
PARENTS OF THE FIELD PROJECT

Interviewee: Professor Herbert Kelman.

Date: August 3rd 2005.

Venue: Harvard University.

Interviewer: Dr. Chris Mitchell.

Interviewer: It's August 3, 2005. We are in the William James Hall at Harvard University, and we're talking to our old friend and colleague, Professor Herb Kelman, one of the pioneers and certainly one of the parents of the field in conflict analysis and resolution.

Herb, looking back to some of the early days of the conflict, peace and conflict studies field, people came into it from a whole variety of intellectual backgrounds. What was yours, and how did you come into the field? How did you enter it, so to speak?

Herbert Kelman: Well, I won't go all the way to the beginning, but I'll go to the beginning of my graduate studies. I had essentially decided when I was in college – I didn't know exactly where I wanted to go. I knew that I wanted to write, and I started out as a major in English literature - this was in the immediate post-war period – I started college in '43, so I was very interested – after the war, particularly [I] became very actively involved in [the] peace movement and the civil rights movement, and I wanted very much to do something with my life that would be relevant to issues of peace and social justice, and social change. And I decided... I was persuaded, that the way to do that was through academic work in either psychology or sociology, and I picked psychology.

Partly because I was already in my second year in college, and I'd had some psychology - I'd had no sociology - so it was easier for me to finish a degree in psychology. I ended up – actually, my undergraduate degree was a joint major in psychology and English literature, which is where I started. And in psychology, of course, from the very beginning, it was very clear to me that what I was interested in was social psychology, and particularly social psychology concerned with social issues. So even as an undergraduate, I learned about SPSSI. - the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues.

Interviewer: Okay.

Herbert Kelman: And I joined that when I was still an undergraduate, still a junior, largely through the influence of Daniel Katz, who was my mentor in college, and that was... continued to be a very, very important person in my life. So, when I finished college, I applied to graduate school in places that had social psychology programs, and I decided to go to Yale. There, I became socialized, as a good, well-trained standard experimental social psychologist – but continued my interest in social change. I was working on attitude change, doing experimental work in the field of attitude change, persuasion, and communication, but also remained active politically in issues of peace and race relations and so on.

I'd had some history in that work before I went to college, and I continued my activity. And in 1951, I think it was, early '51, which was my last year, just before I got my degree, Arthur Gladstone, who was a fellow student - he was a couple years ahead of me – and I, and we had become good friends, we had started a co-op house together with two other people in New Haven, and we both had declared as conscientious objectors at the time of the Korean War.

Anyway, we decided to write a letter to the *American Psychologist* - which is the house organ of the American Psychological Association – in which our basic argument was that pacifists based their approach on certain assumptions, some of which aren't psychological assumptions. And these are potentially subject to systematic research on the part of psychologists, and wouldn't it be interesting for psychologists to devote some of their efforts to testing out some of these hypotheses - if you will, for testing out some of these ideas. And we published that – I think it was an article, or a letter perhaps, a long letter, actually - in the *American Psychologist*.

It produced a number of responses; some favorable, some unfavorable, but the most interesting ones were from people who said; “This is a great idea, we ought to get together and do something about it “

Anyway, one thing led to another. We had our first meeting some time in the fall of 1951 at the meetings of the American Psychological Association. By that time, I'd already gotten my degree in '51, and we met a couple of times, and by 1952, we had established a small organization called The Research Exchange on the Prevention of War.

And that little organization mostly consisted of young psychologists and other social scientists... more psychologists because we did it around the activities of the American

Psychological Association. One of the older people who joined us very early in the game was Ted Lenz. I don't know if you ever ran into Ted Lenz.

Interviewer: Oh, yes. Yes, I did.

Herbert Kelman: So Ted Lenz was really a prophet for all of us, and here he found a bunch of young people who were interested in it. Anyway, we started by putting out a bulletin - *The Bulletin of The Research Exchange on the Prevention of War*. We organized symposia at conferences, at one of which, for example, we had Quincy Wright speaking. We organized one or two summer workshops. And so we were going and I began writing a little bit - mostly on what can social scientists contribute to international relations, more generally into issues of war and peace, more specifically trying - in a sense to find a niche for social psychological contributions.

Anyway, so we went, and it was a modest organization, but we continued to work, and at one point, two graduate students at the University of Michigan, Bob Hefner [sp?] and Bill Barr - I don't know if you ever ran into them.

Interviewer: No, I don't think I did.

Herbert Kelman: I've lost touch with them, actually. But anyway, they took over the mechanics of putting out the Bulletin. They were able to - we started out with the mimeographed sheets - remember those days?

Interviewer: I do remember them.

Herbert Kelman: And they advanced our technology by making it into a photo-offset production, actually with a cover and everything else. It became -

Interviewer: A quantum leap.

Herbert Kelman: A quantum leap, exactly ! Anyway, in 1954, I had the good fortune of being invited to the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, which was a very good place for developing new ideas and especially reinforced my interdisciplinary bent, which was always [there], from the very beginning. I had mentioned to you [that] I was kind of choosing between psychology and sociology, and in graduate school I did a lot of anthropology, actually. So, anyway, the Center reinforced that, but we had a very good relationship with people there, and we were able to talk about all kinds of things. I was one of the youngest

people... I was in my 20s, but then there were some quite senior people, including Kenneth Boulding, who was at that time, not as senior as he became later, but he was already –

Interviewer: He was pretty senior.

Herbert Kelman: He was a pretty senior, [an] established person in the field; and Anatol Rapoport and, I might add, a younger person, named Steve Richardson, who was the son of Lewis Richardson, who was name you'd recognize.

Interviewer: Indeed.

Herbert Kelman: And who had come there with two... Lewis Richardson had died, and had left two unpublished manuscripts. One on escalation and I forget the name – something about the "statistics of deadly conflicts" or something like that. Anyway, these two manuscripts. Anyway, I got these people - Boulding, Rappaport, Richardson, and a number of other younger people - together for a series of meetings, which started with my telling them about the Research Exchange, and telling them a little bit about my frustration. I had really two frustrations. I mean, I was young, and... things were moving too slowly for me. Now, I realize that really we had moved quite a bit. We'd started it in '51 and this was '54, early '55, and [we] started really from nowhere.

But my frustrations were one, that the people in the Research Exchange, mostly, were talking about things one ought to do, but weren't doing it. And secondly, that we hadn't really attracted the specialists in the field. In other words, we were mostly psychologists, sociologists, an occasional educator or whatever, an occasional anthropologist. [By the way, I think Raoul Naroll was also in that group of anthropologists.]

Interviewer: Okay. Yes, I know.

Herbert Kelman: Usually did very important work - kind of statistical work - the rise and fall of civilizations [that] kind of things. Anyway, so these were my issues. How can we attract some of the specialists in the field, and how can we get moving into *doing* things? Anyway, one thing led to another, we had these discussions, and in the meantime, I should say, Boulding and Rappaport, who were already interested, of course... and especially... Boulding [who] was a Quaker and Rappaport was a "peace-ifist" - a term that Ted Lenz used to use.

Interviewer: I've never come across that [term]

Herbert Kelman: It was Ted Lenz's expression... and so they were very interested in the idea, but they were also very stimulated by those Richardson manuscripts, which showed the possibilities of using these quantitative methods to study issues highly relevant to war and peace. And anyway, the decision was made to start a new journal, which would, in effect, replace the *Bulletin* of the Research Exchange by becoming a more formal journal with a broader scope [and so on so forth], but fulfill some of the functions of the Research Exchange, which was to promote a new field, as it were.

