
PARENTS OF THE FIELD PROJECT.

Interviewee; Dr. Landrum Bolling

Date: 20th December 2005

Venue: Worldwatch Institute, Washington D.C.

Interviewer; Dr. Christopher Mitchell.

Interviewer: We are here at the Worldwatch Institute's Headquarters in Washington, D.C. as part of our Parents of the Field studies. It's 20 December 2005 and we're interviewing our colleague, Dr. Landrum Bolling, who is currently working for Worldwatch. He has a long, long history of involvement in our field. So Landrum – may I call you Landrum?

Landrum Bolling: Of course, everybody does.

Interviewer: Yes, I've noticed that. Going back a little bit - in the early days of peace and conflict studies, people came into it from a huge variety of different backgrounds – intellectual, personal etc. What was yours and how did you get involved in peace work?

Landrum Bolling: Well, I was a war correspondent in World War II. I spent the last winter of the war with Tito's Partisans in Yugoslavia. I was in on the liberation of Sarajevo and I saw the surrender ceremonies on the Po River at the end of the war in the Mediterranean.

And I had some very interesting post-war experiences as well. I stayed on as a foreign correspondent for a few years after the war. But then I went into the academic world and my interest in international affairs had – well, actually began as a child. I was always interested in the far world. Geography and history were my passions, academically. So I had a predisposition to studying the problems and the conflicts, and the war experience as a war correspondent simply heightened that.

I was – I am and was - a Quaker. I had – I had status as a conscientious objector but I withdrew that actually and agreed – decided to abroad as a war correspondent. And my interest in these studies developed out of that.

Interviewer: So what particularly... attracted you to [an] academic interest in peace studies?

Landrum Bolling: Well, I did graduate work in political science at the University of Chicago; and I taught at Brown University and Deloitte College. And I found myself almost inevitably drifting toward international relations studies, rather than some of the more generic, basic political science fields.

So I had that – I had that kind of academic background, but I think the thing that really got me very much engaged... was becoming involved with the Middle East crisis – the Middle East conflict. I made a trip to the Middle East in 1958 – my first visit to that part of the world. That's a long while ago, now. And I've been going back and forth all the years since then.

I had a post in Jerusalem after I retired from the academic world. I felt as the Director of the Medical Institute at **[Inaudible]**, an institute in play between Jerusalem and Bethlehem. And even before that, though, I was very much involved because the American Friends Service Committee asked me to do a study of the Middle East conflict and see if there was anything the Quakers might contribute. So out of that came a committee that worked with me and we produced a book - which I basically wrote - called Search for Peace in the Middle East. This was published in 1971.

Interviewer: I remember.

Landrum Bolling: And that – that sort of anchored me from then on...as being very much involved and so both with that and the academic world and the journalistic world - and then various public forums - I've been really, deeply engaged in the Middle East problems.

Interviewer: But going back a little bit before then, where was your first appointment as an academic? Where did you start out?

Landrum Bolling: Brown University.

Interviewer: At Brown... and you implied that when you became an academic, - a card-carrying member of “academia” - you were entering the field of international relations while you were doing your studies. Was there a [conflict or peace] studies field in those days ?

Landrum Bolling: Not really, no. I never heard the phrase, I think, in those early years. Though, obviously, those who had a special bent toward

this field naturally did put effort into trying to learn more about what causes war, how you get out of them and so on...

But now I've watched the emergence of this field, of these studies of conflict resolution and marveled at how it has taken hold and I don't know how many hundreds of institutions now across the country have these programs. I know my own college that I was associated with for so many years - Earlham. I got very deeply involved in this, and still am to this day.

Interviewer: Yes. Well, we've had a couple of graduates from Earlham's [peace studies] program from the early days. The program is still very influential.

Landrum Bolling: Yes, it's still going strong.

Interviewer: So... You became very interested in the Middle East and peacemaking - and "peace building" as it's now called - in the Middle East.... Were there any other people who very much influenced the way you thought about the Middle East and wrote about it, because I know you've written about some of your activities there. Who were other influences on you at that time, do you think?

Landrum Bolling: Well, those who've influenced me about the Middle East first of all were the Quakers who were interested in it. And there's a Quaker community in Rammalah, North of Jerusalem - and the Quaker School has been in operation for more than 100 years and I had some contact with them. And through them, I had my first introduction to the life of the people there. But I also became acquainted with a number of very interesting Jewish people who had strong interests in peace in the Middle East.

Interviewer: Yes..

Landrum Bolling: And some of them were tremendously influential. One of the most important ones in my whole life was a man named Dr. Noam Dolgin [sp ?], who was one of the leaders of the Zionist move. He was the founder of the World Zionist organization. He was the founder of the World Jewish Congress. He was the organizer of Council of Presidents of Major Jewish Organizations - which is sort of the inner circle of the American Jewish establishment. But he was an ardent "dove" and he was very much concerned about the development of the conflict between Palestinian Arabs and Israelis. Actually, he refused to go into the Israeli government

because he felt that Ben Gurion and the other early leaders were not taking it seriously enough to meet and get down to business and negotiate with the Palestinians about territory.

