present and future generations. As Condon and Yousef (1975) note, the shift to ethnorelativism includes an understanding that "normal behavior" is a culturally relative term. Likewise, "natural behavior" is a socially construed concept (p. 34).

In order to facilitate more peaceful relations between Soviets and Americans, it is important to generate a more empathic understanding of what has been deemed "natural" and "normal" in both cultures. While the Minimization of intercultural difference provides a necessary condition for the eventual Acceptance of such difference, it is important that Minimization/ethnocentrism is not perceived as the final, completed phase of intercultural sensitivity.

The position of Minimization suggests the perspective that "we like them because they are like us, and are therefore good." This position may serve to bring Soviets and Americans together, a necessary starting point with two cultures which have remained distanced and silent. As Gudykunst and Kim (1984) note, "the more similar two people are, the closer is the relationship they form" (p. 177).

However, when individuals of two cultures encounter the differences which are part of two social constructions of reality, the assumption of goodwill based on assumption of similarity, no longer applies. When this appearance of difference occurs, the assumption that "we like them because they are like us, and are therefore good" is no longer viable. Singer (1987) asserts, "if we want to communicate effectively with one of 'them' it is important to get to know their perceptions, attitudes and values as well as their cultural language" (p. 47).

Communicating with one of "them" and getting to know "their" cultural language always presents the possibility of change, of seeing that what one has so immediately taken for granted as being "natural" no longer applies universally. This latter realization is potentially one of the most threatening to a human need for order and understanding of the external environment. It is also a realization which holds the potential for facilitating more effective communication between hostile nations.

By emphasizing the perceived "naturalness" of a concept such as "friendship" on a universal scale, organizations which minimize cultural difference serve to bring psychologically distant individuals together. However, when differences do inevitably surface between Soviets and Americans, it is important that the premise of empathy, or that of Assumption of difference, underlies Soviet-American contact.

LIMITATIONS OF THE RESEARCH

The nine organizations included in this study represent a small sample of the total number of U.S. peace organizations which now exist. The Defense Monitor (1985) lists approximately 200 organizations now involved in peace work, while Surviving Together (1988) lists approximately 85 organizations engaged in peace work. While each organization in this study employed different strategies in their approach to face-to-face contact with Soviet citizens, and were found to demonstrate a general tendency toward Minimization, this study did not and could not include an analysis of all U.S. peace organizations now in existence.

Second, Bennett's (1986) model was used as a tool of analysis in examining the rhetorical content of each organization's literature. By virtue of choosing one diagnostic tool, other possible diagnostic tools were necessarily excluded in order to complete the research.

Third, although Bennett's model provided a viable tool with which to complete the analysis of organizational material, this researcher was unable to conduct personal interviews with representatives of each organization in order to more fully determine relative degrees of intercultural sensitivity as presented in the literature. In the case of an organization such as Direct Connection, which did not provide ample material for analysis, a personal interview would have been highly beneficial.

Finally, only one researcher's analysis was provided in this study. Were further studies to be completed addressing similar U.S. peace organizations, this researcher suggests that a quantitative content analysis conducted by several coders might increase the overall reliability of the study.

IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

In examining the importance of a difference-based approach to intercultural communication within a global context, Luce and Smith (1987) note the following:

Once we have a general understanding of how culture influences our perceptions and actions, the comparative study of several cultures becomes a meaningful enterprise. At this point, it is increasingly difficult to disregard the reality of cultural pluralism What has shaped an American way of life may or may not have shaped the attitudes and beliefs of other cultures. . . . Thus an American culture takes its place beside other national cultures. It is one more construct, neither better nor worse, within the cultural spectrum of human diversity (p. x).

Luce and Smith suggest that recognizing cultural diversity does not prescribe attempting to transcend or ultimately disregard such diversity. Rather, the focus is upon both self-awareness of the relative nature of one's own culture, as well as the subsequent validity of other cultures. The notion that American culture is "one more construct, neither better nor worse" is the fundamental perspective of ethno-relativism. It is the fundamental perspective of an individual who presents a position of Acceptance of intercultural difference, within the framework of Bennett's developmental model.