And we decided - this was '55 - and we decided to place the journal at the University of Michigan because Boulding was there, Rappaport was about to go there, and we already had kind of a little bit of an infrastructure with Bob Heffner and Bill Barr, the two graduate students who... been doing the mechanical work on putting out - not just mechanical, but editorial work - on putting out the *Bulletin*. So we decided to go through the University of Michigan. Being at the Center, we were able to attract a very impressive - excuse me - we were able to attract a very impressive advisory board. Howard Lasswell was out on [the] board - and all sorts of people, so we had a very nice advisory board, and then, when Boulding and Rappaport got back to Ann Arbor, they got a local group together, Bob Angel and Dan Katz, or course, and let's see - no David Singer came later. So the journal got started. Anyway -

Interviewer: Now, you called it the *Journal of Conflict Resolution* rather than the *Journal of Peace Studies*.

Herbert Kelman: Yes.

Interviewer: ...Was that a deliberate decision, or ...?

Herbert Kelman: It's a good question. It was a deliberate decision... there were several reasons. By the way, there was a subtitle, I don't remember what it was - A Journal Devoted to the Study of War and Peace, or something like that. The word "peace" was in the subtitle, but I think there were two factors. One was a kind of intellectual factor in the sense that both Boulding and Rappaport had [an] interest in the study of conflict, and for Boulding, for example, who was very interested in general systems theory... he had, in fact, run the seminar in Michigan, before he came to the Center, on conflict at

different levels of scientific discourse. In other words, he was looking for concepts that ran across all different levels. And conflict was one such concept. So conflict was a theoretically very relevant and interesting concept. But there was another factor, and that was - this was the tail end of the McCarthy era...and I'm quite sure - I mean, this has been my narrative for some time, so I don't know whether... but I'm quite sure that this was a factor in leaving out "peace" from the title. It was also a factor when we first did the Research Exchange on the Prevention of War. We didn't call it "The Peace Research Exchange", and that was deliberate, I think because peace, in those days... had negative connotations. And it put you into a questionable category.

Interviewer: Yes.

Herbert Kelman: And we thought we had enough trouble trying to promote something that was really out of the mainstream, and that we didn't want to get involved in being... of becoming "suspect" because of our words. And I think that was a factor in our choice of conflict resolution rather than peace research, for example. But there was no question in our minds that this was what we were...doing. This is where we came from.

Interviewer: Well, that's interesting because there has been this...tendency ... for the two to...grow in parallel. "Peace" studies and "conflict" studies seem, in many people's eyes, to be slightly different from one another.

Herbert Kelman: Yes... Well, it wasn't in that case. I mean you have to remember, the *Journal of Conflict Resolution*... even if you look at it now – even more so if you look at it now, I would say – the thing that is its greatest strength is quantitative peace research.

Interviewer: Yes.

Herbert Kelman: Really. It's not particularly interested in conflict resolution, as we know it. The practice, or the scholar-practitioner type of activities that we're involved in. That's not it. I mean, it will publish occasional things on it. In fact, I intend to submit something for the *Journal of Conflict Resolution*.

Interviewer: Good luck !.

-
- Herbert Kelman: Well, I don't know. I think I have a good chance of getting it in. I think Anatole Rappaport and I, if I'm not mistaken, are the only surviving members of the original editorial board. I'm still on the editorial board.
- Interviewer: Are you?
- Herbert Kelman: I guess they don't want to throw me off because I'm a founding father.
- Interviewer: Well, yes - you are, indeed !
- Herbert Kelman: So anyway... that conflict didn't exist then because that wasn't the field of "conflict resolution" that we had in mind. We had in mind conflict resolution as essentially the peaceful resolution of international conflicts, or conflicts of other levels. There was always an interest... in looking at the comparison between different levels. So anyway, if I may turn – did you want to ask something?
- Interviewer: No, no. Go ahead. I'm always very interested in the way the two have slightly grown apart over the last thirty years, and... my own memory is that that [separation] got a significant boost in the '70s when the Scandinavians came into the picture - but that's just my own personal memory.
- Herbert Kelman: No, I mean...you're definitely right, and there are several dimensions in this. One of which is I think that... at least some of the peace studies people tend to be a little bit suspicious of the quantitative, analytical approaches and all of that. So there are a whole bunch of issues involved there and some of the more ideologically oriented peace studies people tend to be suspicious of the notion of conflict resolution, which they sometimes see as a way of ...diluting conflicts –
- Interviewer: Yes - calming things down.
- Herbert Kelman: Calming things down without really, seriously addressing them, which worked for the advantage of the powerful and a disadvantage of the powerless. I mean, that was an issue, certainly. I remember one time having... a debate on this issue with the person who was a director, or executive of COPRED at one point. I can't remember who she was, what her name was.
-

Interviewer: Maire Dugan Was it Maire ?

Herbert Kelman: No, it wasn't...we didn't have any conflict with her about those issues. I think she was in both camps, I would say. And I consider myself to be in both camps.

But anyway, I want to go on just a little bit. So this is where I came from essentially, in that field. In terms of my own activities, I wasn't trained in international relations, and I wasn't trained in this kind of research, and I was... slowly trying to find ways of making my work more and more relevant while continuing to do other kinds of activities - particularly my work on attitude change and social influence and experimental work in this area.

But my first effort to... bridge these interests was work on international student exchange - and subsequently educational cultural exchange - and...for a number of years, I did work in these areas, which have obvious links to functional theory in international relations. I think I was always aware - certainly, I was aware very early on - about the limitations of this. That you don't make peace just by bringing people together and letting them experience the other culture and so on. I was always aware of the fact that conflict is not based entirely on that lack of familiarity with the other, and lack of personal relations, and so on.

It was actually an issue that I've had to struggle with over the years because many people tend to assume - it's an issue that I have to struggle with as a psychologist coming into this field - because people tend to assume that if you're a psychologist, you must be explaining everything in psychological terms, and I still get... it really drives me up the wall when people describe my work as being "an effort to bring people together so they get to know each other, and like each other" - and therefore make peace !

Interviewer: Yes.

Herbert Kelman: So that has never been my view. And so I was always very cautious in my analysis of where do these kinds of activities make a potential contribution. And I do think they do make a potential contribution, broadly related to functional theories - which I also take with a grain of salt.

So that was my one kind of activity, and that bridged my interest in attitude change and social influence with my interest in international relations.

The second... line of work really began in earnest when I moved to the University of Michigan in '62, and where by that time, the Center for Research on Conflict Resolution had been

established. Of course, I'd had long-standing relations with the University of Michigan, the social psychologists and Dan Katz being the major figure. And so Dan and I, with the collaboration of some of our students – originally Richard Flax, later John De le Maher, and other people – developed a program, a project, a series of studies on nationalism and the relationship of the individual to the national political system.

Interviewer: That's right. I remember that article you wrote for, and published in Jim Rosenau's first reader.

Herbert Kelman: Exactly. That was my first – well, it wasn't my first... my first articles were actually jointly written with Dan Katz and some of our other people. But that was my first... re-formulation of some of these issues in a slightly different framework. So that was my second venture in the direction because obviously nationalism and national identity are central issues in international conflict. :

The other activity that I pursued from the very beginning – starting in the early 1950s – was an interest in trying to define the place of social psychology in all of this. In other words, my view was always that international conflict is not a psychological issue *per se*, but is an issue, if you will, that has psychological, and from my point of view particularly, *social* psychological dimensions. And that it's our task, really, to try to define the appropriate point of entry for psychological analysis. In other words, I was always very much – in the subsequent years in all of my teaching on international conflict, I always started with a long sermon about the dangers of over-psychologizing. And my operational definition of over-psychologizing is, if you use psychology more than I do, then you're over-psychologizing !