Interviewer: I never realized.

Landrum Bolling: And he was a tremendous influence... Here a man with credentials that couldn't be questioned. He was an ardent Zionist, but at the same time he felt that the political figures who'd taken charge of their new country were not seeing correctly the problems they had to face. And so he would never live in Israel. He hadn't kept a home there. He went occasionally. He lived in Paris most of the time, traveled over the world. He was a major force in the Israeli life in one way, because he was the negotiator of the financial settlement that the Jews won from the Germans. So he was a major figure in Zionist history, but his vision of peace in the Middle East was not the vision of the political leadership there.

Interviewer: Yes. So much the greater pity, I think. Who else - particularly - [among others] practitioners, activists, [for example] ?

Landrum Bolling: Well, you know, I think frankly that one of the most significant forces in shaping my thinking about peace studies came out of my work with my colleagues at Earlham College, in the development of our off-campus study programs. We were pioneers in the development of serious well-organized [international] study programs. And in the course of the years that I was a professor there, and on the committee that worked on that later as part of the college, we developed a program that provided opportunities for students to choose one of about 20 different foreign study programs they could be involved in. And by the time people got to graduation time, most of them would have had anywhere from three months to a year studying abroad. I believe very strongly in direct, face-to-face contact as central for building peace. And the development of this foreign study program, with so many dimensions and different parts of the world, I think... confirmed in me the belief that this is one of the most central things. How to get other people to know other countries, other cultures, other people face-to-face. And out of that I... a lot of my thinking about conflict resolution, and how you go about it, has been influenced by that concern about people-to-people knowledge and understanding, I think that's very fundamental.

And in that group, there were many faculty members who were influential in helping me with that effort. I was unmistakably the leader, organizer of this and as president of the college. This is one of the things that like has some influence on it. So I found many allies along the way.

One of the allies that I acquired in those years was also head of another educational institution in Indiana and that was Father Hesburgh, the President of the University of Notre Dame. And Father Hesburgh, early on, became very much convinced that the study of war and peace was an essential obligation of the academic community and this ought to be made a part of the program. He worked at this at Notre Dame. He talked about it with me before he really was able to launch the program at Notre Dame. So I sort of gravitated toward people of this sort and Father Hesburgh was one person of considerable influence with me in the development of these ideas.

Interviewer: So when he and you began working in Earlham and in Notre Dame, was there a sense of a “new field” emerging, something which was different from normal International Relations - or were you conscious of shaping something new?

Landrum Bolling: I think the awareness of the emergence of the study of conflict resolution, for example, came a little bit later. But yes, I did become acquainted with people who were deeply committed to this. For instance, Kenneth and Elise Boulding were friends of mine and I was in their home from time to time and we talked about these [ideas]. They visited me at Earlham. They were certainly influential in my thinking about it and I saw their influence in helping to develop the field. But, in time, I became very much involved with two or three people at Harvard. One was Herbert Kelman, a social psychologist who was very much interested in this - and another one was Roger Fisher of the Harvard Law School. Roger and I became acquainted because of a common interest in Middle East peace.

Interviewer: Ah, yes. *Dear Arabs, Dear Israeli* - that was his book wasn't it?

Landrum Bolling: Well, yes, he wrote a book called *Dear Arabs, Dear Israelis*, and that grew out actually of a trip he took with me. He took leave from Harvard once to work with me for about three months on the Middle East Peace problem and out of that working together, he developed this little book.

-
- Landrum Bolling: But he also was involved in television broadcasts at that period and... Roger was the founder of the interdisciplinary interdepartmental project in Harvard called the Harvard Negotiation Program which enlisted people from psychology and from the law school, and I was invited to some of their preliminary meetings. And I was, for a time, on the Harvard Advisory Committee on Middle East studies. So these things all sort of rolled together. I mean, it's hard for me to disentangle these different strands of influence, but they're all related.
- Interviewer: But there's a clear line from your background to Earlham, to Notre Dame, to Harvard, so it was ... kind of a network that developed ?
- Landrum Bolling: There was a network there. Yes, there was indeed !
- Interviewer: And eventually at Harvard – let's just follow up on the Harvard piece for the moment - I think it was you and Roger who were very influential in starting up “CMG” - the Conflict Management Group.
- Landrum Bolling: Well the Conflict Management Group, of course, grew out of the little book that Roger wrote with the help of some of his students called *Getting to Yes*. And *Getting to Yes* became a big seller and, of course, I read his book... and he asked me to join [the Group].
- Interviewer: ...we talked to Roger a little while ago - I think in the summer, up on Cape Cod. We went up and interviewed him so we've got part of his side of the story... So back to the Middle East. You first visited there in '58 and then you've been back many, many times and I think that obviously you came across a number of people who were doing peace and conflict work there – practical peace.
- Landrum Bolling: Yes.
- Interviewer: What do you think were some of the... major developments in attempting to build bridges between the Palestinians and the Israelis? Obviously, your own work ? You could tell us about that. You mentioned some people in these activities.
- Landrum Bolling: Well there are a great many people. One of the principle figures in that kind of effort was a professor at Hebrew University named Edy Kaufman... the director of the Harry Truman Peace Institute at Hebrew University in Jerusalem. I got to know Edy very well and he assisted me in bringing together a group of Israeli
-