As such, what utility does this perspective hold for future research of relations between hostile nations, such as the Soviet Union and the United States? Hostility between nations may become manifest with regard to verbal, public proclamations of hostility, as well as by competitive militaristic technology. As the literature review of this thesis suggests, there is little existing research on U.S.-Soviet relations from an intercultural communication perspective. While ample material exists on the purely political aspects of U.S.-Soviet relations, this material has not yet been directly linked with intercultural communication research.

Rohrlich (1987) suggests that the link between political science research and a difference-based approach to intercultural communication is an important connection to be made:

To claim that intercultural communication does not address the "real" issues is untrue. War is symptomatic of a world of divergent value systems and conflicting priorities, in brief, of cultural pluralism. . . . Avoiding the war altogether will surely take major political and/or economic steps, but this stage will never be reached if communication remains ineffective. Intercultural communication will never be the sufficient condition for solving the world's major ills, but it is undoubtedly a necessary one, even if "only" interpersonal (p. 126).

Rohrlich confirms the importance of examining both symptoms and causes of tension between hostile nations, asserting that the causes originate from ineffective communication. Gurtov (1988) asserts that one of the nonmilitary issues involved in creating a more humane reality for all people includes the empowering action of individuals.

The pervasiveness of war, its terrifying costs, and the slowness and weakness of the negotiating process have brought increasing numbers of people into the peacemaking arena. Popular rather than bureaucratic will is pushing the agenda of a non-nuclear, non-violent world forward (p. 189).

A glance at an urban newspaper, on any particular day of the year, usually reveals an abundance of headlines which point to countries, states, or towns, which are presently at war with some "other," some hated "enemy." Clearly, the phenomenon of us/them is one which reaches into all corners of the globe. As Singer (1987) observes:

The US/USSR tensions are clearly not the only ones that poison understanding. Each intense conflict situation one can name, whether it be North and South Korea, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Arab/Israel, India/Pakistan, North and South Ireland, Britain and Argentina, Cuba/US . . . the list goes on and on. Would that there were an easy solution to the problem There is not (p. 212).

Stein (1987) suggests that the underlying psycho-social principle involved in US/USSR tension is that each nation maintains integrity by projecting unacceptable qualities onto the other nation (p. 56). If this is true, then it is important to investigate this principle which may be indicated in other nations and cultures which have been similarly polarized as enemies. As Stein suggests, the process of hating some "other" may in fact produce one's own reflection in the mirror.

A final implication for research is directed toward the participants in programs which sponsor contact between Soviet and U.S. citizens. It might be useful to create a survey and/or questionnaire administered both prior to, and

after participation in a given program, in order to determine changes in intercultural sensitivity and awareness which may have occurred as a direct result of face-to-face contact with Soviet citizens. This information would be useful in determining the levels of intercultural sensitivity, and indications for changes in such programs.

None of the nine organizations included in this study appeared to offer structured guidance for participants, which might facilitate an understanding of a processual, difference-based approach to intercultural communication. The following section contains suggestions for such training, both within the framework of Bennett's developmental model, and utilizing the suggestions of other intercultural trainers in the field.

IMPLICATIONS FOR INTERCULTURAL TRAINING

Bennett (1986) notes the following suggestions for developmental strategies, with regard to the positions of Defense, Minimization, Acceptance, Adaptation, and finally, Integration of intercultural difference. The latter two positions have been included, as they are part of the continuum of cultivating a stronger position of intercultural sensitivity.

1. Training strategies for movement out of a position of Defense include increasing the individual's cultural self-esteem by emphasizing both what is "good" about native and nonnative cultures, and preparing trainees for the "possible

existence of reversal attitudes before any statement of them comes from the group" (p. 189).

2. Training strategies for movement out of Minimization include using representatives from other cultures (who themselves are aware of cultural relativity), as well as awareness on the trainers' part that the shift from Minimization to Acceptance indicates a shift from ethnocentrism to ethno-relativism, and may be disorienting to trainees at the outset of explanation (pp. 190-191).

