

**PARENTS OF THE FIELD PROJECT.**

*Interviewee; Professor Chadwick Alger.*

*Date; 16<sup>th</sup> December 2005*

*Venue; Columbus, Ohio.*

*Interviewer; Dr. Chris Mitchell.*

Chris: It's the 16<sup>th</sup> of December 2005, and we are here in Columbus, Ohio, talking to our friend and colleague, Professor Chad Alger, as part of our "Parents of the Field" project, recording recollections and views about the beginning of the field of conflict analysis and resolution. Chad, looking back now, in the very early days of peace and conflict studies – whatever we're going to call it – people came into the field from all sorts of different backgrounds, intellectual and experiential. What was yours? How did you come into this field? What brought you into it?

Chadwick Alger: I was brought into it, basically, as a result of the fact I was, at that point in time – now I'm speaking about the mid '60s – doing research on the United Nations, and was doing field work at the UN beginning about 1959, and I decided to spend the year in Geneva – studying the agencies in Geneva. I think critical here is I moved out of North America and went to Europe. And it was there that I established contact that connected me with, then, what we called "the peace research field".

Indeed, my UN studies have always been part of the research that was then seen as a separate, different thing, and very important was the fact that – I guess it was the Fall of 1966 – Johan Galtung invited me to come to the Peace Research Institute in Oslo, and that was really... I knew about this article and that article, but I hadn't really known that there was a peace research *field*. But spending several days at the Peace Research Institute in Oslo, I believe in the dark days of November 1966 – it was dark in Oslo – that I became aware of this field.

Chris: And what, in particular, attracted you to becoming part of it? What drew you into the field, in particular?

Chadwick Alger: Well, I think I was drawn into the field by virtue of the fact that –

see, I was a political scientist. I got my degree in political science, a PhD in political science, and the field of international relations was mainly devoted to helping us understand how the world became the way it is. It was dominated by so-called "realists." I always put that in quotation marks, because it's an etiology.

It's not an empirical reality, and peace research began to develop in me an interest, not only in explaining how we got where we are, but getting knowledge which will enable us to move to a different future, and that was very important. Things change slowly – that began a very slow change in the basic goals of my own work. Also, in that year, John Burton invited me to come to London to be involved in – what did he call his – you were there too, Chris ?

Chris: I think at the time he was calling it “controlled communication”.

Chadwick Alger: Yes, controlled communication. He would bring people from two sides of an international conflict. They would sit there with the social scientists, and they would present their perceptions. In this case...our case was the Cyprus case, and people from both sides who would explain – John would be asking questions – who would explain their points of view, and then, gradually, the social scientists would intervene and try to help them move towards an understanding of each other. Well, that was the second experience of that year.

John was going at it in quite a different way than Johan Galtung. John was an ex-practitioner. Johan was a sociologist. But those two events were very important. Then, I'll just add one thing. In the summer of that year, the summer of 1967, after my contact with Johan, I went to the second – I believe, the second – conference of International Peace Research Association in Stockholm, and ... there I encountered a few people from all over the world, and the dramatic aftermath of that was that I learned that people in different parts of the world define “peace” in different ways.

I was from North America. “Peace” was getting rid of armaments. Others from the so-called Third World saw “peace” as getting rid of the fact that they didn't have medical care, they didn't have food, they lived in terrible poverty. I found out that “peace” is defined throughout the world as getting rid of the things that most limit your capacity to have a normal life. That year was a turning point for me.

Chris: I'm going to come back in a minute to this whole issue of "peace", but let me ask you one other question. Many of the people that we've interviewed for this project have traced back their interest and enthusiasm - their motivation - to experiences that they had in the 1940s. A lot of them saw some of the Second World War. Did that have any kind of an impact on you, in the way you thought about things 20 years later, when we had this experience?

Chadwick Alger: It had an impact in that I began relating - I began drawing knowledge and insight from past experiences that I had not had before. In 1943 - in 1942, I graduated from high school, and the following March, I went into the United States Navy. And I was in the U.S. Navy three years as a Radioman on a long-range seaplane - a patrol seaplane - and served throughout the Pacific and was lucky enough to be in the air and looking down on the troops that were landing in Okinawa on the 1<sup>st</sup> of April in 1945. So, that experience I reflected upon and it caused me to be very critical of the fact that my country sent me many, many thousand miles from home without ever giving me any education that led to an understanding of *why* I was there.

And then, after going down to graduate school and getting an M.A. at the School of Advanced International Studies in Washington, I worked in Naval Intelligence in the Pentagon for four years. And I reflected back - let's see, that was during the second war, the Korean War - in the Pentagon, and that caused me to ask questions [and use what I learned in that experience] that I had not raised before. So those experiences were a very significant educational background.