So I was always pointing to the dangers of over psychologizing, and always saying these are not psychological issues *per se*, but they have psychological dimensions.

Interviewer: Right.

Herbert Kelman: But in order to be relevant, theoretically, we have to have the larger picture and see, at what point, psychological analysis can make an appropriate contribution. So it's an issue – it's the point of defining the relevant points of entry, and this incidentally has become also relevant to practice, to which I want to turn now.

I'm just about to begin to answer your question.

Interviewer: All right [but] let me slip another one, in if I can.

Herbert Kelman: Sure.

Interviewer: Following up on your point about not over psychologizing, whose ideas at this stage in your career, do you think were influential in the way you thought about things ? You've talked about Dan Katz. You've talked about Arthur Gladstone - [and] I'm not at all sure what happened to him, because I haven't seen anything about him for a long time.

Herbert Kelman: No, he's completely out of academia. I'm in touch with him, but he's gone his own way.

Interviewer: But who else? What else...?

Herbert Kelman: People who influenced me in those years ? Well... I can name a number of different people. Harold Guetzkow comes to mind I encountered with him rather early. I don't even know if you knew that Harold Guetzkow is a social psychologist by training. He is a social psychologist, who... went all the way...I mean, in other words, I tried to educate myself some, but Harold really remade himself to the point to where a lot of people don't even know that he's a social psychologist.

Richard Snyder... I got to know and had an influence on me. Karl Deutsch. Boulding, of course. Then, let's see, who would be some other people from these earlier years? Later on, Ralph White and Irving Janis. They were all people, by the way, who...all the names I've mentioned are people who contributed to my book, *International Behavior* which I should also have mentioned in this context. I mean, part of my effort to try to define the place of social psychology in the field was to put out this book which we started, actually, in 1959, but was published in 1965.

Interviewer: Six years, yes.

Herbert Kelman: So it was – this was a really constructed book. This was not a set of conference papers. This was a book which, with the help of a number of colleagues here, we worked on a frame work, and I had a definite frame work into which I tried to then solicit contributions that would fit into the frame work, and the purpose was to present – if you will – the “state of the art” of social psychological contributions to international relations.

Interviewer: It's a good book !

Herbert Kelman: Thank you. It's called *International Behavior: A Social Psychological Analysis*. And a number of the people I mentioned were on the board, and also a number of them had on the advisory board, and a number of them had chapters in that book. And some of them brought in some of the younger associates like Harold Guetzkow brought in Jack Sawyer, and Dick Snyder brought in Jim Robinson. Karl Deutsch brought in Richard Merritt, and so [on]

Interviewer: Yes.

Herbert Kelman: Bruce Smith also had a chapter in there with Irving Janis. So this book was really another effort... to define the contributions – the potential contributions – of social psychology. I think I named some of the important people.

Interviewer: Okay.

Herbert Kelman: David Singer, by the way, is another category because David Singer actually – although he's a little older than I am, not much – but a little.

Interviewer: A little.

Herbert Kelman: But he was trained as a traditional IR person at Columbia. But then, he somehow saw the light and he came and while I was at Harvard in the 50s – I was at Harvard '57 to '62, then I left for Michigan and then I came back - So while I was at Harvard in the 50s – I mean, I think right when I came, '57 or thereabouts – David was here as a postdoctoral fellow trying to learn about behavioral science, about social science. And... I think it was Gordon Alport or Jerry Bruno, I don't know – directed him to me. And so we became friends, and all that. And then he moved to the University of Michigan, and then we sort of re-connected.

So these are some of the people.

Interviewer: Okay.

Herbert Kelman: I may have left out some important figures, but these are some of the people that come to mind. Anyway, but this brings me right up to the critical... really turning point. In '65 the book came out. In '66, John Burton came to Ann Arbor... I'm pretty sure it was David Singer who hosted him. I don't exactly know. I mean it's not

surprising that they made contact through various kinds of peace research activities or things of that sort... I mean, it was David who invited me to his house, where I first met John Burton. That's why I connect him with it. Burton – I had some vague familiarity. I mean, he had published a couple of books by that time – more than a couple, probably – but... the book that I remember most had to do with looking at the world as a global society. I forget what the name of it was.

Interviewer: Oh, *International Relations a General Theory*, would that be the one?

Herbert Kelman: It could have been that, or –

Interviewer: The one before that was called *Peace Theory*, I think - or something like that.

Herbert Kelman: Ye. It was something like that. It was clearly – he was searching within the social sciences for ideas for the study of international relations. And clearly, he was developing the concept of the international system as a society. With all of the features of a society, so...this is where he started or where he came from.

So I had a vague familiarity with what he was doing, but I can't say that I was deeply knowledgeable about his work. He, in the meantime, had seen my book - the *International Behavior* book. Anyway, we met and he told me about this method that he was developing, and that he had applied once in relation to the conflict in between Indonesia, Malaysia, and Singapore. I don't know whether at the time he used the term "controlled communication." [maybe] That came later. So – but he told me about the method, basically.

And I remember that I kind of “saw the light” ! I mean, I thought; “This is it !” I mean, I had been interested in the social psychological approaches to international relations theory, but here was what I regarded as a social psychological approach to international relations *practice* because I saw it – at least in my parochial view – I saw it as social psychological by virtue of the fact that it was making use of the dynamics of small groups, and it was making use of interpersonal interaction.

Changing ideas in individuals, which of course then have implications, but it was working at the level of individuals in interaction with each other, in the context of small groups. So to me, this was a social psychological approach. And in a way – although I'm not sure that I had ever consciously been searching

for it – but if I hadn't been consciously searching for it, I should have been, because, in effect, I was always interested in practice, if you will.

I mean, I went into the field because I was interested in peace, and so clearly, that spoke to me.

And so when John then invited me to come to London for the exercise on the Cyprus conflict that was scheduled for November of '66, I accepted enthusiastically.

I might add, incidentally, two other people with whom I had had contact in these earlier years - and who influenced me - also came to that meeting. As you know - Chad Alger. Chad Alger, of course, I first met when he was still a student or a young faculty member at Northwestern. And Bob North. And Dave Singer – John invited Dave Singer – but Dave was off flying in those days, and so he didn't want to go, and so I went. So that was basically a major turning point for me.

Interviewer: Yes.

Herbert Kelman: But I think - as I hope I have demonstrated in all this, the words that I have produced here... there was – I was waiting for it. I mean, this was a turning point, but it was one that really was, I think, a very, very direct natural outgrowth of what I had been doing and thinking about and... hoping to do.

Interviewer: Well, I'm going to come back to the practice, but can we just go back to the development of the field a little bit ? Because you came into it from a particular slant, even though you were obviously very keen to keep your psychological slant well under control. But ... one of the things that strikes me about the development of the field in the early days...is; Did it always claim to be multi-disciplinary? And that means it borrowed ideas, concepts, theories from all over the place.

Can you, looking back... canyou think about particular ideas that have influenced the way in which you think about the field and think about your work in it, which are not psychological? ...Just as an afterthought, I always think that we overdo this “multi-disciplinary” thing, because I think we never escape our real discipline... I'm not and have never been trained as a psychologist, but I sometimes find that the most useful ideas that I have [do]come from psychology. I'm an international relationist. What's the cross fertilization - from your point of view?

Herbert Kelman: That's interesting. Well, I don't know. I mean, offhand, nothing strikes me except things that have kind of played a major role in my thinking... Except for the fact that I have always emphasized that... whatever we do in our practice – and, indeed, in our theoretical analysis as social psychologists – occurs within a societal and organizational and systemic context. And so my very first ... article in... this field, were in the *Bulletin of the Research Exchange*... which is a more informal thing. But my first, more formal article in this field was called "Societal, Attitudinal, and Structural Factors in International Relations," and that was in 1955 [I think] that it was published.

