Peace and War: Understanding Public Attitudes

Authored by

mohammed looti

November 22, 2025

The Psychological Foundations of Attitudes toward Conflict

Attitudes toward peace and war represent a critical area of inquiry within social and political psychology, exploring the complex interplay of cognition, affect, and behavior that shapes how individuals and groups perceive conflict and its resolution. These attitudes are not merely simple preferences but deeply entrenched belief systems, often rooted in fundamental assumptions about human nature, justice, and security. Understanding these foundations requires acknowledging the inherent duality: while most individuals profess a general desire for peace, attitudes supporting specific instances of war often emerge rapidly in response to perceived threat or ideological mobilization. Psychologists utilize models of attitude structure, primarily the tripartite model (affective, behavioral, and cognitive components), to dissect how feelings of fear or anger, intentions to act, and factual beliefs about an adversary combine to form a stable, yet malleable, stance on military engagement. The affective component, particularly emotions such as empathy or hostility, often serves as the most powerful predictor of whether an individual will support aggressive or conciliatory foreign policies.

The formation of these conflict-related attitudes is fundamentally linked to basic psychological needs, particularly the need for security and belonging. When group safety is perceived to be jeopardized, attitudes rapidly shift toward protective stances, prioritizing in-group cohesion and viewing external threats through a lens of suspicion and prejudice. Research consistently demonstrates that high levels of perceived threat, whether real or manufactured, activate cognitive mechanisms that simplify complex geopolitical realities into stark binary oppositions, often utilizing the concept of the "us versus them" dichotomy. This simplification process facilitates the adoption of more extreme, militaristic attitudes, as the psychological costs of war are minimized relative to the perceived existential risk posed by the adversary. Furthermore, the role of generalized belief systems, such as social dominance orientation (SDO) and right-wing authoritarianism (RWA), significantly predicts an individual's propensity to endorse aggressive foreign policy measures, illustrating how dispositional tendencies interact with situational factors to shape attitudes toward conflict.

Crucially, attitudes toward peace are not simply the inverse of attitudes toward war; they represent a distinct psychological orientation characterized by a proactive commitment to non-violence, negotiation, and interdependence. Peace attitudes often involve higher levels of cognitive complexity, requiring the capacity to tolerate ambiguity, acknowledge shared humanity across group lines, and engage in perspective-taking with former adversaries. This orientation demands a fundamental shift away from zero-sum thinking, where one group's gain necessitates another's loss, toward a framework emphasizing mutual gains and cooperative solutions. The psychological effort required to maintain strong pro-peace attitudes is substantial, particularly in environments dominated by conflict rhetoric, necessitating continuous reinforcement through social support and institutional norms that champion diplomacy and conflict resolution over military intervention.

Defining and Measuring Attitudes toward Peace and War

Defining and accurately measuring attitudes toward peace and war presents unique methodological challenges for researchers. Early attempts often relied on single-item measures or overly simplistic scales that failed to capture the multifaceted nature of these complex constructs. Modern psychological measurement, however, emphasizes the distinction between general pacifism--a broad moral stance against all forms of organized violence--and specific policy support, such as endorsement of a particular military action or a specific international treaty. Valid scales now typically assess multiple dimensions, including willingness to engage in conflict, perceived legitimacy of military force, expectations of conflict outcomes, and commitment to diplomatic alternatives. The use of implicit measures, such as the Implicit Association Test (IAT), has also become increasingly important, allowing researchers to explore non-conscious biases and automatic associations related to conflict and diplomacy, which often contradict explicit, socially desirable self-reports.

One prominent measurement framework differentiates between militaristic attitudes and conciliatory attitudes, viewing them not as opposite ends of a single continuum but as two orthogonal dimensions. An individual might score high on both, indicating a readiness for defense coupled with a willingness to negotiate, or low on both, suggesting apathy or avoidance. The concept of the "security mindset" often emerges in these measurements, reflecting the degree to which an individual prioritizes national security measures, even at the expense of civil liberties or international cooperation. Furthermore, psychological instruments often incorporate measures of perceived threat intensity and perceived efficacy of military action. If individuals believe military action is both necessary (high threat) and likely to succeed (high efficacy), their support for war dramatically increases, regardless of their general ideological orientation toward violence.