3. The third phase, that of Acceptance, marks a paradigmatic shift on the part of the participant. Training application is best used by exploring specific attitudes toward religion, work, family, etc., within the broader cultural organization of reality. Underlying value differences may be approached by discussing concrete experiences, such as communication differences in a nonnative homestay (pp. 191-192).

4. The next stage, Adaptation, is marked by the capacity to consciously shift frames of reference and to empathize with the nonnative cultures. It is advantageous to include opportunities for interaction with individuals from other cultures, as well as to relate training and examples to real-life situations which participants may encounter at work, in developing friendships, with homestay families, etc. (p. 193).

5. Finally, Integration of intercultural difference includes a focus upon the subject of ethics. That is, since

the phase of Integration indicates an individual who is open to a variety of cultural constructs and morality codes, then this individual may have difficulty formulating ethical commitments which satisfy his/her needs. Integration of difference marks a position of constructive marginality, which Bennett (1986) asserts "constitutes a valuable and perhaps crucial resource for creating a world that is hospitable to the great diversity of humanity" (pp. 193-194).

Landis and Brislin (1983) also note a variety of general approaches available for cross-cultural training, including cultural awareness exercises, experiential learning with field trips to a nonnative environment, and an interaction approach which includes host national/nonnative face-to-face contact (p. 9). Considerations which may affect a trainer's choice of approach include the following: availability of materials, experience and comfort level which the trainer has with a given approach, and the level of sophistication of the trainees (pp. 8-9).

With regard to individuals who participate in programs which include face-to-face contact with Soviet citizens, this researcher suggests that training may be useful both prior to and after participation in such programs. Training which precedes actual contact with nonnative individuals may serve the purpose of raising cultural awareness of both U.S. and Soviet cultures. If the peace organization is based in an urban area, it might be possible to draw upon existing Soviet communities and/or individuals as the basis for expanding

awareness of both what is "good" about Soviet culture, and the possibilities for differences between Soviet and Americans. As Bennett (1986) emphasizes, however, it is important that actual host nationals hold an awareness of cultural relativity, as "being from another culture does not preclude ethnocentrism, and having a resource person in Minimization is worse than none at all" (p. 191).

As for activities which facilitate cultural awareness of both self and other, Landis and Brislin (1983) identify a variety of options, including lectures, discussions, critical incidents, role-plays, group problem solving, and simulations (p. 51). They identify a number of "critical variables" which the trainer should be aware of in employing a specific strategy with trainees, including trainee characteristics, trainer characteristics, risk elements of training activity (risk of personal disclosure, risk of failure), and the goals of training, whether cognitive, affective, or behavioral (p. 51).

The development of specific training programs for any one of the nine organizations falls outside the scope and focus of this thesis. However, general suggestions may be made, utilizing information about specific organizations which is provided by the solicited pamphlets/brochures/program descriptions. The following are three examples of specific training structures which may benefit three specific peace organizations included in this study.

World Peace Camp

The World Peace Camp provides an opportunity for Soviet and American youth to interact in an outdoor setting. The camp includes workshops on Russian Life, Citizen Diplomacy, Leadership Training, and Conflict Resolution in its summer activities, as well as offering sports activities which are typical to most summer camps. The inclusion of the former types of activities provide an ideal environment in which to address Soviet-American differences.

The population at the World Peace Camp consists of "youth," and thus it would be important for a trainer to keep this fact in mind (i.e., focus more upon activities which involve participants, as opposed to lecture-style presentations). General approaches as suggested by Landis and Brislín (1983) could easily include the interaction approach, marked by host national/nonnative face-to-face contact, as the very purpose of the camp is to encourage this type of interaction. Options for specific activities might expand upon the existing activities which the World Peace Camp sponsors.

Example One. In discussing Russian life, a prime opportunity exists for discussing possible similarities and differences which exist in American life. Topics should be relevant to participants in the program, such as relationships with peers, and relationships with family members and authority figures such as parents and teachers.