Interviewer: *Journal of Social Issues?*

Herbert Kelman: It was probably from the *Journal of Social Issues*. And a big boost to my morale was that Stanley Hoffman – I think it may have been his first book – reprinted it. He did... an essay on theories of international relations – with readings [attached] and the fact that he regarded this as a theory in international relations,

I was always coming into this field feeling a little bit out of place. I mean, I'm a mere psychologist. What do I do in here? So that was very pleasing to me. But the point is that even in that article, right at the beginning, I emphasized - obviously - attitudinal factors were my domain, but that we're dealing with societal and structural factors, so the social structures were always a burden. And this was always my critique of the "Great man" theories – of course, I believe people make a difference. But I was always very – took pains to emphasize that they do occur in a particular historical context, and in a particular institutional context, and so on. So none of this is very exciting because these are basic for me. These are background factors.

Interviewer: Yes.

Herbert Kelman: They're terribly important. And as I said, in my teaching, I was teaching a course in social psychology, but they played a very important part in my teaching. And of course, I also made some use of notions of national indicators... measures at the system level, and so on. But I'm not able to come up with a concept. I mean, like, if you ask me about psychological concepts, I could come up with these, for example, as a very big input. But I can't come up with a comparable concept... but again, many of the concepts are concepts that I've worked with. More and more in recent years I've worked with "identity".

Interviewer: Yes.

Herbert Kelman: Now... for me, identity is a concept that exists at several levels. I mean, clearly it exists at the level of the individual, but it exists at the level of groups, organizations, school activities, and societies. And more and more, it's not being used so much, so I have some colleagues here at Harvard who are trying to find a measure of "national identity" that would be comparable to the GNP – some kind of measure that you could have – some quantitative measure that would sort of play the role of GNP. So it's a concept that has taken on a meaning at that level – at the macro level. And there are other concepts that have meanings at the micro and at the macro level. Ideology, obviously. Nationalism. But at the moment, I'm not coming up with something that's uniquely at that [level].

Interviewer: I find things affect me by a kind of process of osmosis. I don't realize I've picked them up, and then I suddenly find myself thinking "Ah, I remember that. That was useful. Where did that come from?"

Anyway, to go back Here, back in 1966, you've actually been to John's second workshop. So then, what? What happened personally in your intellectual journey, then what happened to the field? And in between that, you became very much involved in the Middle East, and [in] work in the Middle East, which... bridges the... practical and theoretical sides. So tell us what happened next...

Herbert Kelman: Yes. Well, personally, it was easier. I'll go that way. Well, I came away from the event, from the exercise in London. [The theory] wasn't introduced until later. I mean, I took it from Leonard Doob, basically. So I came away from it, I mean, extremely stimulated and excited, and so on. But also somewhat critical. I mean, there were issues. ..that I felt... hadn't been quite – that needed to be resolved, I mean, certain open questions about methodology and about assumptions and so on. But on the whole, really, really very excited. I, of course, was very busy with all sorts of other commitments and activities, and in fact, shortly after – I can't remember. I guess traveling must have been easier in those days than it is today for me.

Because I think I first came home and then went off to Nigeria because in December – yes. This was in November...I think – I came home, and towards the end of December - latter part of December - I had this international conference on social

psychological research in developing countries, which I'd been involved in - which I shared and co-organized, and so on - that took place in Nigeria. Somewhere along the way, I stopped in Spain, I remember. And then, early in the spring I went off to California for another stay at the Center for Advanced Studies in the Behavioral Sciences. So... I was doing other things. But in '67, in the summer of '67 I was in California, in Palo Alto, and the Six-Day war, the Arab/Israeli War of '67 was on the screen. It also was taking place in real life. But I saw it on the screen.

And at that point, it hit me that isn't this an arena where Burton's approach might be applicable? And I should mention, just to put on the record without going into detail, but I have a very strong Jewish background. I was born in Vienna with a Jewish family with a refuge from Nazi [Germany], grew up in the Zionist youth movement, and spoke and, in fact, wrote Hebrew. Spoke [it] fluently, wrote Hebrew articles. My first two articles were in Hebrew as a student. So I mean I have a very thorough Jewish Zionist background... so I mean to me this was a very... important event, and like most Jews at that time, there was a tremendous concern about the future of Israel because we didn't realize how well armed and prepared Israel was. But of course, my orientation was towards conflict resolution. And I might - since I mentioned my first two articles, which were in Hebrew, published in 1945. One was called *The Question of Arab/Jewish Cooperation*. '45, yes. I mean, there were - within the Zionist movement there were people like Martin Bover [sp] - a name you're I'm sure familiar with - and others who were proposing a bi-national state, etc., etc. I mean, there were different trends within the Zionist movement, and these were the trends that attracted me. And, by the way, the other article that I published in Hebrew was called *In Defense of Nationalism*, which was... an attempt to distinguish between good nationalism and bad nationalism, etc

. Anyway, so I got in touch with John to ask is there something we can do. And he actually managed to raise some money from Carnegie, I believe, to pursue something - but it never got anywhere. The main problem was that I had no contacts - no significant contacts - in the Arab world, and John had some, but they weren't enough really to mount an event.

I mean, one of the things - maybe the most important thing - I learned from that exercise was that it takes a very, very great deal of preparation. That you can't become an instant diplomat, even unofficial diplomat, overnight. And so we talked about it. We tried, and money - I mean, money might have become a problem if we'd actually gone into the field, but it wasn't the big problem.

Some seed money was there that John raised, so nothing came of that.

Interviewer: Yes... I think, before the Six-Day War, John had established some good contacts in Cairo.

Herbert Kelman: Yes.

Interviewer: But they weren't the important ones. He was trying, after the War, to make some contacts with some of the Palestinians in London. But... my memory is that the Palestinians at that particular stage were so badly disorganized that there was no "there" there. And so that, I think was one of the reasons why nothing came of that [project]. Because I was partly involved in it, as kind of a "gofer". I would go and listen to these meetings of the Palestinian exile community in London arguing with each other about which way they wanted to go, and ... that was one of the problems ...

Herbert Kelman: Well, anyway, the seed had been sown. I mean, this was the first time I thought about it in relation to the Middle East, but I didn't stop thinking about it afterwards. Then – I'm trying to remember. It was either '69 or '70 – that I went on a trip... there was another little experience. I mean, it's in Cyprus. A whole bunch of people were taking an interest in Cyprus. People developing ideas about conflicts and conflict resolution because Cyprus seemed like an ideal laboratory. It's this little island, relatively self-contained. And so Cyprus was of interest to a lot of people. And there was in the summer of '69 or '70 – I can't remember right now which one it was – that a group of people including a Cyprus born – I think – political scientist here in this country organized a kind of a summer floating seminar in Kyrenia... it was over several weeks, and they invited different people to come to it and speak and so on. And John came to it, and I came to it, and Leonard Doob came to it, and that was another attempt of mine to create a [linkage], an earlier one... but to bring together John with Leonard Doob and – but he always had suspicions of Leonard Doob, also, because he felt he didn't know what he was doing...

Interviewer: A not uncommon phenomenon. Yes.

Herbert Kelman: And that he didn't really have a theoretical foundation, and so on. Anyway, I did bring them together in Cyprus, but it didn't lead to anything big. It didn't lead to any lasting relationship. I mean, I brought them together. So anyway, it was really a side story

because what I wanted to mention was my trip to Israel, which was also in '69 or '70 in which I began to... talk to various people about the idea, this kind of an idea. And I got different kinds of reactions. One very positive one, which I might say from Shimon Shamir whom you remember, and who has continued to work with me over the years until today. A very negative one, and one that was sort of mixed.

