
PARENTS OF THE FIELD PROJECT

Interviewee: Professor Betty Reardon

Date: 17th February 2006

Venue: Teachers College, Colombia University, New York.

Interviewer: Dr. Chris Mitchell.

Chris: It is 17th of February, 2006... We are here at Teacher's College Columbia University and we're interviewing Professor Betty Reardon as part of our "Parents of the Field" project about the early years of the peace and conflict research, peace studies movement, and we are, as usual, delighted to be here and happy that you came to talk with us and tell us about how the field got started, by looking back. In the early days of peace and conflict studies - or whatever we're going to call it - people came into the field through all sorts of different backgrounds and different experiences - intellectual, personal, etcetera. So what was yours? How did you get involved in this field, and why?

Betty Reardon: I'd got involved in the field as a field — I think it is a field, it's not a discipline — as a consequence of some of the things I did as a teacher in a private school in Westchester. I had developed what turned out to be a kind of groundbreaking program in teaching "World Issues" and I was working with a little foundation that supported such programs ...such as "World Order Studies...So I was asked ...by...the Institute for World Order to develop and direct a school's program for the Institute - to formulate curricula, educate teachers, so that the issues could be brought into the schools.

Chris: So was there something that particularly attracted you to working in this kind of a field ...?

Betty Reardon: Yes. I think from the time of being a child in the Second World War and what seemed to me the complete folly of the enterprise, I had an interest in issues of war and peace, and I had some interest in things such as the World Federalist Movement... And I had been following the UN from San Francisco as a teenager... I had been taken to the original UN headquarters at Flushing

Meadows before they moved to Manhattan in New York by... my social studies teacher in high school. So it was an area that worked its way into my teaching, and then, as a consequence of being able to do some rather unusual things, I was asked to come to do — and it looked to me like an opportunity to have other teachers doing what I thought they should be doing, which wasn't exactly what I was doing, but at least raising the issues and preparing people to think about them as responsible citizens.

Chris: So about when was this ?

Betty Reardon: Well, I started working for the Institute in 1963, and I was there until 1970 - or something like that, so I worked with for the Institute for several years, during which time a number of developments took place, both in my area of the field, peace education, and in the fields that we relate to.

I think of the field as — well, I call it “peace knowledge,” and it’s peace research, peace studies, which is not exclusive, but draws largely on peace research to create university studies, and peace education which is not just what happens in schools, but...is a whole field which devotes itself to pedagogy. That is, “What are the ways that people need to be able to think about certain problems in a constructive way which can move them outside of the paradigms of thinking that have - apparently - kept us trapped in the war system for all these years?”

Chris: Can you give us an example of the kind of “parameter shift” that you are talking about — a shift in...?

Betty Reardon: Well, one thing... that I learned to use in my years at the Institute for World Order is to look at issues within a systems context, and not just nationally or globally... but to look not only at factors that influence an issue or problem, but also the system in which that problem emerges, the components of the system, what it’s supposed to be able to do... what it can and can’t do, and why and why not, and what might the alternatives be...

...we’ve done that most of all with the way in which we study security issues, but it has relevance to other aspects. We have been working on this more in the past 20 years, the specification of the pedagogy, developed different processes for different issues, not so much issues as fields of concern. And we train teachers in it and create university curricula.

We were, for example... called upon - the Peace Education Center at Teachers College was called upon - to do major work on the design of the Masters in Peace Education at the University for Peace in Costa Rica... that was a wonderful opportunity and gave us a chance to talk with a lot of people who were working in the same area, so that was something that exemplifies the work that I did that was to be talking with people in other parts of the world about how you see the issues, what do you think the research and educational problems are and so forth.

Chris: Yes - one of our alumni down there now is now Dean of Studies, at the UN University - Dr. Amr Abdallah..You must meet him....But going back to the 1960s, to 1963 when you started, through the '60s and '70s, that was very much the era of the Cold War. Did that have a major impact or a peripheral impact on the way the project developed... ?

Betty Reardon: It had a considerable impact, but not so much in the evolution of the pedagogy as on the political context in which the work was being done. There was a considerable difference between 1963 and 1968, for example. In 1963, reactions from the general educational establishment was, "Well, this is a project of idealism and it would be nice to do that if we had a little room in the program and so forth, but no need to pay much attention."

However, there were a lot of teachers who were paying attention, and I was able to work with many of them on the creation of materials and so forth that then began to catch on. But the ability of the teachers to use that material and to raise these issues was very much compromised. And the great pity of it was that nobody was looking at the materials...

Chris: So... the problem was that the material was there, but people were not paying attention to it.

Betty Reardon: No. That wasn't the problem. The problem was that when the resistance from the establishment came to the field of peace education, they were reacting to a preconceived notion of what peace education was. They never looked at what we did, because we bent over backwards not to be advocates, but to have an open inquiry and to try to get people to think in terms of alternatives and to think critically.

But if you said, “peace,” it was very, very threatening, and what happened was a lot of people took cover in something called “Global Education,” because global education came to mean for a lot of people, “We are going to educate a generation for global power.”

Now, there are a lot of people who have practiced global education that mean “global justice,” and “cooperation,” and so forth, but that wasn’t what was the underlying purpose of a number of projects that were called “global education.” But it brought into the field new issues that weren’t apparent when the focus was primarily on the arms race and the nature of conflict at the higher system level.

So it helped us — and again, using this kind of systems perspective — to inquire into how conflicts were emerging out of historic conditions - colonialism - and relating to the larger conflict. I think that was a very important development, but it took a while for that to really become the way people looked at Vietnam, because the teachers who were able to bring it into their classrooms just did very traditional stuff - pro or con the war.

Chris: Yes, I see.

Betty Reardon: It was like the “Teach Ins” which were very good, but they were — somebody gets up and defends the policy and somebody else criticizes it —

Chris: I remember

Betty Reardon: — and it never produces very much, except some people in the audience will go one way or the other. It did convince university students that they wanted to have peace studies, however.

Chris: So you think that the field, in a paradoxical way, benefited from that debate of that time.

Betty Reardon: Yes. I think to some degree it did; however, the underlying problems were there, whether we had had a Vietnam War or not, and if there was a legitimate scholarship, it would have found its way into this area and I think we would have had peace studies and, I hope, peace education as well.

Chris: Yes. So - peace studies, peace education, conflict studies, conflict resolution. Did you see any distinction at all between all of these various labels... ?

Betty Reardon: Oh, yes, yes, definitely !

Chris: What struck you?