Example Two. While The World Game may not appeal to all individuals in all cultures, based upon its assumptions of competition and impacting the external environment, it provides a rich opportunity for discussion following the simulation. Lead questions (use of discussion as a training tool) might uncover if indeed the Soviet and American participants had different perspectives on global problem solving. In the case of a discussion following the simulation, participants have the opportunity to focus on the process as well as the product (in this case, solving the world's problems). The World Game provides a relatively safe activity for participants in that focus is upon group problem solving, thereby minimizing what Landis and Brislin (1983) identify as potential risks in training activities (personal disclosure, personal failure, etc.).

These two examples of training strategies which may be used in the World Peace Camp are congruent with Bennett's training strategies in the developmental model. Participants may "explore specific attitudes towards religion, work, family, etc." (1986, pp. 191-192), as well as explore differences in processing "problems" as presented in The World Game.

Peace Links

Peace Links emphasizes a basic premise of empowering its participants to take part more fully in the political process. The organization sponsors workshops which reinforce this

empowerment, by having individuals voice their planetary concerns. The population involved in Peace Links is presumed to be adults, as its precepts are relatively sophisticated and not visibly geared toward the specific populations of children and/or youth. Therefore, general approaches as identified by Landis and Brislin (1983) could conceivably include cultural awareness exercises, which serve to clarify the participants' cultural identity, thereby laying the groundwork for holding a more global vision. Options might easily include lectures, discussions, and group problem solving in the context of conflict resolution which Peace Links seeks to address.

Example One. Peace Links offers conflict resolution workshops, which are based upon the principles of "affirmation, communication and cooperation." In the analysis portion of this thesis, this researcher found that these three principles may lack cross-cultural utility, if it is assumed that they are identically defined in all cultures. However, the focus upon these three principles could be used as a foundation for uncovering the deeper value orientations which Peace Links' participants may hold. That is, the activities could be geared toward uncovering what it means to "communicate," to "affirm," and to "cooperate." Utilizing values clarification exercises, participants may refine their own definitions of these three principles, with follow-up discussions. For example, Bennett (1986) suggests that the movement from Minimization to Acceptance of difference

indicates a paradigmatic shift--training application is used by exploring specific attitudes toward religion, work, family etc. Using concrete experiences is also helpful, which may be reinforced by a role-play in which the participant must engage in a hypothetical, but quite possible, situation with a Soviet native. Questions may arise regarding the principles of "affirmation" and "cooperation" such as: What does it mean to cooperate? Does it mean I must give up all my values? If not all, then how much? Where are my limits? How do I define the boundaries between myself and another human being? How might this perception be influenced by my cultural identity?

In terms of "affirmation," what happens when I try to "affirm" a Soviet citizen either verbally or nonverbally, and she/he recoils from me? How might different connotations of "affirmation" cause tension between a Soviet citizen and myself, and how might I use these differences to expand the possibilities for a more peaceful global existence? In order for a discussion such as this to be effective, it would be necessary for either the trainer to have insight and experience into Soviet culture, or to include a Soviet individual who holds a difference-based perspective of intercultural communication.

Center for U.S.-U.S.S.R.
Initiatives (CUUI)

CUUI is similar to The Friendship Force and Citizen Diplomacy in that it places a strong emphasis upon "making

friends" with the Soviets. Therefore, it is possible that suggestions for this organization, with regard to training, may be generally applicable to other organizations which take a similar approach. CUUI presents a definite stance of Minimization of intercultural difference.

Generally, CUUI's population appears to be adults, as described in program activities. Unlike the World Peace Camp, or Project Raft, CUUI's participants travel to the Soviet Union for trips which include sightseeing and visits to major cities, etc. Therefore, it appears that training would be most effective prior to participants' departure to the Soviet Union. General approaches could focus on cultural awareness exercises, especially those which have the intent of uncovering cultural beliefs concerning "friendship." Options might include using role-plays to present concrete experiences which participants might encounter in the Soviet Union. Additional use of "critical incidents" might further expand participants' understanding of cultural relativity. As Bennett (1986) suggests, there may be disorientation when an individual encounters the premise that his/her "reality" is perceptual, not objective. Therefore, it is important to approach this possible confusion with sensitivity and non-confrontational techniques.

