PARENTS OF THE FIELD PROJECT.

Interviewee; Professor Walter Isard

Venue; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Date:

Interviewer: Dr. Chris Mitchell.

Interviewer: We are here in Philadelphia and interviewing Professor Walter Isard in his very beautiful house… Again, this is part of our "Parents in the Field" project, where we are interviewing people who were active in Peace Research… Peace Studies and Conflict Resolution in the 1950's, the 1960's and the 1970's…we are getting their recollections of how the field started and what is was like in those days to try to set up something which was really very new and very daring. All right. Professor Isard - may I call you Walter?

Professor Isard: Yes.

Interviewer: In the early days of Peace Studies, Peace Science, Conflict Research - whatever we're going to call it - people came into it from very varied intellectual backgrounds, very different experiences. Now - what was yours and how did you come into this field…?

Professor Isard: Well, I guess… I got into the field because, when I taught at Harvard, there was a professor there – I think his name was Bowie – he was an international lawyer and he was a member of the State Department in Washington, and they set up a study of international problems or international conflict under him, and they set up a center…financed a center at Harvard.

And then the same thing happened at MIT where Max Millikan - who had a like fine reputation, his son being a son of a Millikan on the Nobel board - also set up a center for international studies, again financed by the Department of State. And so I looked upon them as, of course, putting forth the standard national policy with regard to armaments and so on - and I thought they were just pawns of the State Department.

So being a conscientious objector - I was at that time of the [Second World] War - I felt well, sometime, I've got to do – do something about balancing the analyses that have been going on. And so I pretty much committed myself to do something on peace science, peace research. But knowing that I wouldn't have any clout going in there as a young scholar, I recognized if I'm going to have impact, I'm going to have to develop a field and be recognized as a leading scholar and so on.. and so I went into the field of Regional Science.

And no one had done anything about that in the U.S. The Germans had done a lot on Location Theory and Regional Development, but nothing in the U.S. And so I started off this Regional Science field and when it got significant recognition, I decided to go into Peace Science full blast…right ?

Interviewer: Okay.

Professor Isard: And the exact times was the time of the Cuban crisis. Khrushchev and Eisenhower were involved… ? And that was the beginning of this period that you're interested in and I decided at that time to do something about it and you know…it was [I think] in year 1963, Khrushchev had visited the U.S., established very warm relations with Eisenhower and all that, but…And he set up the Moscow exhibition here in the U.S. and the U.S. exhibition in Moscow, and everything went along very well and warmly then, and suddenly came that U2-flight business… and then Khrushchev asked for an apology, and sort of punishment for those who were involved. Of course, Eisenhower was involved - he agreed to having that flight ! So then everything got awfully bad, and then the Cuban crisis came around and all that. So that's how I got into it.

And then I sat down and said; "Well, let's have a PhD program in Peace Science !" And I was able to have Professor… an economist, Nobel Prize… Klein…Larry Klein ! – join me and then another professor, a mathematician, Tom Saaty [a brilliant fellow] join me and we set off to get the program going - and we had the PhD program going.

Interviewer: Now, you weren't at Harvard any longer, you were… ?

Professor Isard: I was at Penn.

Interviewer: You were at Penn.

Professor Isard: I left Harvard and went down to Penn.

Interviewer: Yes… And the program, it was a PhD program originally?

Professor Isard: A PhD program. Yes.

Interviewer: So you started at the very most senior level then?

Professor Isard: Well, we had plenty of clout behind there. I had, again, the fellow from the economics department - the Nobel Prize winner - and Saaty was a professor in the Wharton School, a very distinguished fellow, and we went right ahead, the three of us, and set up the program and went on.

Interviewer: Well, that's wonderful. You mentioned that you had decided that when the program was set up, it was going to be called "Peace Science" ?

Professor Isard: No, it was called first "Peace Research", but then, you know, there were a lot of other Peace Research organizations, like one had developed in Europe and there had been a conference in London and everybody was for a Peace Research Association, but to me there wasn't enough science in it. Not enough use of formal mathematical models and of input/output [analysis] that…is used quite a little bit in economics. And so, I thought, well, let's concentrate our efforts on bringing science together with all these social sciences - non-mathematical sciences - into one, integrated place. And so I went to Peace "Science" in order to separate myself from those who just talk philosophically and religiously about peace, but don't have any real, basic underlying analysis.

Interviewer: I think around about the same time, I was in London, and it was a time when people in London were setting up things like the Conflict Research Society, and there was the beginnings of an undergraduate degree at London University….

Professor Isard: That's right.

Interviewer: But they tended to talk about conflict analysis and conflict resolution, and here you were talking about peace science and the others were talking about peace studies. Did the distinction matter? Did it bother anybody at the time…?

Professor Isard: Well, it didn't bother me at all, because I felt there were very fine scholars involved, even if they did use math. They were very fine

scholars, [but] I can't remember the names of them. Burton, for example, was a really fine scholar, but he wouldn't go ahead, wouldn't go for… getting data accumulated, a big sources of data and that kind of analysis. There's no question that he was a very fine person. : Well, my talking about my past experience that was, I guess, starting in the early '50s… and I went through maybe ten years, and then came the '63 –

Interviewer: Cuban Missile Crisis.

Professor Isard: The Cuban Missile Crisis, and before that, I think the year was maybe '63, but '62 - when Khrushchev visited the United States, right ?

Interviewer: You know, a lot of the people we've already talked to have said that one of the major influences on them deciding to join the field - whatever we call it - was the Second World War… did that have any impact on your decision to become a Peace Scientist or was it other things ?

Professor Isard: No, the war just firmed up my belief, my conscientious objecting beliefs, and then after the war - I'd say in the early '50s - I met some others at Harvard who had these kind of feelings, and then when the time was right for me to really dig into it, that was around '63. That's when I went.

Interviewer: You mentioned one of the things that you really felt was necessary was to bring some "hard" science into the study of peace.

Professor Isard: Yes

Interviewer: So what do you think at that time, when the field was starting up in the early '60s and middle '60s, were some of the major influences - the major intellectual influences - that were hitting the field? I mean, apart from the need to use mathematical models and input/output analysis, what else was influential in your thinking ?