I'll just give you one example. In the Pentagon I had a stereotype of military people being very war-oriented and civilians holding us back. Stereotype doesn't work. I have found that there were many civilians - and we all know this now - were far more eager to have war than folks that experienced it before in the Pentagon. So what I'm saying is that those kinds of thoughts only came ... I only appreciated the significance of those things later on. I began to understand the significance of my prior experiences to the research interests that I then began having in the '60s.

Chris: Going back to the whole business of the different views of "peace", one of the other things that we've found talking to people who became part of the field in those decades. They seem to fall

---

very roughly into two sets of people: those that talk about the field as though it was a field of “conflict research” or “conflict resolution” and those that talk about the field as though it was the study or the science of peace - or they would seem to be very insistent that it was “peace research”. Were you conscious of the different nuances of people who were part of that world, and did it mean very much to you?

Chadwick Alger: Well, I always identified myself as being involved in peace research, and I think that’s probably because my focus has always been in international relations and international conflict. Now, if you – more recently, I see the field as being – I still call it “peace studies”. It is much more broadly that. We must consider - as a part of this area of study - what’s going on domestically as well. But I’ve always had a complaint that some of those that call it conflict *resolution*, in the sense that conflict – we shall always have conflict and view conflict as necessary. The challenge is to enable conflict to take place without violence. I always use the words “not to have seriously *disruptive* conflict”. So anyhow, I identify myself with peace research.

Chris: Say a bit more about IPRA and about how that was important in the development of your place in the field.

Chadwick Alger: I tell my students that the two most important universities I ever attended, one was the United Nations, where I learned that I could sit there all day and listen to people from all over the world discuss their problems, and when they speak everyone seems to be speaking the truth, and I believe what they are saying because they have a reasonable point of view.

The other one was IPRA, because it was terribly important to me to be continually in contact with people who were involved in peace research from around the world - because you have to escape from the intellectual prison of your country, and see the world from other countries and see peace research issues of other countries to really understand them fully and begin in making an important contribution with respect to handling them.

So I immediately joined IPRA at that meeting in Sweden in 1967 and have missed very few conferences since. Because it’s continually important to me to get... to refresh my perspective, to broaden my perspective because when I come back home and just see the news in the United States, I slowly sink into a prison that I

have to escape from. You can do it from reading and on the Internet, but there's something about really sitting around a table talking to people that is very, very important.

Chris: Who were important influences in IPRA in those early days? Clearly, one thinks of the Bouldings, but who had particular influence on you, do you think?

Chadwick Alger: Well, let me say the Bouldings were very important. Johan Galtung has always been very important to me. There are few people that I can say that if I'd only thought of it, I would have written that myself and Johan has taken such a broad disciplinary view. In essence, it would be hard to tell where Johan's identity is on the globe because he criticizes everybody, and few do that. Johan is very important. The Bouldings are very important. I just find it difficult now to recall. There were so many people that I sat around with talking to at that Stockholm meeting who told me so much that's useful. I just can't recall more than a few right now.

Chris: What were some of the ideas that set you on fire - that really interested you - in the period of the '60s? I know you talked about John and controlled communication. Were there others? Were there central organizing concepts to found something like a social science, then or later?

Chadwick Alger: Well, I guess basic was just being continually challenged with information that indicated that the cause of the... there are just so many causes of conflict. Early on in International Relations it all had to do with disagreements between the leadership of states but gradually we began to see it was people with all kinds of challenges in their daily lives with respect to inadequate food, inadequate health, inadequate shelter, etc., etc.

It really, let's say, pushed me to an evermore interdisciplinary route -- evermore looking for things in psychology that are relevant, sociology that are relevant, anthropology that are relevant. So that was the main thing, I think. It was doing, it was making what seemed to be analytically, reasonably "simple"... evermore complex and ever and evermore challenging!

Chris: Did the people in those early days think that they were constructing a discipline -- what was the tradition that they had in that particular time?

---

Chadwick Alger: Well I think certainly we began calling it “peace studies”. That is the name that most folks that... approached it from a background of international relations were calling it - and “peace research”... was what we called it, because we saw our goal to be learning how to achieve peace and we had an ever broadening understanding of the things that were undermining peace...And for most of us there was an escape from our – from the disciplines in which we got our degrees, and whether we were political scientists, sociologists, etc., etc. we were now part of a new field.

And one problem we all had was then when we go “home”, there was little understanding or early acceptance by our departments of what it was we were “up to”, because now we wanted to start publishing in the peace research journals and in most of the departments that I’ve been in for the last 35 years the only thing that counts is the American Political Science Review or some similar kind of journal and so that we were – so far as our disciplinary custodians were concerned - we were “off the beaten track”.

Chris: Other people have said that, or made that point.

Chadwick Alger: We still have that problem today. At my university, I started an undergraduate course in peace studies and we still have nobody in the regular faculty – all regular faculty must be hired by a discipline that can’t teach that course here. Much of the time, it’s been taught by my graduate students.

Chris: Probably well taught. David Singer, last week, used the word “tolerated”, I think, about where he was. That was his feeling about Ann Arbor.