Betty Reardon: Well, the basic field that I come from and substantively is peace research, and there is, of course, the conflict strand in peace research, but it's not the only area of inquiry. And peace studies drew very heavily on the arms race issues from conflict studies, but also on some of the normative elements that were being brought into the field largely, I think, in the United States as a result of the Civil Rights Movement which brought focus to active nonviolence as a political strategy. So there were universities that did have courses in nonviolence as well as conflict war/peace.

Very often, it was couched in terms of issues of war and peace or peace and conflict, almost as if they were opposites rather than on a continuum and interrelated. So the distinction between peace research and peace studies is that peace studies is curricular in nature.

The field of peace education, as I said, goes... to the pedagogy, and peace education draws on all the field and it had been affected - as the field of peace research had been - as the whole area of "positive" peace emerged and issues of development, human rights, issues of structural violence became the subject of research. That also entered into peace studies and peace education. But ... you can't do conflict resolution only and say it's peace education.

You can't do human rights in the area — calling it positive peace and say that's peace education because peace education requires a kind of comprehensive view, because the citizen has to be educated about human rights, about development issues, about security, about conflict. So when people say, "Oh, it doesn't matter what you do, if you do this one or that one," - well, it doesn't matter where you start. It doesn't matter what the entryway is, but ultimately if it is going to be peace education in the way that we - people that I work with - have defined it. It has to be comprehensive and recognize that these are distinct fields and have been from the very beginning.

Chris: So in the beginning, whenever that was [called] in the '60s, who were major figures of that time that influenced the way you thought about it? Who were people who provided interesting ideas for you...?

Betty Reardon: Well, the "standards", but also I was very much influenced by the people in the Institute where I worked and their enterprise called "The World Order Models Project."

Chris: Oh, "W.O.M.P" - yes.

Betty Reardon: Yes. So I listened to and read the work that Falk and did, and was involved in a lot of their conversations and so forth, Kotari from India, Gustavo Lagos from Chili, Gene Gerasomoff was from the Soviet Union, Johan Galtung, and very much by Kenneth and Elise Boulding. And I always appreciated very much that Elise saw that education was another field and it was equally as important to the whole enterprise of peace knowledge, and she was very instrumental in opening the minds of researchers and peace studies people to the significance and urgency of peace education - because they weren't convinced that it was at all relevant to what they were doing.

Chris: And, of course, if you talk about Elise and Kenneth, then you're almost immediately talking about IPRA and internationalizing peace research and peace studies and peace education. When we were talking earlier, a lot of the people whose names you mentioned were connected with IPRA and were outside the United States of America.

So how did you come into contact with people such as — well, you mentioned Asbjorn Eide - and that immediately triggered off another name in my mind, Anders Boserup. And so there were a whole series of people that were connected with IPRA... through the efforts of Kenneth and Elise and others. How did you come into contact with them - or did you, or did you just know about them?

Betty Reardon: Well, I knew Kenneth and Elise before I was aware of IPRA, and that's because the Institute for World Order always worked internationally. So working there, I began to have contacts with people. And then, with the help of some professors of education in the United States, who were able to identify their counterparts in

other parts of the world, and also people in the World Order Models Project where I could identify educators for us.

So I began to have this network. One of the first international endeavors that I did for the Institute was to have a working seminar at Harvard with educators from about eight or nine countries, very distinguished people including **Hartmund Von Hentic**, who was one of the most revered living German educators, and people who were stars in the education firmament in the United States, such as Donald Oliver and Lawrence Metcalf, who were very attracted to the enterprise.

Chris: And this was about when?

Betty Reardon: That was the summer of 1965, I believe... But I had been — when was I first dispatched abroad? We had so few professionals on staff that we all turned to everything, so I think I did some things in '64. I can't remember. But I remember that particular event because that was the nucleus of a serious group of scholars in education who validated the enterprise, so that was very meaningful. And then I did do a... sort of reconnaissance in — that's a bad word, isn't it?

Chris: It's amazing how we get trapped into using military terms, isn't it ?

Betty Reardon: I did the preliminary investigation in Latin America, because I had a little Spanish and they said, "We have to make some contacts there. Why don't you go?" They had about two people that they were working with, so I did that. And I found people for the research aspect and some people for the education part. But I have never ever felt that we can work nationally. I mean, you do work nationally, but that's not the only perspective, and you have to — the only way you can learn is through the interactions with others — I mean, the world that was in my head in 1963, and the world that was in my head in 1970, say, was a totally different world, and not just because the world had changed, but because I had done a lot of learning through working with people who looked at the world from a different place, with different concerns.

Chris: So your reconnaissance took you to Latin America - and to Europe?

Betty Reardon: Yes. I went to Europe to conferences. And, of course, most of the peace research conferences were in Europe. And the Peace

Education Commission of IPRA was founded not until 1972, but at the IPRA meeting in Bled.

Chris: In Yugoslavia?

Betty Reardon: Yes.

Chris: Did any of the other sort of traditional disciplinary conferences help at this point? ...You talked about going to educational conferences, but this is well before the National Conference on Peace and Conflict Resolution. But I remember going to some conferences with the International Political Psychology Association, for example, that were very interesting and very helpful. But were there any when you were starting out that were interested in peace education and wanted to push it?

Betty Reardon: No. They weren't interested. But I was interested in what they were doing as an arena in which to learn. So I used to go quite regularly to American Society of International Law and sit in the back of the room and absorb it all as much as I could.

Chris: But you are a teacher, not a lawyer.

Betty Reardon: That's right. But you have to know that stuff to teach what we teach. And the Political Science Association, the International Relations. I did a lot of that because this is where the mainline thinking was and that scholarship was influencing what was happening in the schools, and then there were a lot of people who were doing some wonderful, groundbreaking work in those societies.

I don't remember the particular names who aren't crossovers, but they helped, I think, to create a discourse between traditional disciplines and people who were doing peace research and peace studies. And that helped those of us who were educators to formulate our inquiries and to identify the kinds of problems that would be appropriate to build into curricula.

Chris: So you stayed with the Institute until the early '70s?

Betty Reardon: I left there in 1976.

Chris: To come here?

Betty Reardon: No. No, I left. There was a kind of struggle. There's an intersection of hierarchies that women professionals, particularly women educators working with substantive people, deal with all the time, and one is that, in the academic hierarchy, anybody dealing with schools is down about here, and then teachers are down about here. And then the other aspect is — and was particularly strong in the '60s and '70s — that, "You uppity women can't really understand this stuff." And when you say you have another perspective, it's a very personal perspective on public issues and so and so. So it got to be — it prevented me from doing what I felt needed to be done, so I left, and then I did other things for a while and ultimately started things here.