Example One. Critical Incident: a hypothetical critical incident might include a situation where a CUUI participant and a Soviet citizen have become "friends," and there is a resulting misunderstanding, one in which the American

acts "naturally" to clear up the situation, which only seems to make matters worse.

Example Two. A role-play may be used which emphasizes the potential for intercultural difference regarding non-verbal behavior, including eye contact, temporal orientation, touch, territoriality, body posture, and paralanguage.

Bennett notes the following regarding developmental strategies from Minimization to Acceptance of intercultural difference:

For Westerners, this shift seems best approached inductively. Simulation, reports of personal experiences and other illustrations of substantial cultural differences in the interpretation of behavior are effective at this point. Awareness of these differences must be shown to have definite practical significance for intercultural communication to overcome the stasis of minimization (1986, pp. 190-191).

The preceding examples, that of a critical incident and a hypothetical demonstration of nonverbal difference, both provide highly practical pieces of information to participants in programs such as CUUI and The Friendship Force. The purpose of these programs is to increase understanding and goodwill between Americans and Soviets, and it is therefore imperative that participants have a basic awareness of the potential for misunderstanding which can easily result in person-to-person intercultural contact.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

This thesis has focused primarily upon the underlying assumptions of selected peace organizations, and their respective presentation of Minimization and/or Acceptance of intercultural difference. The shift from Minimization to Acceptance marks a paradigmatic shift, one in which the individual moves from seeing culture as a "thing" to seeing culture as a dynamic, nonstatic process. This researcher suggests that it is also important to consider the final stage of Bennett's 1986 developmental model, that of Integration of intercultural difference.

In a future vision of U.S.-Soviet relations, perhaps such integration will gradually emerge, following a more complete understanding and experiential awareness of the elements involved in Acceptance and Adaptation of difference. This researcher poses the following questions: What qualities does an individual who has reached a state of Integration reflect? What is the nature of his/her interaction with varying cultures?

Bennett (1986) describes the individual who has integrated difference as the following:

The integration of difference is the application of ethnorelativism to one's own identity. . . . In the language of this model, a person who has integrated

difference is one who can construe difference as a process, who can adapt to those differences and who can additionally construe him or herself in various cultural ways (p. 186).

Adler (1976) defines an individual who has integrated difference as one who is inherently creative in his/her interactions with other cultures, having an identity "far from being frozen in a social character, is more fluid and mobile, more susceptible to change and open to variation" (p. 364).

As for interaction with individuals from varying cultures, the individual who has integrated difference is identified by Adler as the following:

He is neither a part or nor totally apart from his culture; he lives instead, on the boundary. To live on the edge of one's thinking, one's culture, or one's ego . . . is to live with tension and movement (1976, pp. 364-365).

To live with tension and movement, in an essentially non-static manner, is to participate more fully in being a co-creator of one's own perception of "reality." Such participation also increases potential for understanding other individuals' perception of reality, including those who have been once thought of as enemies.

This researcher suggests that because of the inherent creative power which exists in participating more fully in one's understanding of reality, this notion is perhaps one of the most unsettling ones known to humanity. Bruteau (1979) confirms this assumption in the following statement:

To be a "free, self-making process," that is, a creator; here at last is the name of the fear we

have been avoiding. Those who cannot live securely without submission to another as authority will shrink from this dreadful prospect. . . . Creativity, then, is the ultimate presumption, the most audacious activity in which we can pretend to engage. Indeed most of us still believe, with fear and trembling, that it is blasphemous to think in such terms (p. 13).

Intercultural difference is fundamental to a world comprised of hundreds of varying social constructions of reality. The challenge in encountering this diversity is not in insisting that all individuals conform to a single cultural system. Rather, the challenge is in participating in a process which allows for both survival and creative growth of all cultures.