Professor Isard: Well, the work of Kenneth Boulding… had a major impact on my thinking. He was clearly a leading figure and he was not only a leading figure in terms of writing economics - and good economics, solid economics - but he was also a leading figure in the center at Michigan that had been developed… And so that center became active - I guess it was active by 1963 - and continued for maybe another decade or a decade and a half, and

there you had the great mathematician Rappaport becoming interested. The sociologist from Michigan – it slips my mind – but he was there, and a good and solid research group developed there.

And while that was developing then, I took advantage – let's say that would be about 1964 or '65 – to set up conferences and inviting scholars from that center to produce papers for the conferences, and these conferences were held in the University of Chicago. And a lot of leading figures were there. I would have to refer to the program listing, to note them, but that went very well.

Interviewer: So you began this series of conferences… ? I remember very vividly there was one that I attended in London.

Professor Isard: Was it at the Conflict Research Society? But I would call it still then Peace Research. And maybe about five years later, it became Peace Science. I think David Singer became the president of the Peace Science Society.

Interviewer: So there were some interesting and very diverse figures in the field at that time ?

Professor Isard: Yes, yes !.

Interviewer: And some ideas which were very fruitful in producing some new thinking. Was there anybody particularly that had a major influence on your own thinking and your own development around that time? You came from Regional Science.

Professor Isard: Of course, Professor Leontief - Wasily Leontief of economics - and he was a Nobel Prize fellow, and he influenced my use of input/output in solving peace conflict problems. Galtung was an influence, but his influence was through his following, his students, graduate students. A recent bunch of graduate students, and they, in turn, influenced my thinking. Yes. He wasn't as scientific so much as others [but]… very much interested in pushing hard and, you know, we set up the first conference, or the first organization – it was still Peace Research – in Lund, Sweden, and the reason why we had done it in Lund is I said; "Well, I'm now going to gather a bunch of good regional scientists, geographers, and economists to work on peace." And so we had it in Lund.

Now we had Regional Science going on at Lund, but they wouldn't allow us to meet –

Interviewer: Really?

Professor Isard: -- at the university, so we all went down to – what's the name of that city – Malmo ! Malmo, which was a port where ships went to various [parts] of Europe. So we decided to meet down there in a hotel and we had this meeting. There was a Polish scholar present and the Yugoslavs were present, I think.

Interviewer: What was the objection from the University of Lund? Why didn't they want you to have your conference?

Professor Isard: You know, "peace" wasn't a good subject at that time.

Interviewer: Why not?

Professor Isard: They just were fearful of negative impact.

Interviewer: Even in Sweden?

Professor Isard: Yes. We had a grand geographer who invited us to come to Regional Science, but he was hesitant about allowing us to meet.

Interviewer: And so you had to move down to Malmo.

Professor Isard: Yes, to a hotel in Malmo. Yes.

Interviewer: I didn't realize that "peace" was so unpopular.

Professor Isard: Oh… not so unpopular, but a lot of negative feelings around the Peace program - I'd say it was about 1964 or '65 - about that time. And so then, you know, about that time, I also started annual conferences in London and also an annual conference in Poland or some other place where we had Regional Science. Every time we had a Regional Science Conference, I had a Peace Research Conference, and we had some at Krakow, as well as at Warsaw. Then… I used to go to Asia and of course, we had conferences with the peace groups… and then we went to Japan in'64, '65, '66… We also had Uni Fair in Japan and so I think things went very well.

But you know, I think that the interest in peace started to fall off - maybe around the beginning of the '70s.

Interviewer: Why was that?

Professor Isard: I don't know why. I guess – I guess I never really asked why. All right, I was conscious of it and so that the numbers in the Peace Science group at that time started to dwindle. Then the big change took place about, I'd say ten…or twelve years ago when at Binghamton University, there was a thrust to bring in international studies. And there was a distinguished political scientist who taught originally at the Center of Conflict Resolution - Bremer, Stu Bremer - who then took over as secretary of the Peace Science Association, and he built it up with young peace – with young political scientists who were mathematically minded of course, he was encouraged in all of this because of the development that Singer was involved in - you know, with his COW [Correlates of War] data…And so that has developed strongly and it's going very strong now.

Right now, we have a very interesting European group getting started again.

Interviewer: I'm still not very clear as to why peace was so unpopular in the '50s and '60s. I mean, you make it sound as though it were almost a dirty word that people wouldn't use in polite company. Why was it so ?

Professor Isard: Peace Research never had any great value in… society. It just – it was recognized as relevant, the Quaker influence was there, and the other peace kinds of groups, you know – I can't remember their names, all the organizations – but you know, it was a rather limited group.

Interviewer: But you were saying - going back to more recent times with Stuart Bremer - that they revived.

Professor Isard: Yes, he revived it greatly. I guess I sort of started to run out of steam I'd say about that time, a dozen years ago. I wasn't – I mean I was in my 70s…, and I wasn't as active as I used to be.

Interviewer: But you're - we were talking earlier about this - you're still working.

Professor Isard: I'm still working –

Interviewer: And you're still working up at Cornell ?

Professor Isard: I can still have good ideas. I'm trying to build up a teaching program, but I'm really interested in bringing together young scholars from all universities, all parts of the world.

Interviewer: Now, one of the things that we've heard from a lot of people when we've done these interviews is that even in the very beginning of the field, it was always – it always tried to be - it always characterized itself as "multi-disciplinary"… It borrowed ideas, it borrowed theories, it borrowed methods. What do you think were some of the most useful things that were borrowed in those days? You've mentioned Leontief and you've mentioned input/output [analysis]. What are the other things that you feel were important ?

Professor Isard: Osgood's GRIT approach… you knew that, Osgood and the GRIT approach ?

Interviewer: Yes, we've come across that.

Professor Isard: That was one.

Interviewer: Of course. He was a psychologist, wasn't he?

Professor Isard: He was, yes.

Interviewer: Did they play much of a role in those days, do you think?

Professor Isard: In those days, they did play a significant role. You know, it was – it was careful reasoning that went into it, much more careful than the kind of studies that were being done just by different groups, and he built up a process of conflict resolution that had a lot of sense to it and had a lot of appeal. So that was Osgood – he was one. See, it's hard for me to recall many of these.

Interviewer: Well, you've… jogged my memory in several ways. I'd forgotten about Charles Osgood. He was influential. David Singer mentioned Tom Schelling [who just got the Nobel Prize] as a kind of an "anti-figure". I get the feeling David was always arguing against Schelling. Did you come across Schelling's work at all?