Chris: So how did you come to be invited to... start up a peace education program here?

Betty Reardon: I wasn't invited. Nobody ever invites anybody to set up peace education — well, now they do. But in those days ...

Chris: Things have changed over the years ...? So how did you end up actually here at Teachers College?

Betty Reardon: I came to Teachers College because Teachers College was host to an organization called "The World Council of Curriculum Instruction," and for about two years or so, I served as executive director of this organization. So I came regularly to Teachers College. And one day, a young women walked into my office and said, "I'm a doctoral student in science education and my professor is looking for you."

So Professor Willard Jacobson, who was very well known internationally as a science educator. had become deeply concerned about the nuclear arms race. This was the early '80s, and he felt that some things should be done as an educational response because we were very ignorant about the nature of the weapons, their consequences, and about the politics of it. So anyway, he and I started talking about what could happen here, and we started with one seminar and gradually built and built.

Chris: And so it started with you and Professor Willard Jacobson and then "the building" consisted of —

Betty Reardon: Well, actually, there were three of us at the beginning. Willard called a meeting of faculty to present this, and it was quite well attended. But when things really were shaken down, beside Willard and me, there was one other professor who was willing to put in a lot of extra time, and that was Douglas Sloan.

So the three of us were co-teachers of the first seminar, and ultimately, I had to take over all of it because they got overwhelmed with other things. But it made it possible because we had two respected, tenured professors and that make all the difference.

Chris: Oh, yes. It does, doesn't it?

Betty Reardon: Yes.

Chris: So it's interesting that the person who acted as a gate opener or "Rainmaker" ...was mainly interested in physics and the nuclear problem. One of the things that a lot of people have said about peace research, peace education, conflict research, is that it's always been very multi-disciplinary and pulls ideas from a variety of places. And it seems, too, that that's been your experience as well here, and in your previous work for the Institute. We were talking earlier about whether it's a field or a discipline, and if it's anything, it's multi-disciplinary and pulls from all sorts of different places. Has that been something that you see as a major advantage in your experience in your work, borrowing from everywhere?

Betty Reardon: I think it is. I have my own particular take on this. I believe that people should be grounded in a discipline. I think that it gives you your first experience with systematic thinking about particular issues in substantive areas. But most of the problems that we deal with require knowledge and expertise from many disciplines so that that makes it — makes the multi-disciplinary an important part. But there has to be as well coming together to define the areas of inquiry which I would call "inter-disciplinary." And then there is the point at which some people, who are commonly concerned [but] who may or may not be from disciplines, know that they have to draw on those. And I would say that this in a way is trans-disciplinary because you just kind of go over the boundaries rather than recognizing and using them. But it is important because it represents some of the ways we have to begin to think.

Even though I still advocate that, particularly for undergraduates, they should have a traditional discipline grounding, even if the kind of thinking we have to do and the way we have to think about the world isn't something that can be learned through one discipline. So it is very important, I think, for our field to draw people who have a really firm discipline and who see the multi- and inter- and trans-disciplinary possibilities and what that ...can contribute to building peace knowledge.

Chris: I think I agree with you, but give me an example of the way in which this ability to pull different ideas together has... helped you, particularly, in your work. Could you do this ?

Betty Reardon: Well, I think — can I give you something more contemporary?

Chris: Yes, of course. .

Betty Reardon: For a couple of years, I've been working on a project called, "Ethical and Spiritual Foundations of Peace Education." So in order to create an educational sequence which enables people who are not going to be specialists in any of these areas to engage with ethics or religious aspects of peace questions, you have to bring in aspects of theology, ethics, political science in the sense of analyses of inter-religious conflicts, human rights because these offer standards for determining what is a trans-cultural ethic, and that kind of thing.

I think it works with virtually everything we do in a way — the study of development issues and poverty...you have to look at structural issues, political questions, economy, culture.

Chris: Yes. The world doesn't fit neatly into the departments of universities, unfortunately, does it? Or fortunately, I guess.

Betty Reardon: And one area that I have always found fascinating - when I can get into some of the things that they're doing - is anthropology. And I regret that we don't have anthropologists in IPRA.

Chris: Really? Are there none ?

Betty Reardon: I haven't come across one. Lots of sociologists...!

Chris: Well, it's interesting you should say that. It hadn't struck me in the past, and I guess maybe it's because I can't move without tripping over an anthropologist.

Betty Reardon: Right. They want to study conflict.

Chris: Well, they also want to teach it... we have three anthropologists, on the faculty [at ICAR] at the moment.

Betty Reardon: Well, maybe they're all hiding as conflict people in IPRA. I don't know. I'll have to go and look, go to some of the conflict commissions and find out whose there.

Chris: Well, I think the phrase our people use is, "Recovering anthropologists" rather like recovering from illness or alcoholism.

I want to go back to something you said earlier about why you left and about the whole issue of attitudes towards women, which, of course, always infuriates the half of my students who are women, while at least half of them are mainly interested in studying gendered aspects of conflict ... Do you - I'm trying not to ask this in a leading sense, but - what changes have you observed since the 1960s and 1970s in the role of women in peace education and peace studies and conflict studies? Have ... have subjects shifted and new focuses arisen? Have disciplines changed because of the fact that many more women are now involved in the field? Have the hierarchies that you mentioned a few minutes ago begun to fray at the edges?

I mean... looking back and now looking at where we are now — have things changed that much?

Betty Reardon: Yes and no. Let's see, how to sort it all out. Nobody feels free to express what once were just "given" assumptions about women's roles. And so on the level of professional discourse, it's much more open. There's a great deal more recognition that gender is a factor. There's clearly acknowledgement that traditional social systems have oppressed women and that these are issues of violence which have a place in peace research.

There has been, I think, a significant contribution from feminists. I'm not saying gender studies people now, I'm saying feminist peace researchers to the field —

Chris: Particularly who, would you say?

Betty Reardon: Well, Bernice Carroll and Cynthia Enloe and — well, I just ... the names don't come tripping off my tongue, - from my own students, Kosway Okubyoshi and Andrea Percival (sp?). There are people who have done a good deal. And it's generally recognized as legitimate scholarship. But in reality and under the politics of the field — not the big politics, the little politics — there's still a long way to go - a really long way to go.