The vast piles of nuclear warheads which the U.S. and Soviet Union now possess, are symptoms of the hostility between two governments which have threatened the survival and creative growth of all cultures, in all sections of the globe. In order to address this threat, the first step of U.S.-Soviet contact has been initiated by the organizations described in this study. The majority of these organizations emphasize a Minimization of intercultural difference, operating under the assumption that such difference is to be tolerated and viewed as generally insignificant compared to perceived cultural similarity.

Through an analysis of appreciation of intercultural difference, it may be that an eventual celebration and preference for difference in U.S.-Soviet relations takes place. In the case that this preference does indeed occur, the

process by which this stage was reached will serve as vital information in exploring other pairs of cultures and groups, which have been polarized as enemies. Stein (1987) reinforces the importance of empathizing with those who have been considered the "enemy," a position which is congruent with the basic assumptions of a difference-based approach to intercultural communication:

A difficult but necessary beginning in conflict resolution is to imagine what it would be like to be "the enemy," to try to feel the world from their childhood, and history, and from that position, ask how one might feel about and perceive and wish to act toward one's own group (now identified as "the enemy"). . . . Transcendence of groupisms can be accomplished only, and always incompletely, as we are able to relinquish and integrate the inner splits between "goodness" and "badness" that have led us throughout history to dichotomize between idealized and disparaged groups (pp. 205-206).

The United States and Soviet Union must look toward different approaches to coexistence than those that have been employed during the long years of the cold war. The process of empathy, that of seeing the world from another's perspective, suggests a critical approach to dissolving the rigid perceptions of "good" and "bad" which have existed for decades.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS AND JOURNALS

- Adler, P. S. (1976). Beyond cultural identity: Reflections on cultural and multicultural man. In L. A. Samovar and R. E. Porter (eds.), Intercultural communication: A reader, 2nd ed., pp. 362-380. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Barna, L. (1976). Stumbling blocks in intercultural communication. In L. A. Samovar and R. E. Porter (eds.), Intercultural communication: A reader, 2nd ed., pp. 291-298. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Babbie, E. (1983). The practice of social research. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Bailey, K. D. (1982). Methods of social research. New York: The Free Press.
- Bennett, M. J. (1986). A developmental approach to training for intercultural sensitivity. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 10, 179-196.
- Berger, P. L. and Luckman, T. (1967). The social construction of reality. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Brislin, R. W. (1981). Cross-cultural encounters: Face-to-face interaction. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Broome, B. J. (1986). Working for peace: A handbook of practical psychology and other tools. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 10(3), 383-385.
- Bruteau, B. (1979). The psychic grid. Wheaton, IL: The Theosophical Publishing House.
- Casmir, F. L. (1983). Phenomenology and hermeneutics: Evolving approaches to intercultural and international communication. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 7(3), 309-324.
- Condon, J. C. and Yousef, F. (1975). An introduction to intercultural communication. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Educational Publishing.

- Chaze, W. L. (Oct., 1987). Promise and pain for a stagnant economy. U.S. News and World Report, 39-40.
- Damen, L. (1987). Culture learning: The fifth dimension in the language classroom. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Eckhardt, W. (1988). Bridging the gap between peace action, education, and research. Journal of Peace Research, 25(2), 179-185.
- Gudykunst, B. and Kim, Y. Y. (1984). Communicating with strangers. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Gurtov, M. (1988). Global politics in the human interest. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Hayakawa, S. I. (1983). General semantics and the cold war mentality. Etc, 40(3), 373-379.
- Johnson, K. G. (1986). Critical thinking for survival in the twenty-first century. Etc, 43(2), 358-362.
- Kluckhohn, F. R. and Strodtbeck, F. L. (1961). Variations in value orientations. Peterson, NY: Harper & Row.
- Korzybski, A. (1948). Selections from science and sanity. Lakeville, CT: The International Non-Aristotelian Library Publishing Company.
- Landis, D. and Brislin, R. W. (1983). Handbook of intercultural training. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Larsen, C. S. (1983). Social psychological factors in military technology and strategy. Journal of Peace Research, 23(4), 391-398.
- Lieberman, D., Kosokoff, S., and Kosokoff, J. (1988). Do it my way: What's common about common sense? Ortesol, 9, 13-27.
- Lopez, G. A. (1985). A university peace studies curriculum for the 1990's. Journal of Peace Research, 22(2), 117-128.
- Luce, E. C. and Smith, L. F. (eds.) (1987). Toward internationalism. Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers.
- Ninic, M. and Russett, B. (1979). The effect of similarity and interest on attitudes towards foreign countries. Public Opinion Quarterly, 43, 68-78.
- Oliver, R. T. (1962). Culture and communication. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