The negative one really influenced me because it was one that told me, basically; "Don't mix in our business. This is a matter of life and death for Israelis and Palestinians. And we don't like these American or American Jews hopping in and trying to solve our problem. If you want to do anything, you ought to come here and live here. Or, at the very least, make a real commitment. It's not something you ought to be doing with your left hand!". And that kind of criticism really influenced me...

Interviewer: So, you got these three reactions. One - a good one - from Shimon, one medium, and one saying: "Don't do it, unless you're serious and you're going to spend a lot of time on it".

Herbert Kelman: I think that's how I read it. So I wasn't ready to spend a lot of time on it, so I really, for a couple of years, didn't do - well, did two things. I mean two things happened. It really occurred [at]... the end of the '60s, the beginning of the '70s. One was that I wrote my first paper, and this was in... it was Richard Merritt [who] had invited me to participate in a panel in L.A. at the meetings of the American Political Science Association, and was later published in his book on *Communications and international relations*.

And so that was a paper called "The Problem Solving Workshop in International Conflict," I think. And I basically tried to compare Burton and Doob's methods. I think it was pretty clear that I was leaning much more towards Burton method, although I adopted Doob's... terminology of "problem solving workshop". And then I wrote my own kind of implications and so on, in which I began to develop some of my own ideas, and I think - looking back on it - I think the most important thing from my point of view in that paper was... that I began to address the question of the relationship between change and transfer of the change between what happens... at the workshop itself, and how your ideas develop there [and] become transferred - and I think I developed this much more fully later, but I think I was aware of the fact that there could be these contradictory requirements - for maximizing change and maximizing [transfer], which I still consider to have

been, perhaps, my most important theoretical contribution here, to the analysis....

Interviewer: Well, it's made whoever looked at it subsequently to think hard about both those issues.

Herbert Kelman: Yes. So anyway, I did that paper. Now, before it was published, I sent a draft of that – I mean, not the text – the pre-publication text of the paper to Steven Cohen. Steve Cohen was completing his doctoral work here in the Department of Social Relations with Fred Bales. I didn't really know him well because by the time I had arrived at Harvard, he was already – I had arrived in '69, and he was already working as a statistician, so I didn't know him well, but he was appointed instructor later, assistant professor in the Department. And we agreed to teach a seminar together on international relations - Social Psychological Approaches to International Relations. And when he read my paper, he became very excited about it, and said, "We should try a workshop in conjunction with the seminar!" So that's sort of the basis for my very first solo seminar at a workshop. And we agreed, in fact – Steve was very interested in the Arab/Israeli conflict, was sort of active, politically, in it, and kind of trying to arrange meetings between the two sides. But this was remote from his academic work.

By the way, at some point before we finish this, I want to tell you about this room, because this room that we're sitting in plays an important part in this part of our work. Maybe I'll say it now –

Interviewer: Yes, go ahead.

Herbert Kelman: Just the first point. That this room ... it has since been remodeled. But the basic structure of this room was something that was designed by Fred Bales, who was a professor here for many years, and he worked on small group interaction.

Interviewer: Bales Scales ?

Herbert Kelman: Bales Scales, and all that. He goes way back to systematic analysis of interaction in small groups. And he set up this room – as I said, it's been remodeled but basically, this was the room, and these tables that you see here were the original tables. And as you can see, they are modular tables, and you can take them out, and they're – particularly those two tables on the sides can be taken out and make this table into a circle. And next to it, over on that side,

was – and is – an observations room where it's blocked right now. But you can open it, and there's a one-way mirror there. And so he used these rooms for observing what he called self-analytic groups. And this is what Steve was working on. Steve was a Bale student and was working very closely with him. He was co-author of a major book that they did on SIMlog.

Interviewer: Yes.

Herbert Kelman: A later kind of incarnation of his observational methods. And so this was the room. And this was the room in which we had our first workshop, and which I've also had a whole series of other workshops since then maybe – I don't know how many. About over 15 [probably] workshops held in this room with the observation room.

Anyway, so Steve, as I said, got very interested in proposing [that] we do a workshop. We had a very small group of students at the time...So we decided to try a workshop - kind of as an exercise, as a pilot workshop. We had a very small group of students at the time, and of course, we had not planned any of it before. The only thing...that we decided in advance was that we did not want it on the Middle East because we felt that - Steve and I, as two Jews - were not the appropriate third party for an Arab/Israeli kind of thing. But, as it happened, the students in the seminar – at least that's my narrative – persuaded us that we should do it on the Middle East. Partly because a couple of the students were themselves interested in it, and maybe they sensed that we were really interested in it ourselves.

Well, be that as it may, we decided to do it on the Middle East conflict, and we did bring in two Lebanese scholars, a very, very senior leading person. I'm not sure I knew at the time how important a figure he was. It was Albert Hourani, a famous Middle East historian from Oxford who was a visiting professor here, and then he and a younger - also Lebanese - political scientist, agreed to be consultants. And Hourani himself - and the other fellow, maybe for part of the [workshop], Hurani actually sat in on the whole workshop. But not as a member of the third party – but... as an observer/consultant.

Interviewer: Yes.

Herbert Kelman: So he would speak when spoken to. I mean, he would make some observations, but the third party - the facilitators - were Steve and I. But at least we got some input - some Arab input. Of course,

we didn't realize at the time that Lebanese Christians are not in fact the dominant actors on the Arab side, but - be that as it may - this was our [first exercise] and, at least, we had an awareness of the fact that there were some problems here. Anyway, that [pilot] workshop was held in this room

Interviewer: Yes.

Herbert Kelman: [It] was – I think - in many ways, very successful. At least, the way I used to describe it when people asked me. Was it successful? I would say; “Well, when the moment... when the beginning of the workshop came, everybody was here, and when the event was over, everybody was still here. And so really [it] was a success.” Actually, it's not entirely correct that everybody was here because originally, we planned to have three teams: Israeli, Palestinian, and Egyptian. We actually had three workshop sessions with each of them. I always have... This has remained my... design to have a pre-workshop session with each group, but ... the Egyptians came to the pre-workshop session and then dropped out... I think it took me a while before I developed that idea. My post facto analysis of why that happened is that - of course - they were busy. They had other commitments - whatever, but I think the reason was that they decided that – or maybe they were even advised – that this was a no-win situation for the Egyptians because – this was in '71 – Nasser was already beginning to think about ways of finding some accommodation with Israel. But publicly, in a fashion in which – I mean public to extent that there were Palestinians present... and so they were in a situation in which they had an agenda with the Israelis, but they couldn't fulfill that agenda because of the presence of the Palestinians.

And so I think they very rightly decided that, that this was not... going to be a productive situation for them, and as a matter of fact, I may at some point even checked it out, because one of the Egyptian participants, who was then a graduate student – in Canada, actually – is now a leading Egyptian political scientist. You might say perhaps the leading Egyptian political scientist.

And I think even in those days, he was at least very savvy about the situation, and he may have consulted - I wouldn't be surprised if he consulted - with some people. So I can still check out with him if I have an opportunity to see him again, whether this is actually the reason why they dropped out.

But anyway, it ended up an Israeli/Palestinian workshop. Many other things that I learned from that [exercise but] I mean this was one.

Interviewer: Yes.