The measurement of peace attitudes, conversely, focuses heavily on components such as internationalism, empathy for out-groups, and adherence to democratic processes for conflict resolution. Scales designed to assess peace orientation often include items related to support for international organizations, belief in shared global responsibility, and endorsement of humanitarian aid even to hostile nations. A critical aspect of measuring robust peace attitudes is assessing the willingness to tolerate short-term insecurity or perceived disadvantage for the sake of long-term stability and non-violent outcomes. This requires moving beyond simple agreement with the concept of peace and evaluating the commitment to the difficult, often frustrating, processes of negotiation and compromise that peace demands. Accurate measurement is crucial for policy interventions, as it allows researchers to identify specific cognitive or affective targets for educational or persuasive campaigns aimed at conflict de-escalation.

Cognitive Dissonance and Justification of Conflict

The theory of cognitive dissonance plays a pivotal role in understanding how individuals maintain support for war, particularly when the costs or moral implications become increasingly apparent. Dissonance arises when an individual holds conflicting cognitions--for example, the belief that "I am a moral person" conflicts with the knowledge that "My nation is committing acts of violence." To resolve this uncomfortable psychological tension, individuals employ various justification mechanisms that serve to rationalize aggressive actions and preserve a positive self-image or in-group image. One primary method of dissonance reduction is the devaluation or dehumanization of the adversary. By characterizing the enemy as subhuman, morally bankrupt, or inherently evil, the moral weight of violence is significantly lessened, making aggressive actions appear necessary, even righteous.

Furthermore, dissonance reduction often involves selective attention and biased information processing. Individuals supporting a conflict tend to seek out and prioritize information that confirms the necessity and morality of the war (confirmation bias), while actively dismissing or minimizing contradictory evidence, such as civilian casualties or diplomatic failures. This psychological filtering creates a closed loop of information that reinforces existing attitudes, making attitude change extremely difficult once commitment to the conflict has been established. The greater the personal investment--whether through emotional support, financial sacrifice, or having family members involved--the stronger the need for justification, leading to increasingly entrenched and polarized attitudes. This phenomenon is particularly acute in situations where initial justification for the conflict proves false or inadequate, necessitating further, often elaborate, psychological maneuvers to maintain consistency.

Moral disengagement is a related mechanism that allows individuals to violate their own moral standards without experiencing self-condemnation. Albert Bandura identified several pathways of moral disengagement highly relevant to conflict attitudes, including euphemistic labeling (calling civilian bombing "collateral damage"), advantageous comparison (claiming "our atrocities are minor compared to theirs"), and diffusion or displacement of responsibility (blaming leaders or external forces). These mechanisms collectively serve to obscure the link between harmful actions and personal moral agency, thereby sustaining pro-war attitudes even in the face of mounting evidence of moral transgression. Understanding these cognitive processes is essential for developing interventions that challenge the psychological infrastructure supporting prolonged conflict.

The Role of Ideology and Group Identity

Ideology and group identity are perhaps the most powerful determinants of attitudes toward peace and war, providing the essential framework through which conflict is interpreted and justified. National identity, in particular, serves as a crucial psychological resource, offering individuals a

sense of belonging, meaning, and immortality. When national identity is linked to specific ideological narratives--such as exceptionalism, historical grievance, or manifest destiny--attitudes toward conflict become highly polarized and resistant to change. Strong identification with the in-group tends to increase perceived differences between groups, leading to the exaggeration of positive in-group traits and negative out-group traits, a phenomenon known as the ultimate attribution error, which fuels hostile attitudes.

Political ideologies, such as nationalism and fundamentalism, provide ready-made scripts for interpreting global events, often emphasizing external threat and the necessity of aggressive defense. Nationalism, when taken to extremes, fosters attitudes that prioritize the nation's interests above all international norms or humanitarian concerns, viewing peace efforts skeptically if they involve compromise. Religious or political fundamentalism often introduces a sacred dimension to conflict, framing it as an existential struggle between good and evil, thereby justifying extreme measures and rendering diplomatic solutions morally unacceptable. In such ideological contexts, support for war is not merely a political preference but a moral imperative, making attitude shifts extremely difficult unless the underlying ideological framework itself is challenged or reinterpreted.