Chadwick Alger: Yes.

Chris: Let me make a bridge between the peace research movement, and ideas that you came across in the late '60s, and your work on Columbus and on cities. How did that come about?

Chadwick Alger: Can I start with the UN?

Chris: Sure.

Chadwick Alger: Because I’ve done research on the UN ever since 1958 when I was at Northwestern [University] and they – out of the blue – asked me

to go to do some research at the UN.

Chris: Was that Harold [Guetzkow] or somebody else?

Chadwick Alger: That was the Chair of Political Science at Northwestern University, Richard Snyder. Harold Guetzkow was there as well, but Dick Snyder was very critical to my development because basically he had an interdisciplinary department there...he brought Harold Guetzkow to Northwestern and Harold was in the Department of Political Science. Those two were very important to my development. But through time, I had my focus – let’s say the political science focus on the UN – changed to the gradual growing understanding of the significance of the UN *system*.

And the UN system, of course, covers all the peace issues. We have the health organization, we have the labor organization etc. And gradually I came to learn that much was being learned through practice in the UN system “laboratory”. It began in the League of Nations. They had already set up an Economic and Social Council in the League by the time of the Second World War and the [UN] Economic and Social Council, the Trusteeship Council etc. and the growth in so many agencies in the UN system were responsive to an understanding of what we now call by present terminology - what is necessary - in peace *building*.

That the reaction to violence *after* it happens is too late. It costs too much, too many lives. You need to begin early to build peace and so we – the UN - were learning this through practice. But those peace researchers weren’t talking about it in this way. [These are reflections back after further work.] So this was, let’s say, the UN system. The insights of peace research has helped me to do a better job of researching the UN system.

Now then. Gradually while I was in the Chicago area with Northwestern University, I became more and more aware that there were links to the whole world from the city in which I was living and I became more and more frustrated that the field called “International Relations” paid no attention to this. What we researched and then what we taught our students and the people about, was what people were doing, were the stars... on the map. Then I gradually found out that everybody has links to the whole world in their daily life.

I began looking into this at Northwestern University and began this

---



by having my students there go out and pick whatever subject they wanted to and figure out how Chicago was linked to the world ... One of my greatest surprises was that two young women wanted to go to the zoo and I couldn't figure out why and, Wow ! What did they discover? Of course, the animals come from all over the world and there are global organizations that are monitoring and facilitating the bringing in of these animals from all over the world.

So this, through time then, linked into my UN research and into my peace research because gradually it helped me to understand that everybody is connected to the whole world continually - by what they wear, by what they eat, by the machinery and tools that they use, by the air they breathe. And then by how they pollute the air that other people around the world are going to breathe tomorrow.

And so I became aware of what I call "the foreign policies of daily life". And because people are making decisions with respect to where they buy their clothes and what's going on there, and where they buy their fuel and what's going on there, and so I came to understand that this all links into peace research too. That what people do in their daily life - maybe not in a very fundamental way - but it all adds up having an impact on the peace of the world.

So I've had truly evermore closely linked areas of research, peace studies, the UN system or global government and then the local link with everybody to that world and the fact that this reveals they have responsibilities. They are either contributing - everybody is in some way contributing to, or diminishing the possibility that there will be peace.

Chris: Think a bit more about your own international linkages. We talked about IPRA and we talked about your time at PRIO with Johan Galtung and the work that we did together with John [Burton] in London and when we were chatting earlier, you mentioned the International Studies Association. What other important links were there intellectually for you in pursuing those three areas of research?

Chadwick Alger: Well, largely as a result of Johan Galtung, I became involved in the International Peace Academy. The International Peace Academy up in New York. The head of it was [Major General] Indar Rikhye, former commander of UN forces in the Congo. And courses were set up too... the first one was in Vienna, I believe, in the summer of 1970. The second one was in Helsinki in the

---



---

summer of 71 and we had there scholars and civilian practitioners in international fields and people involved in international conflict and then military people. Fascinating dialogues across the sea. I taught a course jointly with Johan Galtung and Mihailo Markovich –

Chris: Oh - from Yugoslavia ?

Chadwick Alger: From Yugoslavia - and what an experience that was to be teaching a course and of course, it was set up by Johan. And Johan invited two others to be teaching the course – someone from Norway and someone from Yugoslavia and then me. And then to sit through other courses, some taught by diplomats and some taught by military people. And Indar Rikhye was certainly a very impressive figure and I'm trying to think of ...the remarkable British –

Chris: Oh, former military? Michael Harbottle ?

Chadwick Alger: Michael Harbottle ! And of course, there were other military people. General Rikhye was one. He's still alive and living in North Carolina, I believe, and Michael Harbottle has died – but the incredible devotion of these former military people to what we now call “peace building”. You see, in this field you are always looking for hope because there's always so many disappointments. To see Rikhye and Harbottle gave me such – and be with them for many days and to see them later gave me great hope. Then I did participate a year later [when] they scheduled a similar event in Japan. So that was very important.