And I'm not just talking in terms of some of the barriers that are still held up in women's advance, but to fully understand the significance of gender. One thing that has only trickled in now is masculinity studies, and it's only beginning to get into peace issues. And some of the most committed students that I have dealt with, who want to raise gender issues, have been the young men.

They are making, I think, a very great contribution to the field. I just had to answer something for UNESCO about what advice I would give to young women in the field, and I said, "Work with young men who have the same commitments and same concerns that you do about gender equality and gender perspective." So - yes, there has been a great deal of progress, but there's still, as I say, a long, long way to go.

Chris: So if I were to ask you the same question, what alternative answer would you give to my young women who are students? Where would you like to see them making their effort?

Betty Reardon: I think what I would like young women to be able to do is to formulate their interests, as young men always have, in whatever area of the field that most interests them to be able to follow through with it, and to have a clear field for them. But they also have to understand that every once in a while, they will run into something they're not going to recognize right away as a gender block.

But I think both men and women have to learn to have a sensitivity - not just gender sensitivity and, you know, use gender-inclusive language - but sensitivity to those gender conflict issues which often get papered over. And that they need to work with young men and to share perspectives on that kind of experience. One of the funniest experiences I ever had was in the early '80s I went to a meeting... for the planning of the University for Peace and they

had gathered together the wise - some wise - old men. So I was ... the only woman. And there was one young man who happened to be an African. The assumptions that these wise old European men were putting on...as a basis for all their suggestions were somewhat limited by this fact. So we began to sort of look at each other and we decided, "We're going to be in collaboration to raise some issues." So what we did was he raised all the gender issues and I raised all the race and culture issues. Because if I had raised the gender issues, they'd say, "Well, that's a woman. Oh, all right. You're black. This is why you —" But I think that's what men and women should do... the men should be raising —

Chris: The women's issues and —

Betty Reardon: - the women should be more sensitive to the ways in which men are impeded.

Chris: Did the wise old men listen?

Betty Reardon: Yes, as a matter of fact, they did. I have to say, they were wise, charming, and intelligent old men. But there were generational issues and so forth. Of course, I believe in the wisdom of age. But that's another point that I would make - when peace research was young, the people were younger, you know? And unfortunately, a lot of — as it happens, they don't let go. It's not necessarily "letting go", but turning around to see who can do this. Who's got a fresh approach - who's 20 years younger or so who needs to come along? The field needs them.

Chris: Yes.

Betty Reardon: I'll be interested to see the number of white heads at the Peace and Justice Studies Association meeting in the fall. I haven't been in a couple of years, but we'll see.

Chris: That was one of the nice things about IPRA conferences, of course, and maybe it still is. I haven't been to one for a long time. But it was a mixture of the Kenneths and Elises, but there were also lots of young, sometimes pushy young men and women who —

Betty Reardon: Yes. I think so. But ... a lot of them were students of ours. So there's another dynamic operating there. And every once in a while, some young person just finds out about it [the field] and

comes because of their concern. They say, “That is where I want to be.” And I love it when [this happens]...

Chris: That’s the nice thing about our students and probably about your students as well, that they’re an absolute delight in the sense that they’re in this field not because they’re going to become millionaires as a result of getting a degree in it, but because they really care about the substance. And that’s one of the things that I like about looking over my shoulder to see who’s coming...

Let me go back to my script... You know, you and I both... started off as teachers and educators, but one of the things about the field of peace studies and conflict studies is that they have always claimed that they were “practical and applied”. In other words, the whole point about doing peace studies was not just to study, but it was to do something about increasing the possibilities for peace, however you defined it.

So part of our field — I agree with you. I think it is a field — has been that it has always tried to be practical and applied and to take ideas and to take lessons not just in the classroom or in the college or in the university, but out into the field. Now, in your experience, do you think it’s been successful at all in influencing the real world, either directly or indirectly? Is it a successful, practical, applied, useful, tool-related field?

Betty Reardon: It depends upon what level of social organization and policy you’re talking about. I think, for example, young people who have studied aspects of economic structures in peace studies programs and who have, as part of their studies, gone to developing — and I don’t know what word you should use — but poor and peripheral countries have been able to see things in a way that they would not if they had just done International Relations and read the newspaper. And I think to be very effective as catalysts for bringing some change when they work on projects and things of that kind. I believe that knowledge from peace studies has, to some degree, affected the larger peace movement, but not enough. I think there’s still a little gap between the activists and the academics. Academics are activists, but some of them are not, you know.

Chris: Yes.

Betty Reardon: And there are problems, too, because you have problems of how — you are no longer perceived as some objective scholar, maybe. And certainly I don't believe that you should bring your activism or your views as an activist into the classroom. So in that way, I think the “applied” is somewhat limited. But where it should be useful is at levels of policymaking - national, state... I'm talking about this country, in which it virtually doesn't exist except if someone gets into elected office who happens to know somebody who has this background.

Jim [Laue ?] used to talk politics and others have as well. But then when we look... at the McNeil-Lehrer Report, and who do they bring in for the “professorial pundit”. They're mainline thinkers who are straight within the present paradigm and who talk that game and don't stimulate any different thinking - or anything that can really impact that much on policy.

I think one area where it does have some positive effect is in the UN structure.

Chris: Really?

Betty Reardon: Because there are a lot - not a lot - but there are some people in the UN structure who themselves come out of the academy or a research background and know what the possibilities are. And scholarly associations, including IPRA and so forth, have NGO status. Mort [Deutsch] was just talking about he's going to represent the Psychology Association. And if they have status, they will be called upon. And if you're known in that system, you will find somebody in an agency, and even sometimes a secretariat will call upon you. And then, of course, there are ways to lobby that structure which can use that knowledge. But we still have to... learn what is meant by that and how to do it, you know.

Chris: So what advice would you give? I mean, is it a good thing to join the punditry? Is that the way through ?

Betty Reardon: No! Down with the pundits !! I want — you know what I want to go to? I want to go to the old BBC where you have readers and they read you the news and you can make up your own mind, or then you can read journals or something. But I think it's — oh, I don't want to get started on that ! But I think that we have to have application as a field of inquiry. Now one thing that I did here was to start an internship in civil society. It was a course. But — it

was years ago when we were able to get into the UN with just passes. You know, now the security is so strict it's terrible. ...

But most of the course was being there on the scene. observing how civil society operates, what they're doing that seems pretty effective, what they're not doing that seems pretty ineffective in their roles as NGOs, and stepping back to say, "Well, what are the things we have to learn in order to be effective? What skills have we not been taught, or that have not been even developed would we need to have?"