Social Identity Theory (SIT) and Self-Categorization Theory (SCT) explain that individuals derive self-esteem partly from the status and success of their groups. Therefore, any perceived threat to the group's status or existence automatically triggers defensive attitudes, often manifesting as increased hostility toward the threatening out-group. This psychological dynamic means that even when a conflict is economically or strategically disadvantageous, individuals may maintain pro-war attitudes if those attitudes reinforce a positive group identity or differentiate the in-group favorably from the adversary. Furthermore, the role of perceived shared suffering or historical trauma within the in-group can create a collective memory that perpetually reinforces defensive and hostile attitudes, ensuring that current generations inherit and maintain the conflict-prone stances of their predecessors.

Socialization and the Development of Conflict Attitudes

Attitudes toward peace and war are not innate but are profoundly shaped through processes of socialization across the lifespan, starting within the family and extending through educational systems, media consumption, and institutional exposure. The family environment often provides the first introduction to norms regarding aggression, authority, and conflict resolution. Children raised in environments where conflict is consistently resolved through dominance or violence are more likely to internalize attitudes that view aggression as a legitimate and effective means of achieving goals, translating later into support for militaristic policies. Conversely, exposure to models of collaborative problem-solving and emphasis on empathy fosters pro-peace attitudes.

Formal education systems play a crucial, though often subtle, role in shaping national attitudes.

History curricula frequently present national narratives that glorify military victories, minimize past atrocities, and perpetuate stereotypes of neighboring groups, thereby cultivating a patriotic yet potentially hostile worldview. Textbooks and classroom discussions that fail to incorporate multiple perspectives or critically examine the causes and consequences of war contribute to the development of simplified, often biased, attitudes that resist complexity and compromise. Exposure to peace education, which explicitly teaches conflict resolution skills, critical media literacy, and global citizenship, is essential for counteracting these nationalistic biases and fostering robust pro-peace attitudes.

The mass media and digital platforms serve as powerful socialization agents, particularly in times of heightened tension. News coverage, entertainment, and social media narratives often frame conflicts using emotionally charged language and visual imagery that reinforce the dichotomy between the righteous in-group and the villainous out-group. The constant exposure to narratives emphasizing threat, fear, and the necessity of preemptive action can rapidly shift public opinion toward militaristic stances. The speed and immediacy of digital media further accelerate this process, allowing hostile attitudes to crystallize quickly among large populations. Therefore, critical media consumption and the promotion of diverse, non-partisan information sources are vital components in fostering attitudes conducive to peaceful resolution.

Psychological Barriers to Peace

Despite the inherent costs of war, several robust psychological barriers impede the adoption and maintenance of peaceful attitudes and diplomatic resolutions. One significant barrier is the phenomenon of reactive devaluation, where proposals originating from an adversary are automatically viewed as less valuable, trustworthy, or fair, simply because of their source. Even if the proposal itself is objectively beneficial, the taint of its origin leads to its rejection, locking parties into prolonged stalemates. This bias stems from deep-seated distrust and hostility, making it difficult for groups to perceive genuine attempts at reconciliation.

Another critical barrier is the fixed-pie bias or zero-sum thinking, the erroneous belief that any gain for the adversary must necessarily mean an equal loss for oneself. This cognitive distortion prevents parties from seeking integrative solutions where mutual gains are possible, fueling competitive behavior even when cooperation would yield superior outcomes for both sides. When conflict attitudes are dominated by this competitive mindset, negotiation is viewed not as a process of compromise but as a battle for maximal extraction, ensuring that proposals are designed to disadvantage the other side rather than achieve equitable resolution. Overcoming this requires reframing the conflict from a zero-sum competition to a shared problem requiring collective effort.