Professor Isard: Oh yes, yes, yes. We ran a seminar at Harvard with him. It ran for maybe four or five years.

Interviewer: And of course, Howard Raiffia was also at Harvard at that time, wasn't he?

Professor Isard: Howard Raiffia - he was a mathematician, so he and Luce, Duncan Luce, I think.

Interviewer: Yeah, okay, so –

Professor Isard: We had another [take] on it, on Game Theory..They were bringing in Game Theory, but, of course, before them, there was this British scholar… who first introduced Game Theory, a mathematician, I guess. I forget his name.

Interviewer: I can think of several people it might have been - Nicholson, Michael Nicholson?

Professor Isard: Michael Nicholson ! Michael Nicholson played a great role in the University of Bradford, was it? Yes, and he brought some mathematics, and always I would invite him to conferences because he had that mathematical approach and it was good. Who else comes to mind?

Interviewer: Oh, from Britain, Paul Smoker…?

Professor Isard: Paul Smoker is another…

Interviewer: Yes, Of course…if you talked to them, they would say that they had been very much influenced by Lewis Richardson.

Professor Isard: That's the one ! Richardson's [arms race] model, and everybody was influenced by that. But, you know, it still goes on today and there was… a recent very, very advanced statistical method put out by the group now at the – the British group, which is a chapter of the ECAR Group. You've run across the ECAR Group, and they said the Richardson model doesn't really work.

Interviewer: No, I haven't seen that work...

Professor Isard: Yes - it's a very recent item that's just been published.

Interviewer: One of the things that has astonished me - and it must have been interesting to you - is the way the field has grown over the last twenty years. It's expanded in all directions. It's subdivided. We talk about "peace building" now, we've talked about conflict "settlement" and conflict "transformation". It seems to have taken off and gone in all directions.

Professor Isard: Yes.

Interviewer: Did you have any idea this was likely to happen when you first started the field, and did you think it was going to be this successful? Was this what you wanted?

Professor Isard: Oh yes. , I was always the optimist, as I saw what happened with Regional Science. You see, right now, I have no idea how many regional scientists there are throughout the world, but let's say 10,000, and it might be 15 or so, and there aren't that many peace scientists. I would say maybe no more than 1-2,000, but it's growing rapidly. And it has all the possibility for growth that really Regional Science had experienced.

Interviewer: But you were saying earlier on, I remember, that it is a very difficult thing to get started up institutionally at universities. Why do you think that it is so difficult to develop?

Professor Isard: Well, you know, many peace researchers are thought of as not real solid researchers. They talk about the need for this; they talk about the need for that. The NGO groups are not too solid analytically, but they're important. They're very important. So your question was again?

Interviewer: Well, looking back, are you surprised about the way that the field has grown? Is it something that you didn't anticipate, or are you even disappointed that it hasn't grown more…?

Professor Isard: Well, I anticipated it would grow because there's a need for it. I mean, after all, peace is just as important as military activity and look at the tremendous military activity going on throughout the world. Peace is the counterpart to it, and I always thought that would happen. I think it's going to keep on growing much more. I think we are now developing… developing the process, developing the process of mediation, proving it and really going in greater depth. That's what we're doing… working on now. Because you know… really how can you explain what's happened - say - in the Northern Ireland conflict? Now the IRA has turned in their guns and so on. What was it about the process that went on that finally turned out to be successful in this, getting rid of that conflict and violence ?

And I'm optimistic that the same thing's going to happen in the Israel-Palestine conflict. You can see the possibilities there. There are many opportunities, I think, for developing the economy of Palestine and eventually, the Hamas group will diminish in importance and it will… work out.

Interviewer: One of the other things that I think some people in the field thought about when it first started was that they wanted it to be practical and to be useful and to be "applied". There's always been that practical side to the field. How successful do you think we've been in getting our ideas listened to and put into effect? I mean, you mentioned Charles Osgood's GRIT.

Professor Isard: Yes, but it was never put into effect.

Interviewer: Why do you think it was – why is it so difficult to get new ideas across? What's the problem?

Professor Isard: Well, I think you have disciplines like economics, right? Economics talks about maximizing or minimizing, maximizing profits, minimizing costs, optimizing in general. Now economics has pushed very extensively into mathematics and mathematical analysis and Game Theory, but you know if you look at any conflict today, there's no optimization involved. There's no Game Theory involved. There's new approaches that are being developed – developed by as a result of the work of Tversky. Have you run across Tversky?

Interviewer: Yes, I have - "Prospect Theory".

Professor Isard: Prospect Theory ! Now they're opening up a new direction, which is a realistic direction. And, clearly, economics doesn't have much to say about conflict resolution. You've got all the Game Theory stuff that comes out says we are all maximizing or we're all optimizing, and we're not. I'm not an optimizer. I mean, I'm optimistic, but I'm not an optimizer. I look at my investments and I look at my bonds and stocks and so on. I'm not maximizing. I'm just sort of going along, right …but that's the way it happens in conflict resolution.

When you have U.S. and say North Korea trying to work out something, you know, and there are people like [Condoleeza] Rice, like me. We don't have any real facts behind us, we don't have any real scientific analysis, but if you get too much scientific analysis, it isn't going to work because the people who are

involved in conflicts don't think like truly rational people. They're much more following the lines of Prospect Theory that Tversky has been developing. And so…there has not been much successful mediation. The only place where I see successful mediation is where… now is this getting too technical for you?

Interviewer: No, no.

Professor Isard: I'll take the case of Europe and the European Union. How in the world did it come about? You know, when we were in World War I, World War II, there was tremendous hatred between the French and the German, right? How did that come to disappear? Well, I think it goes back to what I would say, and there was politics involved that – I'll give you some of my theory. Maybe you don't want it, but –

Interviewer: We want your theories.

Professor Isard: All right. At the end of the Second World War, there was U.S. with its political aims, objectives. . There was the Soviet Union with its political ones, and the problem and the thinking that went into the U.S. group was that they didn't want to see the Russians take over too much of Europe. And the Russians were right there in Germany and able to grab a lot.