academics and Palestinian academics at a time when they didn't meet each other. And so I was in with Edy in one of the very earliest meetings in which serious discussion took place between a group of Palestinian scholars and Israelis, plus some other academic people, plus a few people drawn out of the diplomatic service and so on.

Interviewer:: This would be about when?

Landrum Bolling: This would have been in – well this particular initiative that I was involved in with Edy, took place in 1984, I think it was. And he approached me. I was then Rector of the Ecumenical Institute there at Bethlehem and he said, "You know, I have some money. One of our sponsors wants to promote dialogue between Palestinians intellectuals and Israelis, and we would, of course, be glad to invite the Palestinians to come to Hebrew University, but obviously, they can't come. There they would feel embarrassed and awkward and maybe they would be maybe attacked for doing this. And they couldn't invite us to University of Bethlehem, so would you be willing to let us hold a meeting at your Institute?"] And I said, "Of course, we would be delighted to have you come." So [we went] a little further and he said, "Well would you [inaudible] a lot of people [inaudible] over the list." And he said, "Well...would you see if you can extend the invitation to the Palestinians."

Interviewer: Wow.

Landrum Bolling: So I got myself... I was just drawn into this !

Interviewer: You were certainly involved by that time.

Landrum Bolling: And then to finally he asked if I would be the chair of the meeting. I felt it real awkward, anyway. It was very foolish that I said yes. I would say, "Okay, I'll chair your meeting." Well, we set up a very strange set of rules. One was there were to be no photographs taken. There was to be no publicity about it, whatsoever. There would be no minutes kept and no protocol signed at the end of the meeting. But it would be an all-day discussion, and without any publicity and without any public recognition such a meeting was taking place. The Palestinians even insisted that they would not have speakers sitting at the same – at the table. They wanted an outsider to give a speech and then they'd side with the activist speech by the outsider.

Interviewer: Yes.

Landrum Bolling: You know it was very carefully constructed. Well the Israelis agreed to all of these conditions and so it took place and it was an amazing experience. It had its ups and downs but fortunately we had two older statesmen-like people from the Palestinian side. One was the former Director General of the Foreign Office... and another was General Harkabi who had been for ten years, Chief of Military Intelligence. And both of these men were serious Doves. I mean they wanted to see peace made. So I got – by being invited into this discussion, I was the only outsider there, you know. I got a really crammed course - there in that one-day - on the problems, the strategies or the psychologies of these two camps.

Interviewer: Yes.

Landrum Bolling: And from then on I got more and more drawn into this thing. So over the years, my involvement in this Middle East search for Middle East peace was shaped by practitioners on the ground. And in the course of the time, I became very well acquainted with a number of political figures on both sides.

And one key part of my background in all of this, which I have to say something about, is that President Carter asked me to be a kind of messenger boy - carrying messages between the White House and Arafat in the time when it was impossible, illegal for any U.S. Government official to have any contact with the PLO. So I was never on the government payroll. I never had any government money at my disposal but I acted as an informal – I called myself “a messenger boy” instead of Track II Diplomacy, which is the current fancy name for it. But I carried many messages back and forth between Arafat and Carter over a period of his [Presidency] – any even in the Reagan years, I was asked once by the Deputy Secretary of State, "Landrum, are you still keep in touch with Arafat? Would you be willing to make a trip out and talk to him? He's misinterpreting the speech that Secretary Schultz made and he's going through the roof about something. Go and explain to him what this speech really means." So I made a trip to Tunis to explain George Bush's speech and got a good response out of it. So that kind of strange role was part of my education.

Interviewer: Yes.

Landrum Bolling: And part of the experience that led me to feel more and more strongly committed to the efforts to try and find ways to help both sides learn how to get together and work these problems out.

Interviewer: So it's interesting that you comment on the difficulties in making contact with the PLO in those days, because I remember that. Didn't the Ambassador to the U.N. have to resign over that?

Landrum Bolling: Yes, Andrew Young had a...social meeting with the representative of the PLO at the U.N. and this was supposed to be kept secret, but nothing is kept secret, of course – like that.

Interviewer: Of course, nothing like what it should be.

Landrum Bolling: And when it leaked out - Andy Young had sat down actually and had a cup of tea with this representative of the PLO, why there was a big uproar. And Carter had to ask for his resignation.

Interviewer: I recall.

Landrum Bolling: Yes.