I think that's what's needed in the whole area of peace studies in order to make that possibility for applied policy studies.

Chris: Push the argument a little further, though. You talked about different levels and one of the things that has happened over the last 10-15 years has been a tremendous interest in peace at the grassroots level. Do you think that peace studies and peace education at the grass roots level, with the general public, or what they call in the Middle East, the "street - do you think that has become more effective over the decades? For example, what you were talking about a little earlier, educating people about nuclear issues and about nuclear dangers, and particularly now about the problems of nuclear material falling into the hands of people who would probably use it.

Betty Reardon: It's now in the hands of people who would probably use it.

Chris: True, true. So hopefully extended that all the way down your hierarchy.

Betty Reardon: I think it's what I talked about because my colleague in the next office introduced me to the concept in sexism and the war system, the whole notion of reciprocal causality. I think that the field of inquiry and the on-the-ground activism are feeding each other, and we are learning — and the Is are I, and people who observe from my perspective — learning a lot about how the — what the issues are in the reality of the perception of people. Because if that's what they perceive, that is a reality. And how do we, as open inquirers, try to engage that reality? I don't think that peace studies or peace education has had a really profound effect on the growing peace movement. I think the conditions have produced the movement. But when we are part of the movement and can bring some of the skills and perspective we have to what we do as

activists, I think we can make a contribution. But it's also an area in which there has to be more intentionality and sort of systematic review of what the possibilities are and how you go about [having some influence].

Chris: Looking back again, when everything got started, when the peace research, peace education and conflict [studies] got started, it was a field that I think was characterized with lots of hopes and lots of dreams. I wonder, looking back, if you think that the field has fallen short in any way, if the things it was hoping to accomplish in those early days — it was a very, very hopeful field - but I know a lot of people that we've talked to have said, "Well, we haven't quite done what we thought we would do." Is that your impression as well, or do you have a more upbeat estimate?

Betty Reardon: No. It's my impression that what was hopeful was not realistic, but it's also my impression that there was a great deal achieved. I think learning in and of itself is so significant that the fact that we have, even though many of us are not here anymore, a whole generation of people who learn to look at the world differently as a result of their work. And I think that that has been important.

I think somehow there are some influences, even though we fall short in applied research. I think — well, I've always said that I believe what one of the things that maintains hope for me is not to judge a process or a campaign or an intention only in terms of the previously set goals, but to look at it in terms of learning. What did we learn? Not just, "What did we achieve by trying to do this?" What did we learn, and how does that learning relate to the purposes and relate to maybe the reformulation of goals?

When I started in the mid-1960s, one of the first big international events that I went to was a convocation at the Hilton Hotel on the implications for world politics of the papal encyclical *Pro Humanitaris* [Sp ?] among other things. And it was called something about the Year 2000, or whatever. Well, at that point, I had severe doubts that I would be around in the Year 2000, because I would be so old that I would be hardly able to get around anyway.

But I remember one of the things that I had been introduced to was to think in terms of projections over certain periods of time and then think systematically about transition strategies. And things

were set for the 1990s. In the 1990s, that was one of the frames we used. This could be the reality, or that could be - and you went from worst-case scenario to the relevant utopia kind of thing. And most of that — none of it really happened.

But then a lot of other things happened, like the International Criminal Court, not that people hadn't thought about it, but it came about. All of the international Legal Standards on Human Rights, which comes — you know, 1948 and then 1966, a big jump over nothing. But after 1966, this whole evolution of “norm setting” which is beginning to have some real effect on the world.

Now whether or not peace research and peace studies had any effect on that, I believe that we as receivers of proposals, as observers and commenters upon these developments, were much more able to do that constructively than we would have been if we hadn't engaged in the enterprise of peace research and peace studies. So that's the kind of view that I take of it. And I say that to the young people all the time, “Just keep it in the learning framework. What am I learning? What is the world learning? ... what is this organization learning? And is it useful learning, and how do we manipulate or massage that to be a useful learning?”

Chris: So part of your answer implies that there were surprises along the way looking back from the '60s, particularly, and some positive some negative. .. the International Criminal Court was —

Betty Reardon: Who would have thought there'd be a genocide on the European continent again, to say nothing of the other genocidal atrocities that are taking place in the world ?

Chris: So I guess part of the “continue-to-learn advice is”; “Don't necessarily be surprised if things surprise you.”

Betty Reardon: And learn to deal with it. Learn to deal with these surprises. “Why is it a surprise? What didn't I know?” I think we can teach certain skills of anticipation. You can't anticipate everything, but an anticipatory stance, as well as a learning stance, is something that I think serves you well.

Chris: Well, I very foolishly agreed with one of my publishers back in London to redo my old textbook which I wrote 40 years ago now. And I knew the field had mushroomed and “galloped off in all directions”, but what surprised me was just how different the field

is from when I was writing in the early 1970s, when I was trying to survey the field. It's just astounding the new subjects that have come in and the research which has been undertaken. So I was prepared to be surprised, but I wasn't quite to be —

Betty Reardon: Not to be overwhelmed.

Chris: Overwhelmed is right word - which takes me to the next question which is not looking back, but looking forward. What do you think, now on 2006, looking over the next few years, what do you think are likely to be fruitful lines of development in peace research, peace education. Where do you think the field is going now?

Betty Reardon: Well, I can say where we're trying to push it in terms of peace education. I think the whole notion of that is that, "Think global, act local," has to be turned on its head. I think we have to raise up a generation who understand local realities, local possibilities in a way that they never did before unless they were traditional people in a locale. What gets lost is that there is not enough sensitivity to the daily, smaller consequences or seemingly small - in scale, maybe - consequences of local and national developments and events.

I think that is a focus that has to be brought in ... that when you act globally, think locally as well. And to deal more with thinking about — we've always thought about consequences - but to think about consequences not just in terms of, "This may be effective. This may have this bad or positive a consequence," but over time, (which I've always talked about), but also at every level of social experience which it will be felt.

I think that also has ethical implications. Just saw a performance piece the other night on nuclear weapons, and one of the points they made is what they always make about how it's so hard to wrap your head around mega-deaths, but you can be so moved by one to four or five people in terrible situations. That's because we haven't been thinking that way. We think in these large, aggregate terms. And our tendency — now we like to take all this and aggregate it, put it together, get the big picture.

But I think things are lost, and I would like to see — I think it could make for much more interesting discussions sometimes, too - if people would look more to what I call the "quotidian" as well as

the local. And we see the necessity for that in what we've been doing in peace education because we have had a very successful series of international meetings — we call it “The International Institute on Peace Education,” every year for the past 25 years.