So I look upon the Marshal Plan as one way that we, the United States, was able to develop, to fight against the Russian intrusion. And so it happened to be that France's steel industry was in bad shape. Germany had all the necessary coal, access to Swedish ore, and was in excellent shape. U.S. policy was to build up Western Germany to block off the intrusions by Russia.

And to do that, they had to have the French involved in some way and so the Coal and Steel Community was set up as a small basis. The French were pushed hard and finally agreed. That's how it started, and that's a small unit, but then it worked very well.

So when the problem of nuclear research came up for the European nations, they could not match the resources that the U.S. could have put together, but if they work together - European nations, Britain, France, and Germany - they could amass the resources to be equal to what U.S. was doing. And they were equal in contributions.

But once those two things got operating well, others came along. Of course, you saw how the banking system has become unified and the Euros become unified - and there's the European Union !

Interviewer: Did your Regional Science throw a lot of light on that?

Professor Isard: And our Peace Science because…one way of getting rid of conflict is to start with some small cooperative projects that tend to be successful, and then gradually get involved more and more. And this is what happens, what's happening in the Korean Peninsula. We put forth a little project, which had… You know how the North Korean political system is ? They completely controlled the monastery [?] and so - and we suggested a small economic project in the – in the zone. What's that zone? The no-fly zone.

Interviewer: Oh, yes, the DMZ. When you say "we," who is –

Professor Isard: Well, we did – we'd done some research here at Cornell. And then we came up with the idea. It involved a lot of the South Koreans and some people representing China and so on, and we came up with this little idea. And then along came the Hyundai Corporation president… who was born in North Korea, interested in seeing North Korea and South Korea working together, and he was the one who financed the operation.

And all the money that was earned by it - or spent on it - went to the politicians in Pyongyang, and they controlled every employee. They had to pass everything. Every visitor had to pass – pass through.

Interviewer: And that was something that you and the people at Cornell were involved in developing ?

Professor Isard: Yes.

Interviewer: It's a wonderful example of the way the field has had an impact on the real world, which is always what it's been trying to do. But… looking back on your time in the field, was that unique? Have you had several experiences like that - of actually having some of your ideas take off?

Professor Isard: Well, of course, no, I came upon this through the way the Coal and Steel community that was started. I could see that there, and so, that's exactly what we're trying to do in respect of the Palestinian-Israeli situation. I've sat down and done research on how you get jobs in the Gaza Strip and… having the Gaza Strip start off as a place which expands and expands and so on. That's the way I look at it.

Now, you need to know math, you need to know economics, you need to be realistic – Tversky's stuff. You need to bring in a lot of objective [ideas about] relative importance, thinking of different objectives that each nation - or each group - has and work them together. Small things, growing up, that's what we're doing.

Interviewer: It seems to me that that's something that a lot of people back in the '50s and '60s were very keen on… thinking an idea should have an impact on policy. And it sounds as though… your ideas have been very successful in that way.

Professor Isard: They've worked, yes. I don't know… one person alone – one person alone [being] involved isn't it. It worked because it was looked at, examined. I think the Korean President Kim [il Sung]… he had been exposed to our paper and evidently, the president of Hyundai got to know about it, but it happened to be that it was good that he was in North Korea so that he was very much interested in seeing [the division] disappear. And you know, it's disappeared. There's no more conflict between the South Koreans and the North Koreans. The South Koreans are – I'd call them evading the demilitarized zone of North Korea, and North Korea's allowing them to come in. And it's going to be so … you know, North Korea has the resources. South Korea has none. North Korea has big deposits of iron ore.

North Korea has coal, anthracite coal. Very interesting to see the way this has gone about, but there's going to be plenty of opportunities for North Korea. If… we look at this conflict between U.S. and North Korea… I think that conflict will disappear as soon as we in the United States wake up that there's tremendous financial needs in North Korea, and if we can give them sufficient aid, North Korea can really be an important… economy.

Interviewer: Well, it's an encouraging and optimistic thought - but you said that you were an optimist.

Professor Isard: I am an optimist.

Interviewer: Let's go back to how the field developed rather than what's happening in it today. Do you think that there are things that the field hasn't done? It had hopes and dreams when you were starting it up. Do you think it's fallen short in any way of some of

the things that you hoped would happen, that you wanted to happen in the 1960's, 40 some… years ago, when it all started?

Professor Isard: I was disappointed that the conferences really didn't turn out to have good, solid results on managing conflicts. I mean, we had very important contributions by David Singer and his COW Project and now in the MIDS Project, very important. But then there was nothing on how you have effective mediation and there is not much in the past about that.

That's where I think we have fallen short, and if there's not been any effective mediation… Look, we had that Northern Ireland conflict for so many years and so much work's been done on it and so much as Britain has contributed… but you know, just recently, it sort of died out. I want to know why and no one has given a real good reason except saying, "Well, time - passage of time - irons out these things !"

So in that respect – but remember, it's a difficult thing. You're talking about all kinds of social science factors and they have to all interact and come up with something that's realistic… not just talk; not just this Game Theory talk.

Interviewer: Do you think we have a social science? Do you think these studies - or whatever we're going to call them …?

Professor Isard: We're moving slowly…what I'm trying to do is add a little bit here and there and hope my students can come along and add a little bit here and there. That's the way it's worked in regional science. That's the way it's worked in economics But what I'm saying is economics now has gone off in a wrong direction, primarily optimization, and not how do you really confront conflict situations?

Interviewer: So you're optimistic about us becoming a social science ? What would be – I think the favorite word these days – "benchmarks" ? What would tell you we've arrived as a social science, or at a peace science?

Professor Isard: If we had a lot of successful results.

Interviewer: That's a pragmatic answer, isn't it?

Professor Isard: Pragmatic answer. I mean, there isn't too much. Again, I go back… to GRIT. That was a fine statement, really, it was

enthusing, [I was] stimulated tremendously by it. Let's go on to another person. You know Roger Fisher of Harvard Law School.

Interviewer: Yes.

Professor Isard: He's – what's that book of his?

Interviewer: " *Getting to Yes" ?*.

Professor Isard: *Getting to Yes*, yeah. You read his book and I ask: "Well, what are the steps to getting to yes?" But all he has to say is: "Well, let's get together and talk - and talk - and talk !" I mean he's had fine experiences, but somehow he hasn't amassed all of his experiences to really come to some solid conclusions of… how do you engage them in conflict management.