Chris: So gradually, as the field evolved and more and more people became part of it, it always struck me that it has tried always – and you were saying earlier on about where people came from – it always struck me that it has tried to be highly multidisciplinary and to draw from different backgrounds. Do you think that it's succeeded in the integration of a lot of these diverse ideas?

Chadwick Alger: It *is* a discipline. It is a new discipline. It has drawn on these other disciplines but it has, in a sense, created it's own discipline. I see it now as one. There has always been considerable overlap in the disciplines and it's always been necessary, I believe, to draw on more than one discipline to try to solve these specific social problems. Problems and social issues always flow across disciplines. I think it needs to be recognized as a discipline and it will continue to draw on other disciplines but I think it's not just a

---

multidisciplinary effort. It is a discipline.

Chris: What would be the criteria that you would apply to say “This is now a discipline”? What makes you say that with such certainty?

Chadwick Alger: For me, it’s a discipline whose major concerns is overcoming what I call seriously disruptive conflict. One very significant characteristic of it is that it is a discipline that requires a vision of a better future. The main task, then, of the discipline is to use solid, empirical research indicating how we can achieve that mission. It is not satisfied, as some disciplines are – some people in some disciplines – to explaining how and why we got where we are. It is something that facilitates the achievement of a vision in which we will eliminate seriously disruptive conflict.

Chris: Do you think we are anywhere near the degree of understanding that is necessary in order to do that - whether they understand your views or not?

Chadwick Alger: We are. We know so much more than is being applied, I would say. Now, we will always have new problems. That’s the difficulty in the sense that we are dealing with human beings. Human beings have always – some human beings have always tried to go as far, as fast as they can to other places on the planet, for various reasons, just to see what’s there, to get resources, to sell things, to get other people to believe things, have beliefs that *they* believe and to dominate them. Human beings have always – some human beings develop technology so they can do this ever faster and ever further. I think this will continue.

So we continuously have new problems with new borders. So there is going to be constant change out there. So we will never permanently solve everything. The discipline will have to grow and change because the world will continue to grow and change. But presently, we know so much more than we did when I first became interested in peace research. We’ve developed a new terminology that we didn’t have before.

Now, when I first became interested, the focus was how do we stop conflict, seriously disruptive conflict once it happened. Now the focus is on peace building – most of the focus is on long-term peace building and we know so much more than the people who have most of the power in the world understand, know about it - and if they understand and know about it, they’re not applying it.

But they are seriously challenged because this – the dynamism of the world environment is such that every year to some degree there's something new out there. There's a new kind of invention that's changed the Internet or a new kind of weapon etc. etc. So it's never going to be easy but the biggest challenge we have is a link between the bodies of knowledge and the participants.

Chris: Let me push you a bit more on that. What do you think we could do with the field to make that particular link more certain and more useful? I do think that there's a demand on the part of the practitioner, for, give us some tools. How do we do this differently in a reasonable way, using reasonable in their terms. Don't give us utopian things. Give us something practical. What can we do to improve that kind of transfer, do you think? How do we actually bridge that gap of getting these new ideas over to people who - I think - are often portrayed as being non-receptive. Because... they are actually looking for some new ideas. Nothing utopian, but something practical and useful to them. That... I think, is where we've not done very well. How can we do better?

Chadwick Alger: Well, I would... be first inclined to take a long-term perspective. You see, what we have learned is that, basically, all professions are involved in either contributing to seriously disruptive conflicts and virtually all disciplines have the capacity to be involved in peace building. It's not just those limited folks in limited aspects of disciplines that see that they're the ones that are "the experts" in international affairs. ... peace research is a discipline itself but aspects of that discipline are relevant to all other disciplines and all other professions.

I think – over the long-term - that it's terrifically important that some of the things that we have to say are taught in law school, are taught in medical school and particularly important in engineering schools. What will be the peace consequences of your inventions? How are you going to invent weapons and machines and what have you that will not contribute to seriously disruptive conflict. Over the long haul it's not – you have to do that.

But then... I must say I don't have a great short-term idea, although maybe many more of us who think we know so much about peace building have to be willing to spend part of our lives in practice. I hadn't thought of this before, but now I would say that to share knowledge is - when we take our sabbaticals don't do

them for research – take our sabbaticals as being practitioners, working for the Defense Department or the State Department, and sharing through practice what we know.

Only through your question did I come to that answer. I think there are some good programs - maybe we should expand them. - where the practitioners [I'm thinking of the ones that are in government now] - where I think there is a great need [to] come and have “fellowship” years. We have them at the Mershon Center at Ohio State University. We have, every year, a couple of military people come for fellowships. I think that kind of effort has to be expanded. I do think it should not only be that they come to us. I think we should have fellowships for them as well to share what we know.