Interviewer: But tell me, how did you come to be the Rector of the Ecumenical Institute? Did you go there directly from Earlham,... what was that story?

Landrum Bolling: No, there were some years intervened. My checkered career is not something we need to go into here, but after...I've been 15 years President of Earlham College and I then became Head of the Lilly Endowment, a major foundation, which I did for 5 years. Then I was Head of the National Council of Foundations for a period of years and then I retired again - I thought !

But then a [inaudible] service at Georgetown asked me to come and be an adjunct official there, which I did for awhile. And then one day I had a call from Father Hesburgh, my longtime friend and colleague, saying, "Landrum, I've just come back from Jerusalem where we had a meeting of our international board for the Ecumenical Institute and we've decided to broaden the program and to reach out - not just trying to bring Catholics and non-Catholics together in an ecumenical gathering, but to bring Islamists and [others] together...And we want to give peace studies of major impact in this theological institute and study center that's been created and we just elected you President !" I

said, "What are you talking about Father Hesburgh? I'm not a theologian. I'm a political scientist, if anything, a former journalist, I have not standing as a theologian at all. I'm not a Catholic. I'm a Quaker." He said, "None of that matters. You're a man of peace and we know your background and we want to draw upon your experience to help develop a new program."

Interviewer: Oh, okay. So the network comes from Notre Dame.

Landrum Bolling: Back again.

Interviewer: Back again to you and then on to...the Ecumenical Center. Talking of networks, one of the things some of our other interviewees have said was that, as the field emerged - whatever we're going to call it - these studies are controversial. There are a number of centers [and often conferences] that were important in putting people in contact with one another.

Landrum Bolling: Right.

Interviewer: Did you ever find that that was helpful with a particular conferences that you went to - or were you a great conference-goer?

Landrum Bolling: I was for a time, but I must confess to you - very bluntly I want to say - after a while I grew weary of conferences and seminars and special conferences on peace studies or peacemaking and so on. I felt that an awful lot of time, energy and money were wasted in these. It's nice to get together... as in keeping in touch with people who share your interests. That's fine, but I think this is overdone.

Interviewer: The English have a term - a "junket" - for this. Have you ever come across that?

Landrum Bolling: Yes! Oh yes, indeed ! Well - many of these are "junkets".

Interviewer: I'm afraid you're right. Staying with "the field" for the moment, as it emerged, it always tended to talk about itself - or the people in it tended to talk about themselves - as being "multi-disciplinary" or... "eclectic" was another word... that they use. Were there any...ideas that the field borrowed [or you borrowed] from other disciplines? You were a political scientist, but what other disciplines did you find useful in understanding conflict and peace - and particularly conflict and peace in the Middle East? Was

there anything that...helped you a great deal or was it just on-the-ground experience?

Landrum Bolling: Well on the ground experiences were most influential with me in my own thinking but I must say that I benefited by having contact with people who were economists. They brought their insights to bear upon conflict issues. And then social psychologists like Herb Kelman, who...I think had a very important contribution to make in pointing out the importance of the psychological dimensions - the things that block moving toward peace. And then, of course, in my long years of involvement with Roger Fisher and his law background and... especially his focusing on the procedures of negotiation and trying to refine a...pattern of procedures to be followed in successful negotiation, I learned a great deal from that. And I think that basically Roger's contribution has been very, very important in getting people to focus on down-to-earth, practical methods of communicating, of understanding what other people are saying, of helping people to see. One of Rogers's great contributions, I think, has been to get people to see beyond positions to interests. What is the basic interest that lies behind this conflict? Not just the positions you are putting forward publicly all the time.

So I think that this field as it emerges has drawn upon many different disciplines and it is an eclectic, intellectual adventure. I think it is – it needs to be rooted in practical experience and I think... more and more that is happening. I must say that where peace studies stops just with the kind of get acquainted with another culture academic discussions about people's different literatures and social patterns, and anthropological background and so on. All of this is good. I'm not going to demean that in any way, but I think too often the effort in the academy stops there.

Interviewer: Yes.

Landrum Bolling: And I think it's terribly important to go beyond this, to dig deeper into the realities of what produces these conflicts and how can you come to grips with the issues that have to be addressed if you're going to solve them. I guess...I've become more and more a results-oriented person. I want to see something positive happen about all of this. And I think something can happen and it ought to be rooted in some serious knowledge about the cultures that we're dealing with, the political interests, economic interests. We can't... short-circuit this. We don't have enough facts, we don't have enough information often to make responsible judgments,

so... I think...just to explore the political, psychological, anthropological aspects of differences doesn't really get us to where we should be trying to go.

Interviewer: Yes.

Landrum Bolling: And I believe that the academy has a role to play in helping the people out there - on the front line, so to speak - in the diplomatic, and military and political world. They need what the academy can bring and I think there must be a greater effort to communicate with the policymakers, the decision makers in our society.