Maybe it's asking too much to be a social science, you know. The way our universities are organized, they're specialities. Economists don't talk too much to other scientists, other sociologists or political scientists, and they're off by themselves at Cornell doing their Game Theory. This is true of most economics departments, not with scientists.

You know poverty is always there and poverty always leads to terrorism, right ? It's not the only factor that leads to terrorism, but poverty's always there. Poverty must be attacked.. We don't have any really good studies on how you get rid of poverty, how you approach it systematically. The World Bank has put a lot of money into trying to define poverty, in trying to develop procedures for handling poverty, but you know, we have had very few successes there. So I guess your question was, "Will we ever become a social science?"

Interviewer: Yes

Professor Isard: Well, we'll get better at it - let's put it that way. We'll get better at it.

Interviewer: Okay. Again, looking back, what has surprised you about the last 40 years? Anything that you hadn't anticipated happening, anything that you really hadn't anticipated when you started work in the field?

Professor Isard: Well, it's hard to say. I recognize the great difficulties. At the very start, when I was talking about Professor Bowie of Harvard and Max Millikan at MIT, I recognize that it's going to be one

difficult challenge to develop a conflict management "science" - or something like that.

Look – we have a "management science" field of study, which is closely related to Game Theory - but not too much. It's good for business - for making profits, right ? That's good. Management – how you manage a firm to make profits, but what does it say about managing conflicts? Very little.

Interviewer: Let me ask you a question which I've missed, which is about how the field developed from the '60s and the '70s onward, because the impression that we have - having talked to a lot of people - is that there were a lot of small groups and small centers and institutions growing up in different parts of the country - or the world. But eventually, they all seemed to be able to link together in some way or other. But how did this come about? I mean, one way was your [own] conferences, but how did you make links to other centers, other universities… first of all from Penn and then from Cornell?

Professor Isard: Well, the way I did it was through the conferences. I kept my eyes and ears… open to see where there was good work going on....

Interviewer: Your conferences - and any other conferences that helped?

Professor Isard: Oh, I think others helped, but I think I was more sensitive to what is good science for use by conflict managers and that's what I was most sensitive to. So now, you take somebody like Sen who's at Oxford. What's his first name? Amartya Sen.

Interviewer: Amartya Sen, yes.

Professor Isard: He's written some brilliant articles on conflict. There was one on the bomb that was published in, I think, The Nation or New Republic when… Pakistan got the bomb - or something like that. He showed … that they could manage it. And then he's written a lot about poverty. Very perceptive. But then I say I don't find any steps forward to eliminate conflict, so there he stands out as a brilliant figure…the key man at Oxford now… a Nobel in economics?

Interviewer: Yes. .

Professor Isard: And I've written to him and said; "Well, what are the steps? What are the first steps? Now you've written about the bomb and all that[and] how it came about, but now… are the first steps

necessary to go and to get some further understandings of what you can do about that bomb situation?" But his work is brilliant, you know?

Interviewer: So, if I were to ask about disappointments, one of them would be, from what you've said…

Professor Isard: They haven't gone…further along than I had hoped, originally. I guess I was optimistic and hoped that we could find out how to do things. But you know, there's another group that points up the same thing. This is a group that you mentioned: Raiffa, and…

Interviewer: Tom Schelling … ?

Professor Isard: Tom Schelling and [Roger} Fisher. There they were, at Harvard, right ? You know, Raiffa's a great theorist, great mathematics. He's good at business. But I don't see anything there that handles the conflict problem effectively or moving in that direction. But I'm confident that it will be done in time. I can't help but be an optimist, I guess.

Interviewer: Well, let's look at the future. What do you think are likely to be good lines of development from now on? Where do you think the field is going to go?

Professor Isard: Well, where the field's going to go is it's going to turn to the young kids coming in, the young ones that are coming in [from] Sweden, for example, and Scandinavia. There's a good group developing at Oslo, you know – very good group…and the current director was in that Galtung group. We had a conference, you know… once in Copenhagen and the Galtung group was there, Boulding and others from Canada were there, and myself, and the young Scandinavians really attacked us early, saying we weren't really doing anything. They said, "Look at all this poverty in the world. You aren't doing anything about it. And you're not only not doing anything about it, you are ignoring it." And they were right ! I've got to sit back now and say they were right. We weren't really studying poverty, the causes of poverty, how to get rid of poverty, and we can see today that poverty is one of the factors that creates terrorism…but they haven't done anything too much yet, but maybe the young ones… They have quite a few young ones who are getting interested and maybe they'll come through. And maybe the group out at Penn State or the Peace Science Society in Penn State will do something. A lot of bright

kids in there. Let me put it this way. Right now, we have more scientific brilliance aimed at peace than ever before. More than ever before.

Interviewer: What would you advise them to do? If they have all these young, enthusiastic kids… but what would you tell them? Work on what? Think about what?

Professor Isard: Well, you know, the way I find myself doing things is I listen to a person's paper… and all I can do is to comment on how he can further develop [it] - but you know, it's got to be further developed for sociologists. It's got to be further developed by political scientists and economists and so on. And there's got to be – and this is rare – a further development in the integration of the knowledge. That's what we lack now.

We have a lot of really fine minds, young ones, coming up and this is what has come up…ever since [Stuart] Bremer has led the group, and now his successor, [ ] Palmer, is doing some good work, too.

You know, if you were to come to one of these Peace Science conferences - now they have worked it out that so many young fellows want to get in to present a paper - we have poster sessions. And if we just go through and look at the poster sessions, you see an awful lot of ideas being generated !

Interviewer: Again, looking back to when you first came into the field and your optimism then, is there something that you think… that you would love to have done, but you've never actually managed quite to do it?

Professor Isard: Well, as I look back, I have made some mistakes, and one serious mistake I made is when I had a fight with a dean at the University of Pennsylvania. And it was over the question of whether we could have a Department of Peace Science or not and it had been said that we would have, but the new dean that came in said he would not tolerate that. So, as a result, I left Penn and went to Cornell.

And so we never developed a fine, Peace Science PhD program, which would have rivaled or been just as good as the Regional Science department. So that was a mistake I made and I think it was a mistake - but maybe it wasn't, because I'm still here, doing basic research !.

