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The fields of trauma and cognitive science have the potential to influence and inform one another when boundaries between traditionally segregated domains of academic pursuit are crossed. This volume (and the 1998 Meeting which inspired the volume) sought to bring together the methods, assumptions, and interpretations of trauma researchers who crossed boundaries of traditional areas within psychology and psychiatry. In so doing, the authors contributed research and theory that differed along important dimensions.
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such as population or methodology, while sharing common themes. Across
the different methodologies and perspectives represented in this volume,
there is an awareness that multiple forms of assessment and multiple con cep-
tual tools are required to understand the complex relationship of trauma and
human behavior. Multiple perspectives are the essential ingredient in the
study of trauma and its effects. The contributions made to this volume cap-
ture the necessary diversity in methodology, theory, and interpretation that
will push our understanding of trauma and its effects forward.

While diversity in theory and methodology appears to be an important
goal for researchers, diversity requires the breaking down of traditional
boundaries. Breaking down boundaries is a formidable task. In his welcome
remarks to the 1998 Meeting on Trauma and Cognitive Science held at the
University of Oregon, University President Dave Frohmayer recognized the
importance and magnitude of this task: “I especially commend you for your
willingness to cross disciplinary boundaries. Combining the rigor and preci-
sion of cognitive science with the complex worlds of trauma and Clinical
Psychology. Bringing these worlds together is both a challenge and an oppor-
tunity.” The 1998 Meeting on Trauma and Cognitive Science and this vol-
ume provide a model for addressing problems from different perspectives,
paradigms, and intellectual traditions. Now that we have this model, we can
see that such collaborative efforts are a very important and productive way to
operate. This multidisciplinary approach can be applied to the trauma field
more generally, and psychology as a whole. When we listen to other perspec-
tives, the opportunities for discovery and understanding increase. Unfortu-
nately our academic fields are often divided into separate “areas” that be-
come isolated from one another. In contrast, we believe that areas within a
field or department are most valuable when used and thought of as focal
points for shared intellectual interests. Such intellectual communities intrinsi-
cally have fuzzy boundaries, are ever changing, and often have overlapping
edges—they are not some set of fixed, mutually exclusive, and exhaustive
categories that adequately subdivide the field.

President Dave Frohmayer (1998) also noted: “Long-standing borders
are always difficult to cross; that’s the history of inquiry. They are broken
down with great courage and great difficulty.” This sentiment reflects similar
ideas expressed elsewhere in the scientific community. Rhonda Shearer and
Stephen Jay Gould published an essay in the November 5, 1999 issue of
Science magazine, in which they urged scientists not to create disciplinary
boundaries where they need not exist. Shearer and Gould (1999) note that
while humans have a tendency to divide into “us versus them,” humans are
also capable of “mental flexibility, and our consequent potential for over-
coming such innate limitations by education” (p. 1093). They wrote “The
contingent and largely arbitrary nature of disciplinary boundaries has unfor-
tunately been reinforced, and even made to seem ‘natural’ by our drive to construct dichotomies’’ (p. 1093). Perhaps their most important observation is:

Our tendency to parse complex nature into pairings of “us versus them” should not only be judged as false in our university of shadings and continua, but also (and often) harmful, given another human propensity for judgment—so that “us versus them” easily becomes “good versus bad” or even, when zealotry fans our xenophobic flames, “chosen for martyrdom versus ripe for burning.” (p. 1093)

Frohnmayer (1998), as well as Shearer and Gould (1999) speak to the importance of minimizing disciplinary boundaries. What is true for large disciplinary boundaries is also true for minimizing boundaries within a discipline. The study of trauma requires that we cross and combine traditional areas. President Frohnmayer (1998) also drew attention to the importance of combining rigorous science with compassionate humanity: “... to find you here, obviously indicates the seriousness of the topic and of your intellectual devotion to understanding it more deeply. ... This conference brings to this campus obviously not only scientists who's professional experience has immersed you in the world of research, but scientists who understand human beings as human beings and the importance of that research to science and society and indeed to human well-being.” Supporting Frohnmayer’s emphasis on the importance of this research to society, the local newspaper for the city of Eugene covered the conference for the lay public (Mortenson, 1998; Rojas-Burke, 1998).

The future success of traumatic stress studies, and particularly the melding of cognitive science and traumatic stress, will depend upon ever increasing collaboration between scientists, scholars, and thinkers with diverse backgrounds. Key elements are necessary to support this growing diversity and commitment to breaking down boundaries. We hope to see the field become better funded to support diversity in intellectual approach. In addition, a continued emphasis on developmental effects will be essential (see also Putnam, 1997). With the growing awareness that trauma interacts with developmental time course, developmental approaches will be critical to examining the broad range of human behaviors affected by trauma. Moreover, because the study of trauma brings us face to face with human cruelty, it is ethically imperative that we incorporate not just a scientific approach but also wisdom from the humanities. Different ways of knowing, different methodologies, and different perspectives are all essential for continued progress in understanding and ameliorating traumatic stress.

As collaborative progress continues within the fields of psychology and
psychiatry, we hope that trauma researchers and clinicians will seek to broaden the audience for this research. Trauma affects humanity—not any one particular subset of people, but all of humanity. Given this, we need to also break down boundaries to education about trauma and societal denial of the existence of trauma. One critical step to doing this lies in the education of future generations of students in our classrooms, as our advisees, and supervisees. We need to train our students to evaluate and measure the role of previous and current trauma in the lives of research participants, even when trauma is not the specific focus of the research, as traumatic experiences are likely to be impacting a wide variety of aspects of human functioning (including personality, social, cognitive, and neurological functioning). Similarly, we need to include the role of trauma in our curriculum as we teach students about human functioning.

In addition, trauma research can provide a framework for questioning and understanding widespread oppression in society. As collaboration between areas of psychology and psychiatry push forward, we have the opportunity to join other fields, such as women’s studies and sociology in understanding how various forms of oppression, violence, and trauma are perpetrated and maintained in society. As our understanding of mechanisms and effects increases, our ability to intervene and prevent violence and trauma will hopefully increase.

There are risks in asking questions about trauma and oppression, one of which is the effect trauma work has on the worldviews we hold as researchers. In asking about trauma, we are challenged to understand our role in a culture that can tacitly support violence against women and children, our own positions of power and accountability, as well as our responsibility to name trauma. These are powerful challenges that most likely change us in the process—our sense of self, other, and context can be transformed through this work. In this transformation, we realize that we cannot remain untouched by trauma. The study of trauma, the participants who courageously share their experiences, and the knowledge of both the limits and bounds of human resilience change us as researchers. This is not what we are taught in traditional training models; rather, we have been taught that research and science require “objectivity,” not transformation. And so, in studying trauma, we face a challenge to reevaluate our assumptions, values, and views.

While traumatic events, particularly those involving interpersonal violence and betrayal, can challenge one’s faith, as researchers we find hope and inspiration from studying trauma, and from sharing the study of trauma with colleagues from various perspectives. As Frohnmayer said at the 1998 conference: “Your success as it is expressed at this conference will prove to be formative. I believe in the emerging field of trauma and cognitive science helping to set the agenda by focusing on the pursuit of the important cross-
disciplinary questions with a three-fold combination of scientific excellence, attention to ethics, and dedication to humanity."
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