Interviewer: You sound very much like my old professor John Burton, who's had very much the same kind of view about the practicality of the field and that it ought to be – what's Kurt Lewin's old phrase ?-about...acting as practical theorists rather than just theorists. Actually, you've preempted my next question, which was the question about how “practical” the field ought to be and how practical the field has always aimed to be. Do you think we've succeeded in that ? You gave the impression that you thought that we have not engaged enough in the practical side. Was I mishearing you?

Landrum Bolling: No, I – slightly misreading me, I guess. I don't want to put any discipline down or any academic worker in this vineyard. All of us have a contribution to make and I don't mean to be rude... But I do think that it is important to get beyond what I call the discussion phase. We academics are great talkers. We love to spin out ideas and explore insights and all that's right and good, but I think that we need to discipline ourselves in some [way] – at least, some of us do - to see how these ideas, how these theories can be applied in the practical world that we've confronted. And I think the disconnect between the academic world and the real world in the field of diplomacy is very shocking.

Interviewer: Really.

Landrum Bolling: But I don't know how the academy can be taken more seriously than it is. It should be, but so much of what is done by the practitioners of diplomacy is not taking into account the realities that the academic communities [face] Well, there are so many aspects of this. Take one thing in particular, that's a strong interest of mine and that is the mastery of languages. They - the academic world - ought to have been doing much more in the past in training

people in the languages in the areas of the Middle East - in Arabic. It's pretty late in the day. But the teaching of Arabic is now coming slowly into the American academic community. But goodness, not nearly soon enough. And of course knowing about the religions of the world is increasingly important for us. Much of the conflict of the world today revolves around; misunderstandings, antagonisms, hostilities develop between the Muslim and the non-Muslim world.

Interviewer: Yes

Landrum Bolling: Now, it isn't to say that all the fault is to one side or the other but there is... obviously a failure to establish trustworthy communication between these cultures.

Interviewer Yes.

Landrum Bolling: And that's a – that's partly a challenge to the academic community to do more about this. So... what we're dealing with is a many faceted kind of intellectual and social and political adventure and there's a role for all kinds of us in that effort to build a world in which differences can be discussed, can be negotiated, and peace can be found.

Interviewer: Yes - well one of the things that I should have told you when we were chatting earlier about the Institute is that we've just - about two years ago - set up a small center within my Institute for the study of world religions, diplomacy and conflict resolution The Director is Marc Gopin, - you may know him a very interesting rabbi. And so it is very much interested in understanding religions conflicts...

Landrum Bolling: Good, that's very much needed.

Interviewer: Going back to your comments about Roger [Fisher] was that he was definitely one of the leading figures in the development of the field.

Landrum Bolling: Right.

Andy: And you've also mentioned Father Hesburgh [who] is also very important. Looking back, who else would you think of as being key figures in the development of this - as you said early on - quite astonishing growth in the field over the last 30 years or so?

Landrum Bolling: Well one, who unfortunately, I have not kept closely in touch with is my Israeli friend, Edy Kaufman, who's now been shuffling for many years between the University of Maryland and Hebrew University? But Edy is – has been – an influence, not as conspicuous a figure as Roger Fisher and Father Hesburgh, but he's... a very important figure in this development. In a quiet way, he's become for us a very significant figure in keeping the interest of this alive. And, of course, he was one of the people, those volunteers who work to get the U.S. Institute of Peace established.

Interviewer: Okay. Do you think [you can recall] what were the hopes and dreams that people like yourself had at the very beginning of this story? I know having talked to a lot of other people; they've said that nothing has really made a difference and some of them have sounded a slight note of regret about this. Do you have anything that particularly disappointed you or that you would like to have seen – you've mentioned language teaching. You've mentioned understanding religions. What other things do you think we could have done better? Or what have we done well? The positive or the negative.

Landrum Bolling: Well I think I try to be a realist about these things. I try not to get too discouraged by failures or slow movement toward progress. I think that it's true that we've not made as much progress in the development of this field and its application to these real problems in the world as many of us hoped to be the case, but I think that's partly due to a human tendency to be always looking for quick and easy answers.

Interviewer: Right.

Landrum Bolling: And there are few in the world. Serious problems and it just takes time, it takes patience, it takes devotion, commitment, hard work. It may be that we've done about as well as we could have done though I think that maybe we were a bit naïve in some of the assumptions that we've made.

Interviewer: For example ?

Landrum Bolling: Well the assumption that if we often talked about conflict management or conflict resolution, that we would have a serious impact on the training of diplomats or those working in international organisations. I don't think that's happened to us. I

think that – well explaining this field to the general public, the tribe of politicians, to the pundits this – the education of the constituents out there that have to be reached. It has not been done as well as it might have been done. It certainly was necessary for it to be done. I'm still very hopeful about the field. I think it's going well I think it's coming of age.

Interviewer: One of the positive things?