Herbert Kelman: By the way, it contributes to my having a very strong bias – I'm not sure whether John has that bias too – but a very strong bias towards doing only bilateral [meetings] – avoiding trilateral meetings. This is not because I'm not aware of the fact that all conflicts are multi-lateral, but a workshop is not an effort to reproduce the... conflict. But... at least in my knowledge, the purpose of a workshop is to create new ideas and to develop new thinking, and so you need a special kind of setting for it, and that is, of course, an extraction from the reality. But the whole thing is an extraction from the reality.

And my feeling is that the moment you introduce three parties, you get at least three separate relationships, and time is too short anyway. I have never, ever, in my whole years of working [at] this had the luxury that we had in London for that Cyprus exercise, of having a whole week. Do you remember? It was a whole week.

Interviewer: A whole week.

Herbert Kelman: I can never get people to come for a week. I mean, there's just absolutely no way. I have never succeeded – the closest was the time in Bellagio - that you were there, if you remember.

Interviewer: Right. .

Herbert Kelman: Where - I think - we had five days.

Interviewer: Yes, Monday to Friday.

Herbert Kelman: Yes, so that was the closest. That was good. Boy, that was good. I think it was one of the best experiences that we had. But usually, if I can get them for three days, I'm lucky.

Interviewer: Three days. Yes.

Herbert Kelman: So anyway – so in that time, I tried to simplify it, and therefore, only work with two parties, even though, often, there was a temptation to get a third party into the deal. The other thing I learned in that very first workshop was the central role of the PLO.

This was 1971, and I still had to learn it. This happened as part of the recruitment process. We were aiming at that time – we were not aiming for “influentials”. We were aiming for what I now call “pre-influentials”. So we were looking for sort of senior graduate students. And by the way, we succeeded. I mean, some of the people who were in that [exercise] – well, the one who didn't come, the Egyptian, but also on the other side – turned out to be senior sometime later.

But we were aiming for graduate students, basically. We found a graduate, a somewhat older graduate student, a Palestinian, here at the time who was very interested in the project and wanted to participate, and we tried to get him to help us recruit other Palestinians, and he said it would be extremely hard because Palestinians didn't want to sit with Israelis in those days. That meant they didn't even use the word “Israel”...that meant recognizing Israel. And so they didn't want to do it, but he said if you can get this guy, whom I know, who is official in the PLO office at the UN – if you can get him to come, then I can get you the other participants.

So off I went to New York and I met with this man and I got him to come, and he was a very, very interesting person, I mean, there's a whole story about that [but I think I won't go into that.] But then we got the team. And so then, we also raised – on the Israeli side - we got one faculty member, one young professor, involved, so as to... even out the level of the participation. So all together, it was a very instructive experience, and that was in '71.

Then I went off – '72 to '73 – I went off to Seattle for a leave of absence, and busy on other projects, and in the meantime, that article got published, but I didn't do anything further with this. Then on the way home, I had a heart attack in '73, in the summer of '73 in Montreal, and I came back to recover, and while I was home recovering – by the way, even while I was in the infirmary, when I came home from Montreal - I went first to the infirmary here - Steve came by to visit me and to encourage me to continue this work. To say “This is very very important !”

... There was a very different division of labor between me and Steve. I was kind of always small. I was thinking small. I saw this – these are exercises and if you accumulate them and you do more and more things of this sort, you will be making a marginal contribution, and that's worth it. But I came out of the Civil Rights Movement with a particular core of the conservation [movement]... where – every sit-in, every demonstration. It doesn't change the macro picture over night. But that's what it's all

about. You do small things, and eventually they add up to a larger impact.

And that's the way I looked at workshops. But Steve always had the big picture in mind. I mean, he was always very ambitious and saw the potential... And... to me, the big word was "contribution". We want to make a contribution. And if we make a contribution, that's all I'm looking for. I don't care for it – I mean, I I wouldn't mind, but I'm not aiming to do the breakthrough.. That's not what we were about. This is too far removed from where the action is, but it's a contribution. You work with people, and these people influence other people, and you have an input into the larger culture.

Interviewer: But of the other culture that you were beginning, I think, to impact at that particular point - and it was a very long process - was the culture of the field of conflict resolution getting the idea of workshops and [of] involvement accepted? I remember, [at] more or less the same time feeling - while working with John, still trying to do this sort of thing in London – that it was almost not "respectable" even in the field of conflict resolution, as it then was.

So did you get the feeling that you were building up the credibility of this as a "respectable" academic thing to do, and what were some of the difficulties with that? Because I mean, back in London, I remember it, even in the early '70s, this was not the sort of thing respectable international relation scholars did.

Herbert Kelman: Oh, yes. I remember it certainly from – well, at least I remember it from London in '66, but I was back at one point giving a lecture – wasn't it '66, or was it at this later trip – where I gave a lecture, a big University of London-wide event.

Interviewer: Oh, yes. At UCL? Was that it? Or the one that they held at the LSE ?

Herbert Kelman: Yeah, I think so - but I still remember that it was kind of – it was very marginal to have somebody like me come and give that lecture, and I remember the person who introduced me [I can't remember his name}....

Interviewer: It was probably Fred Northedge ?

Herbert Kelman: I think so.

-
- Interviewer: Was it the same here, in the States, or was it much more easily accepted within the field - and within academia?
- Herbert Kelman: Well, I think the big difference probably is that everything is so much larger here. And so there was always room for all kinds of deviants, to a greater extent. Or it wasn't you were one of three professors of international relations in the country - I mean, that's an exaggeration.
- Interviewer: No - not too much of an exaggeration.
- Herbert Kelman: But particularly at that time, and so I think there was always greater room for deviation, but I, myself, was not aware...of course I'm not in the field of international relations.
- Interviewer: No, but I mean you were contributing to the field of conflict resolution, so...?
- Herbert Kelman: Yeah, but I mean...you ... get a little bit ahead of my story. I need to come back to '73.
- Interviewer: Okay.
- Herbert Kelman: But a little bit ahead of my story. In '76, I was invited to join the Center for International Affairs here at Harvard [and not on the basis of this work - that was hardly known at that time.] I was doing it, but it was hardly visible at that time. But on the basis of my book, *International Behavior*, and the fact that I'd worked on the social psychology of international relations... let's see, by that time, I was also active in the International Studies Association. At some point close to that time, I was elected president of the International Studies Association.
- All of this – it was benefiting from the fact that I was one of the very few psychologists doing this, and the International Studies Association wanted to maintain its character and image of an interdisciplinary organization. So as a psychologist, I had a much better chance of being president ...Again, there weren't that many economists, although there were more economists than psychologists.
- And so I was invited to join the Center for International Affairs as a member of the Executive Committee, which was a nice deal at that time because they paid half of my salary - I think if I'm not mistaken - for a while. Or a third – I can't remember what it was, but a sizable sum of my salary, that later dropped out. So I
-

had respectability, within the field, and of course, the book *International Behavior* was widely [known]. I know I kept, over the earlier years, meeting people who were getting degrees in international relations over the world. They said, "Oh, you were part of my prelim preparation." So I think that I was sort of "respectable" as an outsider in the field of international relations, but enough of an insider to be president of the International Studies Association and to be a member – an executive committee member - of the Center for International Affairs, both of which were outfits that wanted to maintain an interdisciplinary character. So in a sense that, as I said, gave me an advantage.

But then, when I started... raising funds, to do this work, and doing it, I always did it under the offices of the Center. The Center didn't invest any of its funds, but they gave me – they administered my funds. They gave me the name of the Center.

Interviewer: Right.