Interviewer: Interestingly…when you were talking about your dean, you used the word he wouldn't "tolerate" it, and several other people have said to us that they thought that they were "tolerated" to do their work in peace research and in conflict resolution, but it never became an accepted thing.

Professor Isard: Never supported adequately.

Interviewer: That was your experience as well ?

Professor Isard: That was my experience, yes. But then, you see, as a result I turned to having conferences and I think that's just as effective. Because we can now say that there's - I guess - , 200 or more members of the Peace Science Society here in the U.S. It's a very good group, equal to any other young group. 200 - and we're getting a very active one in Europe. The Uppsala Group is developing, the PRIO Group is developing, the Heidelberg Group is starting to develop - all with fine, young scholars. So that's where my optimism stems.

Interviewer: I'm still slightly puzzled, though, as to why it was difficult to get a Peace Science department - or School - going… Do you think it was disciplinary rivalry, lack of resources? Why was it so difficult?

Professor Isard: All that. [Inter]-discipline rivalry. You couldn't get support from a strong economics department,maybe. You know the way universities are run now. Anyway, at Cornell, it has to be tops in every field. They can't have too many fields because there aren't enough resources to be tops in every field, so that's one of the problems. But you can't develop a small field and let it grow to major size without, in the process, being cut out.

Interviewer: On the other hand, Regional Science was so successful. How come the one took off, and the other…?

Professor Isard: Yes, but when I resigned from Penn, also that department disappeared.

Interviewer: Oh !

Professor Isard: Now, of course, it was well enough advanced that Regional Science is all around the world. Is it 10,000 or 15,000 regional

scientists? We need to have that many peace scientists around the world, scattered around, in all nations. That would be something !

Interviewer: A couple of final questions. The first is one that I always ask people. [although] this is not particularly relevant to our study, but I'm always interested in the answer. If you were sitting in my seat, what question would you have asked that I haven't asked? What would you have asked a senior member of the field?

Professor Isard: Well, I don't know. Maybe one thing I might have asked is what are problems that you foresee in the future?

Interviewer: That's a good one… And how would you answer that ?

Professor Isard: I'm conscious of a few problems. Suppose you take the European Union and how it expands [is] likely to expand. I'm very optimistic about the fact that we can handle environmental disputes [but] nothing's been done there. I mean, we have the protocol, the EU protocol, which is an important step forward, but still we don't have an effect on management of the U.S. polluting so much and China polluting so much that it's not really a management job.

But I'm optimistic that our conflict resolution procedures, our mediation, can also attack these problems.

Interviewer: But – there's an implied "but" there ?

Professor Isard: Yes. Now suppose we have them and the European Union grows, and maybe some other union forms - a North American or South American union or something like that. Do we eventually get to a situation where we have a global union and then we have leadership concentrated in the hands of one person ? So it would be a "Czar" of global union. Now would…would such a Czar turn out to be adequate?

Well, that is the problem – what is the possibility that an inadequate one ? Now you know… everybody has some feelings about things here in the United States. Not all have been adequate, right? And if you get one that takes on a Hitler-type approach, what happens? That's a danger.

There's another danger I see when I look forward to the problems. Poverty needs to be attacked, right? So, but I find myself saying well, let's develop some outsourcing industry say in Palestine to remove poverty, or some export/import types of industries that could work there, and let's reduce the poverty.

But you know, when you reduce poverty in Palestine or in India or in the Philippines, you see the effects upon employment in the U.S., in France and Britain and Germany.. Are those problems going to be managed? How are you going to find employment opportunities in the advanced countries?

So it's not enough… it's not enough to get rid of poverty in the poverty areas. It's also essential to get new directions of employment in the industrial areas affected. And how do you do that? Are we going to be able to do that? Or is it just talk? So these are some tough problems that come up in my mind and I wonder what to do.

So every time I talk about, - well, this is one way to get rid of the Gaza Strip or unemployment there, poverty there, and I outline various activities, still I say "Now, what about that other part of the problem?"

Interviewer: Because everything's linked to everything else ?

Professor Isard: Everything's linked and especially if you have a global union - when you get to have a global union. Of course, global union is sort of looked upon partly as a goal by peace scientists [and] peace researchers. Not by all, but a number of us would look at that as a goal.

Interviewer: Talking to Chad Alger the other day, he was talking about one of the disappointing things that he finds in a lot of the younger people that he teaches is they don't have a vision of the future. He talked to them about…you're going to get a conflict-free world, but what would you like to see in 30 years time? He says not very many people can think that way.

Professor Isard: They don't think ahead, no.

Interviewer: But I think what you're talking about is another way in which the field has changed and developed is this big, relatively new interest in what they call conflict "prevention" - the anticipation of problems, and doing something about them in time, deciding in time. I think [this] is a healthy development in the field. If you want peace, you have to think about peace *in time*.

Well, the last question we always ask people is who else do you think we should talk to? Who else could tell us what it was like to be in [at] the beginning, to be a "parent in the field" ? You've mentioned [Vasssily] Leontief, but …

Professor Isard: No, he's not around.

Interviewer: He's not around any longer, but who else, do you think ? Osgood is gone. Who else would you advise us to [talk with] ?

Professor Isard: You know the fellow who was at PRIO, whose now…the head of … PRIO.

Interviewer: It's [Nils Petter] Gleditsch?

Professor Isard: Gleditsch ! He was in that Copenhagen group that was very strong and was right, not wrong. We were – Boulding and I were wrong, and the others ! We were wrong. Ye -, at that time, we were really isolated from the rest of the world [in] our thinking. We would run conferences here and it was one conference we ran on the war in – you know, the other war in Asia that we were involved in.

Interviewer: Vietnam?

Professor Isard: Vietnam, yes. You know…I guess, maybe it must have been in the '70s or '80s, Alva Myrdal came to visit us and talked about… the way she looked at peace, and she said, "You know, we ought to have a conference on that - really digging more deeply into these problems."

So I set up a conference on the Vietnam, but it turned out… well… many of the people were American scholars working on Vietnam. And we failed to understand the poverty problem for the rest of the world, and that's where we were attacked and that's where Oley [sp ?] was attacked and I was attacked and all the rest of us from the U.S.A were attacked. This was in Copenhagen. Maybe it would be around… 1975 to 1978. So this PRIO fellow - Nils Petter Gleditsch - he would know a lot about this. And the other one, he's at Uppsala, the sort of the mediator type person at Uppsala.