Chris: Let me take that idea a bit further. It's always struck me that, looking back from where we are now, that the field, whatever we are going to call it, has always served as practically orientated and the field was practitioners as well as researchers that studied and constructed ideas. How successful do you think we have been as practitioners ? We were talking about taking a year as “practitioners”. Is that something that people envisaged, in those early days - that it should be a practical field? And what do they mean by practice?

Chadwick Alger: Well that's about five questions ! Well, I think that what they certainly meant was that they were after knowledge that would improve practice and improve the practice that could lead into violence. But I never - I must say that I never remembered any talk or discussion about the fact that we should be involved in practice. It seemed to me that we were all, for the most part, truly academics.

We thought that we would create knowledge and then weren't thinking about doing very much to put it into practice, but- kind of - assuming that it would be - although certainly, John Burton was , as he came to this through long years of practice in the Australian Foreign Service, right ?

Chris: Yes.

Chadwick Alger: That was on his mind all the time. His sessions between social scientists and practitioners indicated John was thinking deeply about this. I think he was way ahead of all the rest in that regard.

Chris: Yes. That was certainly a very strong element in his thinking.

Chadwick Alger: And certainly, the people that developed the [International] Peace Academy were thinking of this too because they were having the peace researchers and the military people and the civilian government people spending – I guess we spent two months together, six weeks, two months together – so there was something about that. I don't think it was mainstream peace research people thinking that way.

Chris: The other thing that strikes me is the fact... the whole field seems to have [in the last ten to fifteen years]... mushroomed and become much more diverse; and new ideas and sub-fields have actually sprung up and you have talked about “peace building” as the word that people use, and how we could have conflict “transformation” and conflict “mitigation”.

Did people think in the early days that... it was actually going to become a bigger and bigger discipline or become just a small niche tolerated in departments of political science? How did that seem to develop - the future of the field? Or were they too busy creating it to think about the future?

Chadwick Alger: I think part of this... as I see it now in peace research, is thinking about the future. But I think that we were basically- at that point in time - struggling to create a field and weren't thinking much about the future. Because I think all of us were fighting such negativism in our own institutions and our own governments.

Chris: Were there any... breakthrough moments that you can recall - looking back - where things started looking more optimistic?

Chadwick Alger: Let me just say ... one thing that's had a very great impact on my peace research efforts – one was the notion that you must have a vision. You must have a vision of something you define as feasible to achieve. Not just the perfect world – having a vision is not just having a perfect world way out there some place – but something that is achievable in a reasonable amount of time.

Then the second critical aspect here is the result of something that Elise Boulding said. I give this to my students all the time. You must think of a 200-year presence. What Elise was saying – I simplified this – “We must fully understand how we got where we

are". You can't throw away the understanding that I said that International Relations in my student days was limited to explaining how we got where we are. You have to have that understanding. You have to understand fully where you are today but then you have to have a vision of where you are going to be in the next hundred years.

That has been very gradually – that dimension, that future dimension, was added. I was not... I am sure there were people out there that had that kind vision, but I don't recall it very much. There is one other person that maybe I should have mentioned that's been important to me. I don't know whether you know Saul Mendlovitz ?

Chris: I know of him, but I never met him.

Chadwick Alger: Well, Saul – I would say that, along with John Burton and Johan Galtung, Saul was a third person that was critical in my life because Saul had something – and the vision makes me think of this – Saul had a "World Order Model Project" – WOMP –

Chris: Yes, I remember the project.

Chadwick Alger: And he got me involved in that. He had people from throughout the world. There was a series of books that were developed, giving their visions - the visions of the world as they came from different parts of the world. I participated in at least half a dozen meetings of WOMP around the world and this contributed significantly. The WOMP kind of emphasized...focused on parallels to the UN you see, so that the global government's dimension...

This is another aspect that's important in my thinking about the future. In thinking about the future in sort of a systematic kind of way is something that emerged very, very gradually and I don't think – I think we were feeling we were so much - in the early days of what we were doing - that we didn't have the time or courage to think about the future in the early days.

Chris: Are you surprised by the way this thing has developed?

Chadwick Alger: Yes.

Chris: What, specifically, has surprised you?

Chadwick Alger: I'm surprised that there was a time when I thought I was keeping up very well with the literature ! As you probably know in peace research journals I have, in recent years, written a number of things in which I felt there was a need – that we were achieving so much – that there was a need to pull it together and try and summarize it. I've done that. Presently, it's very difficult to do because there is just so much. There's stuff on long-term peace building. Then there's stuff on – what do we call it – post-conflict reconstruction...

Chris: Rehabilitation, reinsertion, all the...

Chadwick Alger: And then, of course, much stuff with respect to resolving things that have already happened. And then, let's say, the area of peacekeeping. Once... first the UN just said: "After a cease-fire send forces in to patrol the cease-fire." In the early days of the Peace Academy, that's all we talked about. That was peacekeeping.