- Rapoport, A. (1986). General semantics and prospects for peace. Etc, 43(1), 4-14.
- Rohrlich, P. E. (1987). Why do we study intercultural communication? International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 2(2), 123-128.
- Samovar, L. A. and Porter, R. E. (1988). Intercultural communication: A reader. 5th ed. Belmont: CA: Wadsworth.
- Schleicher, C. (1982). International relations: Cooperation and conflict. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Singer, M. A. (1987). Intercultural communication: A perceptual approach. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Stein, H. F. (1987). Developmental time, cultural space. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Stewart, E. C. (1979). American assumptions and values: Orientation to action. In L. F. Luce and E. C. Smith (eds.), Toward internationalism, pp. 1-22. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Tims, A. R., and Miller, M. M. (1986). Determinants of attitudes towards foreign countries. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 10, 471-484.
- Trewhitt, H. (Dec., 1988). We won't bury you after all. U.S. News and World Report, 20.
- Watzlawick, P., Bavelas, J. B., and Jackson, D. D. (1967). Pragmatics of human communication. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Zuckerman, M. B. (Oct., 1987). Should the West help Gorbachev? U.S. News and World Report, 57-58.

PUBLICATIONS

- The Defense Monitor (1988). Washington, D.C.: Center for Defense Information.
- Surviving Together: A Journal on Soviet-American Relations (Fall/Winter, 1987). Washington, D.C.: The Institute for Soviet-American Relations.

_____ (Fall/Winter, 1988). Washington, D.C.: The Institute for Soviet-American Relations.

_____ (Spring, 1989). Washington, D.C.: The Institute for Soviet-American Relations.

ORGANIZATIONAL MATERIAL

Beyond War (1985). Introductory brochure. Palo Alto, CA.

Center for U.S.-U.S.S.R. Initiatives (CUUI) (n.d.). Introductory letter. San Francisco, CA.

_____ (1988-1989). The Soviet Experience: Citizen diplomacy travel to the U.S.S.R. No. 3, p. 1.

Citizen Diplomacy (n.d.). Introductory brochure. La Jolla, CA.

Direct Connection (n.d.). Introductory brochure. Grass Valley, CA.

Fellowship of Reconciliation (FOR) (n.d.). Statement of purpose. Nyack, NY.

_____ (Sept., 1986). FOR's philosophy in U.S.-Soviet relations. Fellowship, p. 19.

_____ (Sept., 1986). FOR's philosophy in U.S.-Soviet relations. Fellowship, p. 23.

The Friendship Force (n.d.). Introductory brochure. Atlanta, GA.

_____ (1986). Pamphlet, inside cover.

_____ (1988). Friendship. Pamphlet, inside cover.

Peace Links (n.d.). Statement of purpose. Washington, D.C.

_____ (n.d.). Affirmation, communication and cooperation. Description sheet. Washington, D.C.

_____ (n.d.). Taking each other into account: The U.S.-Soviet relationship. Description sheet, p. 1.

Project Raft (n.d.). Introductory brochure, pp. 1-5. San Francisco, CA.

World Peace Camp (n.d.). Introductory brochure. Poland Spring, ME.

_____ (n.d.). Brochure. Samantha Smith Center. Poland Spring, ME.

_____ (n.d.). Play the world game at the world peace camp for teens. Brochure. Samantha Smith Center. Poland Spring, ME.

SPEECHES

Nielsen, J. B. (1985). From enemy images to confidence-building and friendship trends in positive peace thinking and peace action. Speech delivered to the International People's College, Helsingor, Denmark.