Interviewer: Peter Wallensteen ?

Professor Isard: Wallensteen, yes. He would be a fine person. But you see, again, I would put to him, "Exactly what steps do you take ?" The same problem I put to Sen: "What steps do you want to take?"

Interviewer: We can think about this afterwards, but you opened up a new line of thinking by mentioning the Poles.

Professor Isard: Yes There's something else. Something else came up in my thinking… is that Russian fellow around, beginning with a G –

Interviewer: What was his name? Vladimir Israelevich Gantman. Is that the guy you were talking about?

Professor Isard: I guess I can also find out about that in my notes. Now Wallensteen would be a very good man. Ask him why he hasn't developed models…using data - a lot of data - and using some scientific approaches like input/output [analysis] Why hasn't he done that? He was…very much concerned with poverty.

Interviewer: Let me go back [once more] and ask you something about the conference that you were talking about, which was originally scheduled in Lund and then you had to move it to Malmo. And there was the objection from the people at Lund that… "peace studies" or "peace science" was not welcome on their campus, and link that up to the reaction of your dean [and] to the idea of a "Peace Science" department.

Was the problem with the word "peace" or "peace studies" or "peace research" or why was the idea of a Peace Studies Department not welcome on campus at Penn?

Professor Isard: All right, let me go to the Lund one. ..We were there as guests there to have the conference…[invited] by an outstanding geographer who was a very powerful figure, I think, in the University of Lund. I guess he wasn't sure about whether we were… scientists or just talking about non-acceptable ideas for society. He wasn't comfortable with having this group - which might have had some wild characters - in there.

You know, Galtung was a wild character, for example, in his way, in those days. And if there was a Galtung type person, he was just not comfortable having him come in and disturbing the good relations he had for his department. He was just uneasy, that's all. He didn't have the farsighted approach. Now at Penn, it was basically resources. You know, I was excellent at gathering resources. I had tremendous resources for the Department of Regional Science. It was resources.

Interviewer: So you could have suggested to the dean a new Department of Chinese History and he …

Professor Isard: A good department and he might have been more – but I don't think he wanted to do anything with more expenditure. It was a period of cutting back budgets in universities.

Interviewer: Back to the whole question of peace "science" or peace "research". [David] Singer, for example, [has] a very precise idea of what peace research should be. It should be empirically based, it should be statistical, it should be rigorous; it should involve quantification. Now, you seem to have a much broader view of what to include in peace research.

Professor Isard: Yes. You know, I'm aging - I'm 80. I'm learning. I'm shifting away from the more standard – I don't believe the economists are on the right track in their answers. They're [not] on the right track when they look at the conflict problems. I don't think they are. Now if you asked me that five years ago, I would have taken the approach that Singer has taken - takes now - but I've changed. I've changed.

Interviewer: What changed you?

Professor Isard: You know, I've been working on this Game Theory approach. Well, in 60 years or more, I've written a tremendous number of books, but I look at reality. If you look at the conflict over the filibustering and the nuclear option that we had here, there were no rational, really rational people. You couldn't define anything as being rational by what was going on. It was politics… sure, but there's something more than politics, like when you use the idea of a small group agreeing on something and gradually expanding. Well, you have to start with the politics that enable you to take that first step and to suggest something, and move on.

I no longer subscribe to that process that David Singer has told you about, as well. His approach is what still is current, but now I'm going to give a paper at the American Economics Society saying how Prospect Theory and the Demise of Optimization for Conflictual Public Policy Issues. The Demise of Optimization - including Game Theory - for Conflictual Public Policy Issues. It's not relevant. He's still thinking that it's relevant, as I thought five years ago. I've changed a lot.

Interviewer: Make sure you send me a copy of the paper if you will.

Professor Isard: The only way to do it is to send me an email and I'll do that !

Interviewer: When we talked a little bit about where you thought the field had fallen short, you kept using the phrase, "People have never really grasped or grappled with the problem of the steps they need to take." You talked about developing models from data with the implication that we really haven't done that. So there's a kind of a feeling that you think we've failed on that, but how do we go about developing models from data?

Professor Isard: Well… you know, David Singer and his group do a beautiful job in developing relevant data, but still – how should I put it – it's not data over all the social science fields. It's not data that leads to any creative approaches. So I say I'm all for getting more data and it's more for data for smaller type analysis, more… in terms of conceptual coverage, smaller type analysis.

… a lot is going on and this is what is going on with these young peace scientists in Europe and here in the U.S.A. They get the data, collect data, and then try to make the data talk…

Interviewer: Can you give me an example of a good piece of work that you know about from these young people - where they've "made the data talk" ?

Professor Isard: Well, there's a young fellow, Moyerson, [sp ?] with whom I'm working. Now he would be one of those… he's working in Nepal on the Nepal problem. He's out there now consulting. He works with me and he's in that area. He works with Prospect Theory and he's working with me… You know, in a conflict, there are two parties, and each party may have a main objective, but then it has also other objectives, right ? And you know… you can interview each party and ask them to tell what are their objectives and… the relative importance of these objectives, and from that, you work out possible combinations that could start the steps.

And this is the way we actually came about doing the Korean/ North Korean study. We set out [and] covered all possible policies that we could conceive of to be relevant, and we kept on narrowing down… until we got to one where the requirements were met. It was the one where you don't ask the North Korean government to give up any of its power, but one where the incentive is to have money, revenue from…

It's also one where you don't ask the South Korea government to finance any of this because you know, South Korea…was very much aware of the fact that West Germany and East Germany became unified. The West Germans "won" and then what happened? Germany went into a depression ! Anything that South

Korea would be involved in financing without the rest of the world being involved they would not consider. But of course, it turned out there was one guy…the president of Hyundai, he… didn't mind lending them some money on developing that program, and so that went through.

Interviewer: We were talking about the importance of developing models of step-by-step processes….

Professor Isard: Step-by-step ! But we needed data and we worked with data, but I mean, played around with data. We looked at all kinds of projects. There could have been a Tumen River Valley development that the U.N. was talking about… but that wouldn't meet the needs. It was absolutely essential for the North Koreans to have complete control, [to] police everything - complete control !