Now, peacekeeping forces have police, there's folks trying to establish elections, folks trying to solve economic and social problems that led to the violence and all of these are different dimensions of peace research being brought in now for peacekeeping. Gradually, peacekeeping becomes a long-term peace building effort.

Then, there are books now – and I wish I had the reference list in my hand now I could give the titles but I can't – there are books - for instance, there's the long, edited volume that indicates exactly how various roles that peace people in the field should be carried out and all these different kind of roles. And volumes on long-term peace building and all these other aspects. The literature is now so vast that no one person can read it all. There was a time when we almost could.

Chris: Yes, I've done something very silly. I agreed with my old publisher back in London to go into another version of my old textbook. I've come to the conclusion that I can't possibly cover everything. You can't read it and put it in a book. I'm not sure I'm going to do it.

Chadwick Alger: But you still should do it. The important thing here would be to recognize the various dimensions and at least you wouldn't be

---



perfect, but select a few things that seem to be helpful and significant... but I do think there are now so many different aspects of what I call “peace research” being developed, that everybody needs to know about all the other pieces and how to put them together and how they’re interdependent. In essence, there has to be – I could use the word – “interdisciplinary” work within the growing peace research field.

Chris: I asked you a couple of minutes ago about things that have surprised you in the development of this field. Is there anything that disappoints you? Where do you think we’ve fallen short - where you would have hoped something would have happened and it hasn’t?

Chadwick Alger: My main disappointment is that I would have thought by this time that peace studies would be a recognized discipline throughout universities in the United States and I think we have made hardly any progress. I haven’t done a very systematic study of this but I know in my own university that it is going nowhere. It only appears that someone in mainstream disciplines has an interest. If it doesn’t and it is not encountered by students – the same thing happens that would be my biggest disappointment.

I think that – and here I do not have a comprehensive study to back it up – I’m a little concerned – it seems to me that most peace researchers need some kind of understanding of the fact that there needs to be an understanding of the connection between the local – what I would then call...the provincial – and that within states, regions and the world and I think there are too many of them that are just working in one limited domain without an understanding for the need ...for those linkages.

That’s the only thing I can think of right now. I just think it’s been incredible, the expansion of the field. We have learned a lot through what we have learned from practitioners and then new research that we bring in from the other disciplines. Really, my thoughts have been more on praise in the expansion of the field than criticism, because we know so much more than we knew 20 years ago.

Chris: Where do you think the field is going now? Where would you like it to go?

Chadwick Alger: Well, I would like it – I think I would like what we know to be put

---

---

into practice. I would like it to be recognized within universities and colleges to the extent that every university and college has a tenured professor or two and his fundamental interest is peace research. We don't have that. At least there would be someone everywhere adding particularly to the social science awareness -- all the disciplines of peace research but more and more not just social science that as I have indicated I think peace building is a part -- should be a part of the activity of all professions that are interested because all professions are international. This is a great need.

Chris: I want to finish up by asking two questions which you could answer or not, if you want Chad. The first one is; "If you were doing this interview, what question would you have asked that I have not?"

Chadwick Alger: It seems to me you've asked them all. I can't think of another one.

Chris: Okay. Well if... something comes up in the back of your mind, tell me. The other one is: "Who else do you think we ought to talk to? Who else do you think we ought to include?"

Chadwick Alger: Well. I did suggest thinking about Saul Mendlovitz.

Chris: Is he still around? And where?

Chadwick Alger: Yes, he's in New York. I think you'll still find him if you go on the Rutgers [University] website He's a professor in the Law School -- in international law and related things. But I don't know whether he'd identify himself as a peace researcher but I was just thinking that the World Order Models Project ...what's that African's name [at the] University of Binghamton, I think ? Ali Mazrui -- he was the African contributor !. And then, there were others from other parts of the world, but he was very useful, as I was trying to think of the future of the UN system from my culture to how folks were seeing it in from some other parts of the world. Have you considered Dick Falk?

Chris: Interestingly, no, but that's certainly an idea. And Saul Mendlovitz, he's good.

Chadwick Alger: And Saul, you see, he probably wouldn't come on because to a considerable degree he was the organizer... Saul saw the need for a permanent division for world order - models of world order.

What's the woman over at... Illinois, and now at Purdue. I can look her up - very active in IPRA ? When we are finished I can look it up because... now we have an IPRA Foundation and I am a member of the Foundation and she is on the executive committee...

Chris: Chad, just looking back on what we have talked about, there are three things that I would like to come back to and maybe persuade you to say a bit more. The first one is: you said that it's raised all sorts of questions and issues for you when you reflected on them. Have we managed to answer some of the questions that were raised ? Have we come up with any ideas that might cope with the issues that the two wars you experienced raised in your head?