Landrum Bolling: One of the positive things, yes. I can honestly say that I've been... disappointed in the slowness with which the lessons learned from these activities have been recorded, have been evaluated, have been acted upon. I think this is true of almost any new venture - that it's very important to set up from the beginning some expectations, if not some procedure, by which you evaluate what you're doing. And I think there maybe has not been enough serious evaluation of these activities and mid-course corrections need to be made. For example I – I will tell you one rather indelicate story about one major foundation that I will not identify.

Interviewer: Okay. I won't ask you what it was.

Landrum Bolling: One of their representatives went abroad and checked in on some grants that had been made that relate to various conflict resolution projects. And he apparently made an annual visit to some of these sites where these programs were undertaken and he made – expressed some disagreement with them and he came back the next year... I mean such an evaluation should emerge. And this is not a frivolous man; this is a serious person in a responsible position in a major foundation, who dismisses this as a bunch of incredible works. That was a shock to me when I discovered this.... And the local representative of that foundation said to me, "I'm sorry, I don't agree with my superior, but that's the word I get from headquarters."

Interviewer: Why do you think we've fallen down rather badly on that side of things... convincing people of the worth of what we're doing?

Landrum Bolling: Well it may be – it may be that we over promised or that we did not more realistically evaluate the expectations and some... foundation's funders are faddish. Things are popular at one moment... And then after a year, they asked for an evaluation...!

Interviewer: Let's stop looking back for the moment and look forward. Where do you think the field is going to go in the immediate future? What do you think will be new developments and new changes - which is one questions. The second one is what would you like to see happen?

Landrum Bolling: Well I don't know. I have a very clouded crystal ball, and I don't think I'd be a very good prognosticator about the future of the field. I do suspect that in the coming years, you'll find more institutions that have had the boldness that George Mason University has had, will develop extensive programs of graduate studies and undergraduate studies in this field. I think that's going to come. George Mason has been way out in front I think of any other institution I know of that's so extensive a program. I think more of that will happen and I think basically that's probably a good thing. I think there are likely to be increasing efforts to involve these programs in the more practical kind of negotiation training that the Conflict Management Group represents at Harvard's Negotiation Program and I think that's a good thing. I think to get people to examine cases of conflict and how they might be analyzed and how they might be negotiated. That's a very important aspect of what ought to come out of this field.

I I would hope that in the years ahead, there will be – there will be a kind of fieldwork experience as far as people in this area who will maybe spend a semester in the field exploring a conflict and how it might be dealt with. I would hope that the academics would get more involved with the practitioners in looking over their shoulders and critiquing what the practitioners are doing and where possible, where useful, offering some suggestions as to how this can be done.

Interviewer : Yes.

Landrum Bolling: I think that it's also important that, even though most of us got into this field because of a strong interest in international conflict, that we ought to look at the whole broad area of human disputes and how they arise and how they could be dealt with. And I think in that regard, it would be very important to have not only special field experiences dealing with international conflicts but also field experiences that relate to interracial, interethnic conflicts, class conflicts, conflict within urban societies and so on.

Interviewer: OK.

Landrum Bolling: So that I think we have to break out of a – what I think largely as self-imposed format that tends to, at least in many institutions, to focus entirely on international conflict as such.

Andy: Um hum.

Landrum Bolling: Even though that's been my own primary interest.

Andy: Mine, too.

Landrum Bolling: But I think that there's a – that we need to get the whole world thinking more in terms of how do we deal with human disputes, how they escalate, how **[inaudible]** control, how what started as a very local dispute may grow to something quite horrendous.

Andy: Um hum. And what about you, if it's **[inaudible]** not revealing anything that is secret or confidential, what are your plans for the future?

Landrum Bolling: Well I'm right now trying to distance myself from projects.

Andy: What does that mean?

Landrum Bolling: And to involve myself primarily in writing. I've got two books in the works that I want to do and I must get on with them. This last year I've been involved in too many projects. I've worked the **[inaudible]**. A year ago, I spent a week in Beijing with part of our program **[inaudible]**. A little bit later, I spent a week in Istanbul with another workshop on conflict management. I've just come back now from a week with a group of Iraqi local government officials. **[Inaudible]** that we put on in **[inaudible]**.

Andy: You've been traveling a lot.

Landrum Bolling: I've been traveling too much and I want to settle down and also act my age.

Andy: What are the two books?

Landrum Bolling: Well one is a book about the Middle East conflict and how it can still be solved.

Andy: You are an optimist.

Landrum Bolling: I am an optimist. I have never given up my belief that we – they say because I know both people so well over a period of – I've invested 40 years of my life with this thing now and I'm not gonna give up now. There are too many fine intelligent wonderful people on both sides.

Andy: Um hum.

Landrum Bolling: And they basically know what the solution is. There's a package deal on the table. There's a lack of political will among the Israelis particularly. The Palestinians have no effective leadership. That's the sad thing. And the American government is bemused with all kinds of half-truths about the Middle East problems and don't take our responsibilities seriously. So I don't want to deal with those questions. That's one book.

Andy: Yeah, and the other one?