Chris: Here?

Betty Reardon: No. All over the world. We've been in India and the Philippines and Japan and Greece. I can't remember all the places. But, people come and then they go back. But they go back very often to very few supporters. So what we're trying to do now is to take advantage of this global network we have of people in place and say, “What do you need there? How can we create something like that institute experience in a local area, pulling in local people, and also to begin to work in the local or national languages?”

Because a major problem for all of the things that we're concerned with - if we're serious about the norms we embrace - is the language issue because if you have a monolingual and mono-thinking power structure, it's just disastrous for most of the world. So I think we need to get more into the little bits and pieces of the whole thing, and, of course, see all the interconnections, make them. But really look particularly for us cosmopolitans.

Chris: “Us” English speakers ?

Betty Reardon: Yes. Especially for us.

Chris: Yes. You know there is a film, going around called *Syriana*. Have you seen that?

Betty Reardon: What is it called?

Chris: *Syriana*

Betty Reardon: No, I want to see that. That's on my list.

Chris: It's a film which... illustrates the point you're making very well - that major decisions made in one part of the world have minor, but sometimes disastrous effects in other parts, that you just don't think about and then it blows back on you as well.

Betty Reardon: Well, they don't think of and they don't care about. You see, it's a double whammy.

Chris: Your own plans now for the future ? What are you planning to do? We talked about plans for the field and directions you'd like to see the field going. What are you — what's Betty Reardon's —?

Betty Reardon: **[Laughs]** Well - I always say I'm going to find myself a nice beach chair an umbrella and a stack of books.

Chris: Yes. But aside from that?

Betty Reardon: Well, if I had — I'm trying to dislodge a lot of things, but I would like to do one more book on pedagogy, the pedagogy of transformation.

Chris: That's a new word, really, because people have only started talking about "transformation" over the last decade or so. What do you mean by transformation?

Betty Reardon: Well, I cut my teeth on that word because the gentleman in the World Order Models Project talked about "system transformation".

Chris: Yes.

Betty Reardon: First, they talked about "drastic" system change, and then they talked transformation. And I came to understand that what they were talking about was changing institutions and they thought it was essentially a process of design - and politics. And I came to believe that that was simply the architectural engineering aspect and that transformation is a dynamic concept that results inevitably in structural change of some kind.

But the most important changes take place within the actors as individuals and as sociopolitical units. And we say we "educate for a change", but we educate according to certain expectations of change - trends that are happening in the society.

I want to explore the way in which we would teach to encourage a legitimate transformational process in which the person interacts with the society and realizes that, in order to change the society, changes must happen in one's own world view, behaviors, values, and so forth, and that it requires everything. It requires the structural. It requires social and cultural. And it would be much more — I did a book called *Education for Peace* which had a lot of pedagogical principles in it. But what I would like to do with

this book is to focus more on the intuitive learning that I've experienced which results in kind of intuitive teaching. But now I figure I've got to try and articulate it so, Militarism if it has any value, it might be used by somebody.

I mean, there are a lot of people using my way and adapting it, but it's just like they experienced it, so they do that and then fix it up to their own way. But only in the past few years do I realize I have to — I might do something like that. So if I had the energy and the time, that would be something I would do. Plus, I want to work much more in social action without the constraints of academic responsibilities, to be able to say what I want and do what I want, and not think about having repercussions to an institution or whatever.

And a lot of what I want is to reverse American militarism, and particularly the way it impacts on women, which is never taken into consideration, that there is a profound negative effect on women in every community in which the U.S. has either temporary or permanent bases. And it's only when organized women make an issue of it, that it even is acknowledged, and then it's swept under the rug again. So that's something that I wanted to work on.

Chris: Chalmers Johnson mentions it in his book *Blowback*? It's just a mention, really.

Betty Reardon: Well, he was in Okinawa... it's the paradigmatic case, and the women there have been very intentional and systematic about documenting it and analyzing it and so forth. And there is an international network now growing. But as with all women's movements, it doesn't have that much clout. We need to make alliances and to educate others. We need to educate the peace movement.

Chris: Two final questions, which we always ask - and we've talk a little bit about this previously - but one ultimate question is: "Who else ought we to talk to"? We've mentioned Bernice [Carroll] and Clinton Fink and some of your colleagues, your international colleagues. But if we were to say, "Give us a list of half a dozen people that we ought to talk to, [who] we ought to interview over the next six months," who would be your six...?

Betty Reardon: Do they all have to be long in the tooth?

-
- Chris: Well, pragmatically, that's what we're doing, because we're worried that we'll miss people.
- Betty Reardon: All right. There's a man who was — he wasn't there at the creation, but he was in the early '70s in Netherlands who doesn't do peace education anymore, but he's still at the International Institute in Groningen. His name is Robert Aspeslagh, A-S-P-E-S-L-A-G-H. These are all peace educators. Then there is — he was very much involved in the '70 in the IPRA summer school in Sweden, which was very important in our field, and his name is Jamie Diaz. He's a Columbian priest who is now in Texas. J-A-I-M-E, D-I-A-Z.
- Chris: Okay.
- Betty Reardon: And I can probably — if you send me this list - I could probably give you e-mail addresses for them.
- Chris: I have a feeling about Jaime Diaz. Was he working at one stage on the development of peace communities in El Salvador?
- Betty Reardon: No. He worked in Columbia and he did a lot of empowerment education work. That's Father Alas I think you're thinking of. And I gave you Joe Fahey at Manhattan College
- Chris: Yes, I met him at Manhattan College.
- Betty Reardon: I don't know where she is, but there's a woman also who was in these summer schools and in the early days of IPRA. Her name is — not — anyway pre-'80s, let's say, pre-'80s IPRA. Corrine Kumar DaSousa. That's K-U-M-A-R, D-A capital S-O-U-S-A.
- Chris: She sounds Sri Lankan.
- Betty Reardon: She's the widow of a Goan Catholic. Who else from the early, early days? I'll have to look at old photographs maybe and see who people were. There's another — if you could get a list of the people who... ran the [IPRA] summer schools... they brought together mainly Europeans and Africans. But we had a very inter-regional group among the peace educators who came. I think it was those summers that made us into a community, that made the peace education commission one of the strongest in IPRA.
-