Herbert Kelman: They gave me the prestige of the Center to do it, and there was never a moment – I mean I cannot think of any moment over the many years, that I've been affiliated with the Center, and doing this work under the auspices of the Center, where anyone was ever troubled by it. But I think that's because I wasn't really competing for the status of... the person who had much, much more trouble than I had - much more trouble, serious trouble - was Karl Deutsch., because Karl Deutsch was ahead of his time as being a quantitative IR person in a department that was very traditional and so Karl Deutsch really, I think, felt over the years being marginalized in international relations at Harvard. So this does happen here, but it didn't happen to me because I was not in the Department of Political Science, basically, and it didn't happen around this work.

Interviewer: Well, let's get back to '73 in a minute. Part of my reasons for asking this is because I'm astonished by the way in which, from the '70s up until now, the idea of a field of conflict resolution as a respectable intellectual field has been almost completely accepted everywhere. I mean, there are people who used the language of ed writers use the language. People struggle to get into departments of conflict resolution now to get degrees in it.

To me... the progress on that has absolutely been astonishing, and... to some degree, it's been because of people, such as yourself, have come into the field from other disciplines and *made* the field, through the work that you've done. But I'm always

curious about the “respectability and credibility” factor because we had a real struggle about it in London...

Herbert Kelman: Yes. I might say that within the field of psychology... I have had, early on, some – I wouldn't call them problems, but I mean, some people making noises. Not really for the conflict resolution work, but relating to the idea of psychological study of issues of war and peace... I remember distinctly one rather important person in the field who obviously was very wrong saying, "You can't just come in and start a new field in psychology."

He was so wrong. I mean, after he said that, the whole field of ecological psychology developed – all sorts new fields developed. But he kind of felt that it was something wrong with somebody coming in there and trying to create...it wasn't just me, but the people with me... trying to create a new subfield.

Now of course, there is a division of peace psychology... it's a very broad, broad field, and there were others, also those people more in my own [field], even within social psychology, who kind of felt that you should be doing experiments - that's what you should be doing. That's what we're all about.

You shouldn't be trying to deal with things that are really not part of our discipline and not disciplined work. But there... I remember one person who specifically said that and who said, "But it's all right for you to do it because you have paid your dues." Because I'd done experimental work, I had published and I had “achieved” before I got into this work. I had already established myself. Of course, since then I've disestablished myself, but ...

Interviewer: We know you can really do it if you want to.

Herbert Kelman: We know you can do it, but you shouldn't be misleading these young people who haven't done their homework yet – who haven't ...really paid their dues yet. So... within psychology, interestingly enough, the work on conflict resolution makes more sense than just the analysis of war and peace - as if “war and peace” seems like you're really going beyond the scope of the field. But this is a hands-on approach, working with people in groups, which is co-terminous with all kinds of psychological practice.

It started with group therapy and small groups, and encounter groups. I mean, it's conterminous. It's a form of practice. It's not researched, per se, but it's a form of practice which is acceptable within the wider field. So in psychology, that is more [acceptable] – it actually brings the work – the conservative issues of war and

peace – closer to the mainstream of the field than might otherwise be the case.

Interviewer: Okay, so... ?

Herbert Kelman: So... in '73 came another turning point. I mean '66 for me – I'm again talking personally – '66 was meeting John Burton, and '73 was another war. It was the 1973, the October war. And I was, at the time – I guess I was back home, having had my heart attack, and recuperating, but having developed a new idea, and that new idea was that I may not live forever. That was a very new idea. I've since tried to forget it, but at that time, it was sort of something on my mind. And there was the war on the screen, and I remember the words that this guy told me in Israel about; "Don't do it with your left hand."

And I said, "Well, if I'm ever going to do it with my right hand, now is the time." And I kind of made a decision. I think it was a combination of the war and my recent heart attack, perhaps with some of the prodding from Steve, that I decided, "Okay, I'm going to make that a big, major part of my agenda." And then, of course, it was a combination of developing the work and applying it to the Middle East. I mean, this was a package for me.

Interviewer: Yes.

Herbert Kelman: And both were equally important... in a sense, and...of course, I continued to maintain an interest in other conflicts, and I certainly maintained an interest in developing the methodology, but the Middle East was – I kind of accepted that my part of the package was that I would be concentrating on the Arab/Israeli conflict..and that's when I went out and started to do things more systematically...There was one thing I was considering, but unfortunately, didn't do because I was too busy, and that was learning Arabic.

And it would have helped me. I mean, it's not that it would have been crucial because mostly the people I deal with speak English,...and of course, we are fortunate that we can do our work in English because – you've worked with translators, haven't you?

Interviewer: Yes.

Herbert Kelman: At workshops?

Interviewer: It doesn't work very well.

Herbert Kelman: I mean, I have never done it, but I would think that it would be very difficult.

Interviewer: Oh, it is - incredibly difficult. Yes, and that's why I started to learn Spanish - as I thought I was going to do any work in Latin America.

Herbert Kelman: Yes. Well we were fortunate that we could do it in English...the people I deal with all know English, but they don't know all of it equally well.

Interviewer: Yes.

Herbert Kelman: One of the nice things is that it's not a differentiating factor between Israelis and Palestinians. You find some Palestinians whose English is considerably better than that of some Israelis. And of course vice versa. But... it's a second language for both of them. But they can do it and some of them can do it very well.

But I never got around to really learning Arabic, but we did do a lot of traveling in the Arab world, and I got to know many people and my affiliation with the Center for International Affairs was absolutely essential there because I made contact with people.

The thing that we didn't have in '67 - when John and I were trying to work on something - I really began to develop ... I mean, in Israel, I had contacts before. But Egypt, Jordan, the Palestinian community, Syria, Lebanon - I started with nothing.

Interviewer: Yes.

Herbert Kelman: But... through a few critical contacts at the Center for International Affairs, I began to get hooked into important networks. Of course, I should say, another thing that I don't want to minimize here at all is that this was a decision. When I decided to go into it seriously "with my right hand" it was something that Steve and I decided to do jointly. Steve was still here. He, then, left. I mean, he was here only on a temporary... well, he was assistant professor, but most people don't get tenure, and so he moved on to City University of New York. We continued to do some work together afterwards, but at that time we were here, and... we agreed the first agenda was to develop a team that included some Arab/Americans. And so...the first person that I solicited was Ed Azar.

Interviewer: Yes.

Herbert Kelman: It was Ed, by the way, whom I introduced to John Burton - or to whom I introduced John Burton – so I really was... the starting point of that relationship...

Ed was interested in...peace research.... I probably met them at ISA meetings. I can't remember. But I may have met them also at the Peace Science Society meetings.

Interviewer: Oh, Walter Izard ?.

Herbert Kelman: Yes. So I met him through these contacts, and of course, he was a student of Bob North, and he was interested in quantitative methods, and so on. But... he obviously had a political interests, but I think this whole methodology, this whole [approach], that I think is something he got from me. Then, of course, he became very interested in it and developed it, and worked with John - it's all history... The other was **[inaudible]**, a Palestinian political scientist at the time at the University of Tennessee, Chattanooga. And the third was a psychologist named Jose **Tuma [sp ?]**, who was working internationally – Iraqi origin - working internationally in pursuit of mental health.

Interviewer: Yes. How did Nadim [Rouhana] become involved in all of this?

Herbert Kelman: Nadim became involved – he was a student, doing doctoral work and social psychology at Wayne State University in Detroit. This was already... we are now already in the '80s.

Interviewer: Okay.

Herbert Kelman: And his professor there was a friend of mine, Cal Kaplan, who told him about my work... I think Cal was very noble... and told him that I might be a good person for him to perhaps get to work with. So Nadim got in touch with me, and I think he came over here to visit, and he, at that point, had already finished all of his requirements except for visitation. It would have been the early '80s. And he asked about the possibility of switching here. I made some inquiries, and I told him but even without the inquiries I could have told him: “Yes, we can work on that” - but it would be extremely costly because the Department here would give him very little credit for all the work that he had already done. No automatic credit !