Chadwick Alger: Well, certainly our Pentagon experience indicated to me a desperate need for citizens of the country to know exactly what the military aspect of the government is doing, how it is doing it and why. I understand there's a vast need to keep some secrets from the enemy, but still I would read in the newspaper that the Chinese said American planes were flying over China. And the US Government had announced it wasn't happening, it was a lie. Of course, I knew with the material I was reading - I knew it was the truth.

And then the other kind of examples of the fact there is a greater... need for all information to be "out there" was that when I would read things that would say - see, I was in the Pentagon working for the Navy in naval intelligence - and it would say "U.S. Navy Eyes Only" which means we shouldn't show them to the Air Force or the Army. I wouldn't want to say that either of those were of overwhelming significance but they are examples of the fact.

And then, both of these experiences and the money that was being put into the Korean War and the money that was being put into World War II. And I was not against world war - the U.S. being in that war at that time - but indicated to me that... within U.S. Democracy there is some kind of a problem when it is very easy to get billions for arms and very great difficulty getting that amount of money for engaging in civilian kinds of what I would now call "peace building activity" around the world.

And then - I'll introduce it now because we haven't talked about it anywhere else - I'm talking about limitations on our democracy imposed by the fact that so much money is available for the

---

military and so much less for civilian kinds of international activity.

And the other one I've gradually come to understand that maybe the weakest part of this democracy, which is actively participating in international affairs, is the capacity of one-third of the members of the U.S. Senate to prevent the United States from ratifying a treaty.

There are presently so many positive, hopeful things going on with respect to building a more peaceful world such as the International Criminal Court, such as the Land Mine Treaty, such as the Treaty on Rights of the Child, the Treaty on Rights of Women, the Treaty on Environment and I have a list of about 20 of those and most of the other democratic allies in the world have ratified those treaties. So that comes to mind as well.

Chris: That leads me on to ask another thing ... and that is the impact of the field on politics. Do you think that – are you disappointed in the relative lack of impact from peace research on the way we conduct our business throughout the world?

Chadwick Alger: Overwhelmingly, particularly in the United States. I think it's very clear to me that there is very little knowledge of this. I think were there, those treaties that I just spoke of, would be ratified. There's tremendous progress there in developing norms – worldwide norms – for what I call “peace building”. And the United States is not doing this. And my impression is that there is not much progress being made elsewhere either. Certainly, I don't believe it has in the United Kingdom. I think it's pretty much over with.

Now, I suppose that this happens in all fields. That it's slower – that maybe we expect too much in rapid fulfillment in usage. It seems to me that probably because this emerging discipline has such limited recognition within universities, that this is a factor.

And of course, we must always understand that this result is largely a result of the behavior of the disciplines within the universities because it is... When I wanted to set up a major in peace research in my university, an interdisciplinary board decided no, we couldn't have it – and I think one of the reasons is that we would be competitive that we would take some of their resources... So in essence, to some degree, this is not totally just to begin with the disciplines within universities [which] act pretty

much under the realist theories that the realists talk about with respect to states in the world.

Chris: “Realism” is everywhere as my colleague Dennis [Sandole] always says. Okay, the last one... arises from the conversation we were having with David Singer the other week who has a very clear definition of what “peace research” is. What is your take on that? What would be your definition of peace research? What *is* peace research?

Chadwick Alger: Peace research is research that is devoted to acquiring knowledge that we need so we can have a world in which we have very limited amount – none, if possible - of what I call “seriously disruptive conflict”. I could say “violence” but I think that some kind of other activity can be seriously disruptive - where you create situations where people cannot solve problems by meeting and discussing them.

Now where I might – I’m sure I have a different view than David Singer and it is this – I do not believe that there is any serious question with respect to significant public issues that can be resolved by one method – that every serious problem must be resolved by converging methods and let’s say if one person emphasizes statistical analysis or data collection, it must also be recognized that no serious social problem can be dealt with by stringent analysis of data gotten by documents. That field research is always necessary.

But the researcher must get out there and talk to people. He must interview them systematically but in addition experience the milieu in which they’re active - get some understanding of *how* the world is viewed by the practitioner - and *why* - by talking to them and exchanging ideas etc. Any significant peace research issue must be answered through an array of methods.

Chris: So have you got a social science yet?

Chadwick Alger: Yes, we do - and a very important social science.

Chris: Absolutely. In that definition, do those of us that call ourselves “conflict researchers” or “conflict resolution” folks - are we part of that [field] ?

Chadwick Alger: Yes, absolutely. Of course. I think it all depends on how you are

---

using those terms. I think that “conflict management” is a quite adequate term for the whole field because basically conflict, as Lewis Coser, [a very important author, “*The Functions of Social Conflict*”] told me many years ago that conflict is inevitable, it’s essential. You need conflict. The world is changing around us, we disagree with how we interpret how we should deal with that and there will be conflict and the issue is to do it without serious disruptive kinds of activities - to work out ways to reach some kind of agreement.