-
- Chris: Was there ever anybody from Poland in those days? I'm trying to think back to some of the systems conferences I —?
- Betty Reardon: Well, Marrack A (?) was a Pole, from Poland and we had some people from Romania. We used to have some Russians who came. You should also — and now who could do this for you? In the '70s, there was a very active institute in Vienna for east/west dialogue and many of us were there.
- Chris: IASSA ?. Was it International Association for Systems Analysis?
- Betty Reardon: No. It was set up by Soviet money and the director usually would be a Soviet but the director then was an Austrian... he is somebody else you should talk to...
That whole little bit of the Vienna institute is important as well as this Dubrovnik bit, because it's these places of congregating on common projects over a period of time that really built [the field] — and the projects that built the International Peace Research Movement. IPRA is once a year or every two years. So that's kind of a "gathering of the clan" and that's not the community formation that —
- Chris: — the people formed their own projects —
- Betty Reardon: Around projects and common concerns and so forth. Who else? Who else? I'm just trying to think — yes, and actually, the former prime minister of Romania was a member of our peace education commission, Audria Nastasi [sp?] He was retired by the electorate, but he might be accessible if you could get to Romania.
Magnes [Hovelrug Sp ?] is an important contact, I think. And Magnes was also involved in those summer schools and he would know how to get in touch with Asbjorne [Eide}.
- Chris: We can certainly contact him. We're due to go over to Oslo sometime towards the end of April, so we can certainly tell him we're coming and ask for him to spare us some time, and then maybe —
- Betty Reardon: No. He's going to be here ... Magnes **Hovelsrug** is going to be here for at least six months.
- Chris: Okay. Good.
-

-
- Betty Reardon: And then there are all that group — we used to call them “the Scandinavian mafia”....I see them all by face, and I can’t remember their names. .. and the Finns. My goodness. There are so many Finns. Unto Vesa and... When are you leaving?
- Chris: I’m leaving on Tuesday, but Jannie will still be around. And on Monday...I was going to put the whole of this material in an envelope and mail it to you - stuff about the Institute, stuff about the project, a couple of things that we’ve written that might be of interest to you...I’ll put a little note in and send it by e-mail saying, “Betty, please remember that we need as many names as you can dig out from those early days of the field...tell us who the ‘Scandinavian mafia’ was.”
- Betty Reardon: Yes - but. don’t use that language.
- Chris: All right. Well, I’ll put it Spanish or something like that.
- Betty Reardon: Yes. And then Dieter Senghaas - You have him? He’s in Frankfurt.
- Chris: Still, yes. And, oh, the other people that we might talk to are the people at the European Platform for Conflict Prevention, which is being run by that very nice Dutch guy - Paul van Tongeren...
- Betty Reardon: Carl Heinz Kopper ?. He was the Secretary General at IPRA in the early ‘90s, but he had been in the organization for some time.
- Chris: I tell you what one thing you could probably clear up for me. I completely lost track of Burt Roling, but assume he’s no longer around. Do you remember Burt Roling?
- Betty Reardon: He died. He was a lot older than we are....He was one of the first persons that I did preliminary research or surveyed — one of the first trips I took to Europe for...He had founded the Polemological Institute in Groningen.
- Chris: Yes,
- Betty Reardon: And, you know, he came out of Indonesia and what affected him strongly was that Dutch colonial experience.
-

Chris: I have one last question. If you were sitting here and interviewing Betty Reardon, what question would you have asked that we haven't asked?

Betty Reardon: Oh, what a delicious invitation. I wish I'd thought of that coming.

Chris: You can't think of it beforehand. We have to throw it at you.

Betty Reardon: Yes, right. What would I have asked her? Well, I guess I might want to say something — ask something to the effect of, “For someone who has spent almost a lifetime working on education to change institutions, how have you sustained an inter-institutional life, and what kind of changes would you like to see in the institutions in which you have had to do your work?”

Chris: And you would have said as a response?

Betty Reardon: Lots, lots. I think I would — it sounds very retrograde, but I would like to see aspects of the university return to the traditional notion of a university. We've just been talking about research. I truly value research, but if the university is to be an institution which literally produces knowledge and producers of knowledge, it has to be much more committed to its educational function than it has been. It has to re-value teaching.

It has to recognize that the clients are not “customers”, that their most natural allies are not corporate institutions, and to take a step back and look at the way in which the production of knowledge and the formation of the knowers has been prostituted to other social purposes. And that's a long, long conversation — diagnostic conversation, but I think it has to happen or the university will be sucked into the whole culture that is militarized, capitalist and corporate.

Chris: Okay.

Betty Reardon: And I think that's some of the stuff that we're trying to do in peace education is to get people to be able to raise those questions and consider them.

Chris: That's a good question. That's a good answer. I wish you luck. You're rowing against a tide, but I think it's worth rowing.

Betty Reardon: Well, I don't know. It's not the question that I would spring immediately to the president of the university, but I would like an opportunity to raise the issues with him... And it's not just this university. It's every university, very unfortunately. And it's not just this country. I've been talking to lots of colleagues in Europe who have the same concerns.

Chris: I just think that the Europeans aren't quite as far down the road.

Betty Reardon: But they're intentionally pursuing it. Their whole notion of education for unified Europe is education for working within the corporate structure.

Chris: Of course. Sometimes... something becomes too egregious that people stop and say, "This isn't what it's about." I don't know whether you followed any of the details of the forced resignation of the president of American University recently in Washington —

Betty Reardon: I saw bits and pieces, but I didn't see it all.

Chris: They're just unbelievable. It's... the way in which he had been brought in to push AU down that road at a faster pace, did so, and creamed off a lot of the benefits of the corporate sponsorship for himself...

Could we go back a bit? We talked about this a few minutes ago, but I want to go back to this business about the... lack of impact that we've had on policy, particularly. Now I may have misheard you, but you seemed to indicate that you thought that we'd actually fallen short there, we haven't had a major impact on policy. And I was wondering if I'd heard you right. And secondly, if had heard you right, then why have we not been all that effective in influencing policy, policy makers, the way the world has gone?

Betty Reardon: Well, if I really had some good ideas about the latter part, I would do something about making it be more effective. I think that there are many factors that feed into not being effective and I don't think it's all laid at the door of the field or the researchers. I believe that many policymakers don't know or care that there is a field of peace research.

I think that most policymakers do not think in terms that would enable them to welcome, much less fully understand the products of peace research. And if they did understand it, they probably

would be very fearful of a lot of it because critical peace research is research that looks to critically analyze the sources of problems which would mean profound changes in the way things are done, and maybe even in the people that do it, which policymakers would not welcome. That's one aspect.