Furthermore, the psychological trap of sunk costs significantly hinders peace efforts. Once a group has invested substantial resources, lives, and political capital into a conflict, the motivation to

continue the fight--to avoid the psychological acknowledgment that past sacrifices were in vain--becomes overwhelmingly powerful. Ending the conflict peacefully might be perceived as validating the adversary and invalidating the sacrifices made, leading leaders and citizens alike to endorse continuation, even when the rational cost-benefit analysis argues for withdrawal. Addressing these barriers requires skillful leadership capable of offering alternative narratives that honor past sacrifices while justifying a forward-looking commitment to peace.

Strategies for Promoting Pro-Peace Attitudes

Promoting sustainable pro-peace attitudes requires targeted psychological interventions that address the cognitive, affective, and behavioral components of conflict orientation. One of the most empirically supported strategies is the implementation of the Contact Hypothesis, which posits that intergroup contact, under specific optimal conditions, can reduce prejudice and hostility. These conditions include equal status between groups, shared goals, intergroup cooperation, and institutional support. Successful contact increases empathy, reduces anxiety about interaction, and facilitates the personalization of out-group members, moving them from abstract enemies to complex individuals.

Building upon the Contact Hypothesis, the Common In-group Identity Model (CIIM) suggests that peace attitudes can be fostered by redefining group boundaries to include former adversaries within a new, superordinate identity. By encouraging conflicting groups to perceive themselves as part of a larger, shared entity--such as "global citizens," "co-inhabitants of a region," or "members of a shared humanity"--hostility directed toward the out-group is redirected toward the new, shared in-group identity. This psychological recategorization reduces the salience of the original hostile identities, fostering cooperative attitudes and shared goals, which are essential for long-term peace building. Educational programs emphasizing shared history, common cultural heritage, or global environmental threats are effective tools for establishing this superordinate identity.

Finally, promoting cognitive complexity and critical thinking skills serves as a crucial strategy against the simplification inherent in war rhetoric. Programs that teach individuals to recognize propaganda, evaluate multiple perspectives on a conflict, and tolerate ambiguity in geopolitical situations help inoculate populations against the rapid mobilization of hostile attitudes. Furthermore, fostering empathy and perspective-taking through narrative exposure--such as hearing personal stories from the "other side"--helps humanize the adversary, making moral disengagement mechanisms less effective and strengthening the affective component of pro-peace attitudes. Such comprehensive strategies require sustained commitment across educational, media, and political institutions.

The Dynamic Nature of Conflict Attitudes

Attitudes toward peace and war are highly dynamic, shifting significantly in response to evolving situational factors, leadership rhetoric, and perceived shifts in the balance of power. During periods of escalating crisis, attitudes often exhibit rapid polarization, known as the "rally 'round the flag" effect, where public support for national leaders and military action surges, overriding previous critical or conciliatory stances. This phenomenon is driven by the psychological need for immediate security and cohesion in the face of external threat, leading to temporary suspension of internal dissent and a heightened acceptance of aggressive policy. However, this surge is often fragile, depending heavily on perceived success and the absence of high costs.

Conversely, attitudes can shift dramatically toward peace in response to prolonged stalemates, high casualty rates, or the emergence of a "mutually hurting stalemate," where both sides recognize that continued conflict is unsustainable and mutually detrimental. This recognition creates a "readiness window" for negotiation, where previously unthinkable compromises become psychologically acceptable. Attitude change during de-escalation often involves a painful process of cognitive restructuring, requiring leaders to carefully manage public expectations and provide new justifications for peace that honor past sacrifices while emphasizing future gains.

Post-conflict resolution presents its own set of challenges, as peace treaties often precede genuine psychological reconciliation. Even after formal hostilities cease, deeply entrenched hostile attitudes, distrust, and desire for revenge can persist for generations. The maintenance of peace requires sustained efforts to transform negative attitudes through truth and reconciliation commissions, shared economic projects, and educational reforms that address historical grievances and promote narrative parity. Without this continuous psychological work, latent hostile attitudes can easily be reactivated by political opportunists or minor conflicts, demonstrating that the dynamic nature of conflict attitudes necessitates constant vigilance and reinforcement of pro-peace norms.