Interviewer: And they were not going to give up.

Professor Isard: No, they weren't going to !

Interviewer: Let me just go back for a brief moment, if I can, into the way in which the whole field has mushroomed and subdivided. You seem fairly happy with the idea that in Peace Research - or Peace Science - you can include a whole series of new things, new sub-branches [like] conflict transformation, conflict prevention. It all becomes part of it. You seem quite happy with this.

Professor Isard: You mean - is conflict "prevention" anything new?

Interviewer: Well, it's certainly a new word that people use - and a fashionable word - but do you think it's just a new label for old stuff?

Professor Isard: Yes… I can give you [an example] Right now, I'm at Kendal, old age caring, right. And here, there are about 300 people there and they're all wealthy as well as they're educated. Okay, now suddenly, a proposal was made that there be a flagpole, a U.S. flagpole, a big gold thing with the U.S. flag on it, in honor, of course, of the young kids and maybe some of their relatives who have been there. This is a Quaker group, a Quaker organization. And obviously, you can see that immediately there was a clash.

Interviewer: Yes.

Professor Isard: Now there's conflict that was taking place… and it destroyed the harmony…. and how could you prevent that, now? How could we get rid of that divisiveness I was talking about? So I announce, well, let's use these theories that break things down in terms of objectives. Well, there's the one group now comes out that the objective is the U.S. flag. There's another group that there would be smaller in numbers maybe, but instead, having two flags, a U.N. flag and a U.S. flag, right. And then there's a third group who [say]… we're very happy with the environment here. We don't want any new flags, we don't want a big flag, a U.N. flag or a U.S. flag Leave the things alone !

Well, now how do you prevent – how do you remove that – once again, prevention ?. I want to prevent that now. How do I do that? Well, look at the objectives. If you ask them what the objectives are and each of the three groups could say them. And then you could say, well, let's break the objectives down, just aggregate them, break them down into smaller sub-objectives.

For example, one would be: fly the flag only once a week. That's…taking a small… sub-objective, right ? And maybe that would work. But there's a third… group, which doesn't want to disturb the environment. Everything's going along so well and we're happy. We don't want a big flagpole out in the entrance and so on. So then let's introduce another small objective, side objective, to make sure… to put the flagpole in a place that it's not so evident, right. That's a sub-objective.

Now that may not solve the problem. I think not enough, but what I would be looking for is now getting in other sub-objectives that gradually… works out what people will go along with. That's conflict prevention. That's the way I look at conflict prevention. But it's not really anything different than what I've been talking about. It's just looking at the problem from another angle.

Interviewer: All right.

Professor Isard: [But] I'm still unsatisfied, so I'm asking my wife., I exploit her because I ask her [and] I'm not satisfied with the three [options]. I want to have another. Can she give me say a possibility, work it in that situation where there's a… strong religious group there that would also force me to say: "We have to introduce another kind of an objective." And then, if I had those four things working, then maybe I could…

Interviewer: Work something out.

Professor Isard: Yes. ! Now… this is a transformation, isn't it - what I'm suggesting ? I'm transforming the problem into something that can be acceptable to each party.

Interviewer: You said a few minutes ago that you had some ideas about new directions for peace science and that there were things to be done and there were new challenges to be taken up. So tell us something about the new directions.

Professor Isard: Well, you see… there has been a lot of work in regional science and I thought [of] this fellow, Tom Saaty… who was in the regional group at Penn…He had developed what he has called [the] Analytical Hierarchy Program. But what he does is he says: "Now we're going to get a new kind of data. We're going to have our parties in conflict sit down and state all of their objectives… , and also allow me to calculate the relative importance [through] what they say about it.

Then I'm going to use all this "relative importance" data…, and then combine that with the Tversky type of data [which is not optimizing, but which is more descriptive] and use that together, - fuse them - and come out with… answers to this kind of problem - like the flag problem, or like the current North Korea/U.S.A. problem. But no one's ever done that.

Interviewer: Is Saaty still around? Is he still working?

Professor Isard: Yes. It might be good for you to interview him. He hasn't received much response to his ideas. They're worth much more than the public gives him or the universities give him.

Interviewer: Where about is he ?

Professor Isard: The University of Pittsburgh.

Interviewer: Really - that's a good name ! Thank you.

Professor Isard: He's not even aware of what I'm doing with his modeling.

Interviewer: [Going back once more.] Was part of the Lund problem the concern about "peace" as some sort of undesirable activism - as some kind of subversive activity?

Professor Isard: Not subversive, but it might be associated with subversive activity, yes. It might be associated with that kind of thing.

Interviewer: … and is that still around now do you think?

Professor Isard: No, no, I think the world has become more accustomed to the NGO peace groups and so… it's not there… there's much more tolerance - let's put it this way - of my ideas. There's much more tolerance of Singer's ideas and there's a much greater realization of the value of what Singer's done.

Interviewer: …the term I think you wanted to respond to is "peace activism" .. are people afraid of peace activists?

Professor Isard: They were at that time. They were at that time.

Interviewer: The difficulties of actually getting policy makers to listen to you, - not you particularly, but just anybody from the field - and I had experience of it myself when I was working for John Burton. He tried to influence the [British] Foreign Office about the problem in Rhodesia, as it was then called. And he was trying to get the decision makers - the British government - interested in some dialogues between the African nationalists and the white Rhodesians and… it was like hitting your head against a brick wall. We talked to that Foreign Office and the Policy-planning Department - and their attitude was "What do you know about this. Go away; leave us alone."

Professor Isard: Yes, that's right.

Interviewer: And what was so nice coming over to the United States is that, relatively speaking, American decision makers and foreign service officers seemed willing to listen - at least listen.

Professor Isard: What do you think of this policy of integrating the good data sets and models that come from the different social sciences? Is there a need for economics to be more realistic? Is there a need for sociology to become more model oriented? Is there a need for psychology to develop more relevant data sets and so on? So I would like you to…suggest what is your thinking on this problem?

Interviewer: I'll answer for you, if you like. Yes, I think one of the nice things that's happened is that people have started to take Prospect Theory really seriously as an alternative to explaining why people take the decisions they do… I always thought the economists' idea about

why people chose particular things was just a load of nonsense. I didn't ever see anybody [actually] doing that.

[End of Audio]

Duration: 114 minutes