So that is conflict “management” and we could call the whole field conflict management. But yet, I think peace research then adds a dimension, in that peace, as Johan Galtung said, is... a condition where human beings are reaching their point - fulfilling their potential lets just say... I’m thinking of peace research as a broader field, because peace research adds something to that, and what it adds to it is that we human beings need to have visions of a better world - and they need knowledge, they require *systematic* knowledge as they move towards that.

And then, I would say - just thinking about this as you ask it - peace research is inclusive of conflict management, of conflict resolution - but it is broader because it includes that “future vision” dimension.

But I would just add the greatest disappointments in my teaching days. I have students that I have in my senior seminar in peace studies [which I am still teaching] that have difficulty in achieving a vision.

What I have them do is write... try what they’ve learned in their peace studies in developing a 30-year plan for bringing peace to a place where there’s seriously disruptive conflict and [in] the first part of that paper they have to describe what is a *feasible* vision that they can achieve there ...the experience the students get out of the daily news - which is only bad news - and their other studies makes it impossible for them to have a vision and you have to push and push and push to get them to have a vision. And that is very disappointing.

I think you have a difficult choice ... as to whether you’re in a different country, where you grew up, and you have a difficult choice as to whether you return. I find – see I’m a small town boy and every week – I wish you were here longer I’d like to take you

---

---

to my farm - every Saturday noon through Sunday we are down there and it gives me great peace to be there. Never use the phone, we take video movies, never turn the TV on, we watch a movie in the evening – and there’s a great peace to be there, and I spent my early years in small towns and there’s a little town called Gratiot [sp ?] , that doesn’t have a thousand people.

I just kind of like to be there because I am returning to my roots. It’s very interesting to be there at this time. Maybe you feel a need – [of] course it’s not the town where I grew up, nothing like that but oh it’s a hard choice... I’m lucky. I have two kids that live – two married kids - that live less than two miles away. I could have left Ohio State a while back but I decided as long as my kids would stay there, I wouldn’t leave. And you have two kids?

Chris: Two.

Chadwick Alger: In the United States that might be a good reason... somehow, those family ties are very important to me and at this point in my life, I would do nothing to be a great distance from my children.

Chris: We talked about the impact of looking back on the Korean War and on the Second World War, but there was another war, which, of course, had to play some kind of a role on your thinking, and that was Vietnam. What was the ...

Chadwick Alger: Absolutely. I was on a Northwestern College campus, and I was Director of Graduate Studies, and my graduate students had found out they would be susceptible to the draft. That was one reason. And the other reason was that many just disagreed with the Vietnam War, and serious disruptive things began to happen. I remember one night surrounding the mathematics building the fellow professors to protect students - and I think some were off-campus people - from burning it down because of ROTC - because their Officers Training Program was in that building. And we stood arm-in-arm. And I remember that they came with their torches and I was scared to death. And lo’ and behold the fact that the faculty was there, arm-in-arm, kept them away.

But then, I began to think why are these students *now* so concerned about the Vietnam War when it has been going on for quite a while. They didn’t do anything until they discovered, for the most part, that they were involved, and they had been involved from the beginning as citizens in a democracy and so that ... was significant



---

in adding the local dimension to my view of needs of peace research. Two things here. You have to move people out into broader understanding of preventive measures. We have to help them understand that they are involved and there must be important local efforts to deal with these things before it's too late.

Chris: One of the other things that you mentioned when we were chatting was the mention of COPRED [The Consortium on Peace Research, Education and Development]... How did that come about?

Chadwick Alger: This was, I believe, about 1970, during the Vietnam War – and as far as I know Elise and Ken Boulding had a lot to do with organizing - and Ralph White - and they convened a meeting, a very interesting meeting, in Boulder. They were at the University of Colorado – and there we formed what was called the Consortium on Peace Research Education and Development; and - very important - the three words [were] to link together the researchers, the educators and basically those that were involved, the practitioners. And then COPRED emerged out of that.

I was involved for some years and eventually succeeded, at Elise's insistence, succeeded Elise as the Chair of COPRED. We put out a journal etc. but that was very important because clearly the vision was dealing with some of the issues we were talking about - the linkage between practitioners and researchers...it's very interesting that our emphasis, at that point, was [to a considerable degree] to have the activists proceed with a deeper understanding of how to achieve their long-term goals.

Whereas simply demonstrating against, were some of the things that they were doing, were undermining their long-term goals. COPRED, we should indicate here...I think because of the demands of the university requirements for getting recognition - the researchers pulled out and set up their own organization. What was that called?

Chris: Yes - I know what you mean.

Chadwick Alger: Anyhow, my feeling is the reason for that is - the COPRED kind of organization - when faculty wanted money to travel to that meeting, that didn't meet the kind of needs that the university saw. They wanted strictly the research side. But then, they moved back together again and that's very good. But that has been a very important organization in the United States - COPRED and its

successor - in building a vitally needed U.S. community for peace researchers.