The other aspect is the field itself and the way it articulates itself. It is an academic field, and academics tend to articulate to other academics, and they have little concern with making themselves fully comprehensible to those who are not initiated.

If the average intelligent citizen hasn't got an idea articulated in a form that she or he can consider within their frames of reference, then it's not going to have an impact. And I don't think that this means that peace research has to give up its jargon or whatever. But they have to acknowledge that the form in which they put their product out is not going to hit the newsstands. And I think there is a field there for the popularization of peace research.

Chris: Okay. Thank you. That's fair advice... Something else that we were talking about a few minutes ago, and that's — I don't know what we should call it — the next generation or “inheritance” ..and one of the things I think you alluded to is the fact that we're not taking very much care of our next generation.

We're not making sure that our shoes are there waiting to be filled, and that's slightly worrying for both of us, as educators. Do you think that that's a fair criticism, that there isn't a next generation coming through or that it's not being given the opportunities that you and I had - in spite of the difficulties and times when we started working? What's your feeling about that?

Betty Reardon: Well, I think that those of us who started early had little competition. Nobody wanted to be — isn't it easy to be a leader when there's nobody else in the field, you know.

Chris: You can't be a leader if there are no followers.

Betty Reardon: Right. But we did get some followers. Anyway, people came into the field. I think there's a certain phenomenon that occurs and that is aspects of “the star system” that affects the intellectual arena as all others. And so if people have a reputation, they are usually the ones, “Well, who will we get to speak on this program? Who will

we ask to do this? Who will we get to review this manuscript?" etcetera, etcetera.

And it just — I think that what has to be done is we have to say, "Not me" I say it a lot of times because I just don't want to do it, but not just because we don't want to do it, but because others have to have an opportunity. I can't tell you how many times this has happened to me. They say, "Well, I can't do that, but I know so and so and so and so who is very good and would really do a good job for you and you'd be very happy with the program," etcetera, etcetera.

Well, that might be, but... "Hhe or she is not very well known." I say, "Well, how in heck are they ever going to be well known if they don't get an opportunity?" So I say, "Well, I'm sorry. I can't do it. This is what I can do for you, and if you can't take this person, then I probably wouldn't want to be involved in the program anyway." I think it's partly the star system. And then once in a while, there's something one can't resist - a certain audience then "Boy, let me at them !"

But I think it's not just filling the shoes or the jobs because... the styles of shoes change and they should and it should — I want a new generation to come in and do new things, and if they find what I've done useful, I will be very happy. But if they can throw it all out to make something better, I'll be even happier. I want to think that not only is there a future for the field, but that the future will recognize and welcome the field more than it has. I want them to have struggles, but not the same old ones, you know. Repeat the cycle

Chris: Yes. It's depressing if they just sort of do around and around in circles.

Something else you said when we talked about ideas and the future. You mentioned this idea about transformation. And for the field, anyway, "conflict transformation" is relatively new and it's been exciting and I think it's one of the things that the new generation has taken up... and pushed in a different direction. So it's an important organizing concept for the field now.

But, looking back to when you started, what were the really exciting concepts in those days - in the '60s? They'd moved from arms control and the arms problem into something new and really very exciting. I remember those days as well and there was a sort

of a “buzz” about certain things. Can you remember what you were a-buzz about when you started?

Betty Reardon: Well, some of the thing... Now, I began with war prevention and then moved on to aspects of the field. But the things that were most exciting for me — and influenced the way I did what I did - didn't always come out of peace research.

Chris: Where?

Betty Reardon: I think one of the most exciting things and concepts for me was the work of Paulo Friere and this “Arco Sante” and the intentional design of a new community that was not — I suppose it was in a sense the negative sense of utopian. But it was a way of thinking and a way in which one could imagine and work on bringing into reality an alternative to what was, and not just preventing, not just interrupting arms races and so forth.

So when I had the experience of that, which complemented in some way of working with World Order Models Project and what they were about was designing new international system, it enabled me to see that as a device for teaching and for thinking and so we went through the notion of preventing something, interrupting it, resolving it to a design problem and then all of the new aspects of positive — I wish those terms were never invented — but positive peace, right up through the emergence of the general concept of a culture of peace which I think has the potential to be truly transformational.

But it's been treated like - change the movies and change the government and you change the culture. It's hasn't been deeply enough conceptualized. And that's what I mean by transformation. When I think of conflict transformation, I think of something that's much more positive than resolution because it changes the energies into something positive and also the relationships - and so forth.

So that part of it is changing the way... energies are expended and the purposes for which they're used, as well as relationships. But it changes as well the mindset of the actors, not just the relationship, the value system, the cosmology that one sees oneself in, as well as the structures.

And, you know, I have no grief for new age — most new-age stuff.

But it does seem to me that there are aspects of it that are instructive in terms of consciousness, the formation of consciousness through culture, and that a lot of what is possible is an understanding those interactions and how we can learn with and from each other about how we can change all of those things.

And when we have this kind of complex process of change — multi-level, multi-factor, multi, multi, multi, then that's what I mean by transformation. It sounds like chaos theory. But remember what happened with chaos theory.

Chris: Well, it sounds a very systemic approach. It puts me in mind of the things that we were talking about in London in my Department of Systems Analysis.

Betty Reardon: Yes. That's very much part of it.

Chris: It's something Cynthia Enloe once said: "The trouble is, when you pick up something to examine it, you find it's attached to everything else."

Betty Reardon: Right. But also, not only that you pick it up to examine it and you find out that it's attached to something else, you have to be conscious of what you see when you see those interconnections, and why you see that, and what somebody else sees, and what are the ways in which you can exchange views, perhaps maintain the integrity of yours, but entertain the possibilities of the others. And it's not just... perspective taking. These are ideas that interest me in the sense that they're things that I want to think about and learn about and talk to people about.: That's what I think when something is "interesting". That's the highest compliment I can pay anything. If I say, "Oh, that's interesting. Mmm, that's interesting !"

Chris: So, finally, what are your plans for the future, for your part of the field, [for writing] - aside from sitting on a beach under an umbrella with a stack of good books ?

Betty Reardon: **[Laughs]** Well, what I [will] do is - I have a legal-sized yellow pad and I start writing on the legal-sized yellow pad on the basis of many tiny bits and pieces of paper that I have collected and stack and stacks of books which have little pieces of paper stuck in them

in certain places. And then I get enough material on my yellow pad and then I go to the computer and.....

[End of Audio]

Duration: 120 minutes