Landrum Bolling: The other book is about – a broader one or just more kind of a – not an autobiography, but a memoir of lessons learned. What are the lessons I've learned in this and what checkered schizophrenic career that I've had and I don't know whether it'll be of great value interest to the outside world, but I'm interested in writing it.

Andy: Okay.

Landrum Bolling: To sum up sort of what I think I've learned.

Andy: Well you must come out to the institute and talk about one or other of these books sometime in 2006.

Landrum Bolling: I'd love to, yep.

Andy: I've got two final questions that I always ask and then we stop and **[inaudible]** reminds me of things that I haven't asked properly and that I've missed out. But, my two final questions are really rather straightforward. Supposing you had been sitting where I was sitting, interviewing Doctor Landrum Bolling, what would you have asked that I haven't asked that you think is important?

Landrum Bolling: Well I don't know that's a tough question. I think I might have asked, "What do you think are the principle ingredients of peacemaking?"

Andy: And you would have said what?

Landrum Bolling: I would have said first of all listening.

Andy: Um hum.

Landrum Bolling: The number one thing I believe that has to be put before people's focus is you have to listen to the other side.

Andy: Um hum.

Landrum Bolling: If you're not willing to listen, the thing is going nowhere.

Andy: Um hum.

Landrum Bolling: You've got to hear what the other side says. You've got to be able to look at the options that may be in front of you and try to be as realistic as you can, but at the same time be as imaginative as you can. Nothing is off – off the bounds of possibility.

Andy: Um hum.

Landrum Bolling: Some of the craziest ideas may be the best ideas in the long run. Get people to think in terms of options. They are a very important part of the process.

Andy: Okay.

Landrum Bolling: And then the other question I – the other dimension of it is try to find some strategy for building support for a peaceful resolution.

Andy: Um hum.

Landrum Bolling: Over and over again, the thing falls apart because there's no real basis of support for it. So those are some of the lessons I think I've learned about this.

Andy: Okay and that will be part of your second book?

Landrum Bolling: Yes.

Andy: Okay. All right last one is bearing in mind what we're doing with this project; we're interviewing parents of the field, who else ought we to talk to? Who else should we go and see? Father Hesburgh?

Landrum Bolling: Father Hesburgh is worth seeing, yes.

Andy: Okay. Is he still at Notre Dame, or?

Landrum Bolling: He's at Notre Dame. He's nearly blind now. His mind is still very clear. He'd have some interesting things to say.

Andy: Um hum.

Landrum Bolling: As would some of the other staff members there George Lopez.

Andy: I know George.

Landrum Bolling: You know George, no doubt.

Andy: Yeah.

Landrum Bolling: Joyce Neu out in San Diego is somebody I think also might be worth talking to.

Andy: Okay, anybody at Earlham?

Landrum Bolling: Well, Tony Bing has retired. He's no longer there. Tony is – was a key figure in their – that program of peace and global studies. He lives in North Carolina now. He's still very active in projects with the Quakers.

Andy: Um hum.

Landrum Bolling: If you don't know Tony, he's worth getting acquainted with.

Andy: Okay.

Landrum Bolling: He would have some ideas.

Andy: Um hum.

Landrum Bolling: There are a – there's another dimension to this whole field that I think ought to be looked into. In my experience with the conflict negotiation problems in Bosnia for example and I spent about three years in Sarajevo for Mercy Corps.

Andy: Um hum.

Landrum Bolling: And I had many meetings. I led various seminars; I had conferences with government officials and a variety of people in the society, religious leaders. I – the most encouraging things that I saw happening leading toward peace had to do with economic development projects.

Andy: Um hum.

Landrum Bolling: For example, Mercy Corps had some effort – made some serious efforts in training people in civil society projects, procedures and so on.

Andy: Um hum.

Landrum Bolling: And I think that was useful, but I think in terms of practical movement toward understanding and negotiations toward resolution came out of practical business. For example, Mercy Corps developed a small loans program.

Andy: Um hum.

Landrum Bolling: And it set up staff of people from different ethnic groups and religious groups to be the staff, to be the screeners. People from all segments were eligible to apply for loans and as this program was worked out, people began to see the advantages of working together for their own mutual advantage.

Andy: Right.

Landrum Bolling: If they had an economic stake in it, it was wonderful how quickly you could get past ethnic and religious disputes.

Andy: Um hum, yeah.

Landrum Bolling: If there's some economic stake in it that they can see jointly. It's interesting that criminals and small business people can make peace where politicians may not be able to. Criminals have a wonderful way of working together. Some of the worse things that

[Part 2]

Andy: All right. I'll ask that one first. When you started working in this field, people really, I don't think [inaudible].

-
- Male Speaker: Oops, go ahead.
- Andy: All right, when you first started working in this field, I'm not even sure that there was a term "conflict resolution," or "conflict management." I – when I started, it was called "complete studies," and now it's conflict resolution, conflict management, conflict **[inaudible]**, conflict **[inaudible]**. Have you sort of gone along with all of these changes?
- Landrum Bolling: Yes, I have. I have. Conflict – well when I first got involved in this it more had to do with international studies, peace studies, foreign studies, and so on, and this sort of developed eventually into peace and global studies.
- Andy: Um hum.
- Landrum Bolling: Then the term **[inaudible]** began to take over and I like that, it made sense. Then I got to **[inaudible]**.
- Andy: Um hum. And what did **[inaudible]**?
- Landrum Bolling: It promises more than it can deliver.
- Andy: Um hum.
- Landrum Bolling: And **[inaudible]** is right. You have to learn how to manage them. I think Roger had said something **[inaudible]** short of that **[inaudible]** kind of terminology but that **[inaudible]** conflicts do exist.
- Andy: Um hum.
- Landrum Bolling: They **[inaudible]** continue in one form or another. How do you **[inaudible]** this decision? **[Inaudible]**.
- Female Speaker: **[Inaudible]**. Can I offer you anything?
- Landrum Bolling: Actually, we're just finishing.
- Andy: All right so conflict transformation is okay?
-

-
- Landrum Bolling: Well, they're all okay. I don't – I'm not one to say I'm hung up on semantics but I have a sense **[inaudible]**. I like peace building rather than peacemaking or peacekeeping.
- Andy: Okay.
- Male Speaker: **[Inaudible]** you can ask the last question **[inaudible]** if you want to **[inaudible]**.
- Andy: Well the last question is and you talked about you know very briefly your experiences in **[inaudible]** and what other people have said that is very important **[inaudible]**. But you seem to indicate that your experience in the Middle East was rather more influential on you and balance.
- Landrum Bolling: Well, **[inaudible]** no question about it. I saw enough of the war to know that war is hell. War is unspeakable. War – there's got to be a better way. I came out of the war experience total – I mean I went in as an ex-pacifist and I came out almost a pacifist.
- Andy: Um hum.
- Landrum Bolling: War is not an option. It's not a solution. That's what came from my experience of seeing war and what it does.
- Andy: Yeah.
- Landrum Bolling: An important influence **[inaudible]**. I've had a front row seat for the conflict between the Palestinians and the Israelis for 40 years. I've – no special **[inaudible]** I was a college professor, **[inaudible]** journalist, **[inaudible]** Middle East, **[inaudible]** Jimmy Carter and Father Hesburgh and all of **[inaudible]** into **[inaudible]** after another that got me **[inaudible]** in the front row of this conflict. I have known personally about **[inaudible]** and **[inaudible]** and Paris and **[inaudible]** you name it. I had **[inaudible]** of people. And so I've learned a lot and those experiences have greatly influenced my thinking about what might be done.
- Andy: Landrum, thank you very much. **[Inaudible]**
- Landrum Bolling: **[Inaudible]** so, anyway, I've **[inaudible]** I've had an incredibly rich experience. I've been amazingly healthy, hardly been sick a day in my life. I've hardly ever been in the hospital. As a **[inaudible]** Christian, I say, "God has been good to me, beyond
-

any explanation," certainly beyond **[inaudible]** justification, but there it is and what is essential in my learning is the opportunity to learn about human beings in their different dimensions of life and their relationships and their conflicts and the possibilities of learning how to deal with it. So many of these experiences in my life have converged around this central issue.

Male Speaker: **[Inaudible]**.

Andy: All right. Okay, Landrum, I called you Landrum. When this field started back in the '50s and '60s, people came into it from a wide variety of different backgrounds, there's the practical, the intellectual, the personal. What was yours and what attracted you to working in this field? How did you actually get to **[inaudible]**?

Male Speaker: I think **[inaudible]** just gonna ask the question.

Andy: I'm just asking the question, yes.

Male Speaker: **[Inaudible]** just one or two **[inaudible]**.

Andy: All right. Okay, so who do you think were **[inaudible]** figures in your thinking and also **[inaudible]** figures in the field? You mentioned Roger Fisher, Father Hesburgh, who else do you think was very influential? All your work in the Middle East, you must have come across many people attempting to build bridges between the Palestinians and the Israelis. Can you talk a little bit about some of them and how they worked and who was important? Looking back on the field when it started, whatever it was called, people had hopes and dreams and expectations, do you think we've actually fulfilled most of those or have we fallen short a little bit and why do you think we've fallen short?

[Inaudible] has always tried to be practical. We always try to have this applied side to it and again do you think we've done well on that or do you think that we have really become too academic, or how does the field develop? All right, one last question, where do you think the field is going now in the future? Where do you think we'll be in ten years' time? Secondly, what would you like to see happen in the field?

Male Speaker: Just one last question. What are your hopes and dreams **[inaudible]**?

Landrum Bolling: Okay, all right. Good. So what are your hopes and dreams for the field in the future? And what are your plans personally?

[End of Audio]

Duration: 71 minutes