He would have two options. He could take various kinds of exams to qualify. Or he could just go ahead and take courses that

are geared to our exams. But in any event, I figured out that it would cost him two years to switch. Yes, that's the way it is. I mean, I don't know if it's true in other universities, but it's certainly true at Harvard.

Luc Reychler, who was a student of mine. Luc – another one of my proud products. So Luc wanted, when he came here, to do a joint degree in government and social psychology. And he had established with Karl Deutsch - and he, in fact, worked with Karl Deutsch throughout the time that he was here - but we inquired into that. And it turned out that, well, he could do one thesis, [which he did] and Karl Deutsche could be a member of his committee, and so on. That was not a problem. But he would have to meet all the requirements of the government department, *and* all of the requirements of the social psychology program !

Interviewer: Oh, my god !

Herbert Kelman: And then he could get the joint degree. So... basically, neither department was willing to give up anything other than the thesis, or maybe some other paper... so again it turned out to be too expensive a process, and so he settled on just getting the degree in social psychology with great anxiety because he was going back to a small country where he was worried that - with a degree in social psychology - would he be able to break into international relations. But he did.

Interviewer: Yes, he did.

Herbert Kelman: He did, very well.

So Nadime came, so we abandoned the idea of his switching. And so what we agreed was that I would serve on his doctoral committee at Wayne. That turned out to be a complication too because Wayne State University – in order for me to serve on a doctoral committee, I have to be appointed as a [full] professor there, without pay, of course. Harvard, on the other hand, has a rule that when you are a full time professor at Harvard, you cannot also be a professor at another university - even with no pay – so I talked to my Dean here at the time, and he said, "Look, you think it's a good thing. I think it's a good thing. So let's just do it this way. Let them report you as a [full] professor, but not ever, ever put it into their catalogue, and so Harvard will not know." So I was a [full] professor at Wayne State University, but you will not find it in my CV because –

-
- Interviewer: Or in your salary statement.
- Herbert Kelman: Salary ? That was never an issue !. And so I joined the committee, and Nadim moved here.
- Interviewer: Okay.
- Herbert Kelman: And actually worked on a project... using data that Steve Cohen out of New York was collecting - and so on. And he really worked on a day-to-day basis with me, although Cal Kaplan of Wayne was his official advisor.
- Interviewer: I'm trying to do a segue into something you said a little earlier, about how difficult it was to establish links in the various parts of the Middle East that you were going to work in. And I'm just thinking... if you were starting that particular project now, there would be institutions and departments that you could work with over there, who would know about "conflict analysis and conflict resolution" - which is another major change in the field.
Did you ever have anything to do with... establishing "departments of social psychology *and* conflict resolution" in any of the countries that you worked with in that part of the world? Because – and I know Shimon and some of the people that we worked with on the Palestinian/Israeli workshops in the mid '80s were very influential in establishing some work at Tel Aviv. There's something at Bar Elan now?
- Herbert Kelman: Hebrew University ?
- Interviewer: And on the other side, there are some small [initiatives] growing in some of the Palestinian universities. Are those your former colleagues, your former workshop participants, your former...
- Herbert Kelman: Quite a few of the people involved in these activities, both on the Israeli side and the Palestinian side. Of course, there's much less on the Palestinian side, but quite a few of these are people with whom I had contact of one kind or another. They may be people who participated in my workshops, or on occasion they have been people who were post-docs working with me, or people with whom I consulted, and so on. But... I can't take any credit for any of these things, I mean in a sense of having actively involved. Other than that... other than that, there were these contacts, and these number of people...with whom I've had contacts. Some extensive, some less so. Some early, some later. But... with the
-

exception of Nadim, I can't name people who are leaders in some of these institutions who were my students. They were people with whom I had contact.

Interviewer: Yes, okay.

Herbert Kelman: In various ways, in relation to the work, but not like in the case, for example, if you take Americans. I mean, I can claim Tamra Pearson D'Estree -she was my direct student, and she is now –

Interviewer: William Weisberg?

Herbert Kelman: Yeah, but... I'm talking about people who are heads of institutions – or programs. Cynthia Chataway would be in that category, Eileen Babbitt, there are a number of people in North America...

Interviewer: Luc, of course, as well.

Herbert Kelman: Luc, and others, but I don't know if I have people who are my direct students, really, who were... leading such programs over there.

Interviewer: So we interrupted this [narrative] when you'd actually decided to make a commitment - and you were starting to make contacts.

Herbert Kelman: Yes.

Interviewer: And then the whole thing became very much a focus of your career for a while, if I remember rightly.

Herbert Kelman: Well, I mean, it hasn't been the only focus – but it has been certainly a major -and increasingly *the* major focus. And I remember – I like to tell this story. You've probably heard it before - that I know exactly when I became a “Middle East specialist”, because around the world, there are now people who think that that's what I am... and of course, I claim that I'm just an amateur. But the moment... when it happened was back in – when was it, was it 1981, when Sadat was assassinated ? 1981 ?

Interviewer: Yes.

Herbert Kelman: And... the media were trying to get everybody to talk about what was happening, and so on, and I was in on a TV interview together with another person, and the issue... was what is the impact, what

may be the impact of Sadat's assassination on the peace process. We were already talking about that "peace process" back in 1981, and so while this...was going on, I did a naughty thing - that I'm not supposed to do - which was to look at the screen. You're not supposed to look at the screen while you're being interviewed, or while you're appearing.

Anyway, I looked at the screen and there was my picture - talking head - and under my picture, it said "Herbert Kelman: Middle East Specialist, Harvard University." So that's when I knew that I was a Middle East specialist.

But anyway, I definitely - and I have been - since '77, I've been running the Middle East seminar, now as co-chairman, I'm still doing that, co-chairing the Middle East seminar at The Center for International Affairs, and... I've sort of been the Middle East person at The Center for International Affairs.

So this has definitely been the central part of my career. Of course, when I was teaching, I was teaching other things too, but this course on international conflict, which sort of - which met in this room over the years - became one of my trademarks, of course.

As a teacher, I had... a trade mark undergraduate course, which was not in that field, but...

Interviewer: Okay, I'm going to take you back now to the beginning of your involvement in the field. Thinking back to that time, what do you think the hopes and dreams of people like you and Arthur Gladstone were, and do you think you've fallen short of those, or the field has fallen short? What were people in that time thinking would be, in forty [or] fifty years time, [that] we would like to see - and have you seen it? On a... personal level, what do you think the field was trying [to do] - what do you think Kenneth [Boulding] was trying to do, and Dan Katz - and all of those people?

Herbert Kelman: Well, without - that's actually an easy question. Now because without making any judgment about the significance of what all of us are doing. And without making any judgment about how much we have actually contributed to peace, which is the ultimate test.

Interviewer: That's what we are trying to do.

Herbert Kelman: But if I leave these things out and simply ask myself the question that you asked back in 1951-52, I could not have dreamt that this would be such a big field. I mean, again, I'm not talking about

how successful it is, in terms of the ultimate. I mean, I have opinions about it, but it's just the idea that it would be so much, so many people engaged in this... so many, so many organizations and journals, and research activities, practice activities, teaching programs, concepts that have evolved, findings that had been generated. I could not possibly, possibly... I mean, I didn't even have the concept... of imagining that.

So I think from that point of view, if the idea was to... I mean, our idea was not to create a field... certainly not at the beginning. Our idea was to get people in existing fields to devote energies and efforts to this kind of work. And I think what happened, certainly, went well beyond anything that I was able to imagine at that time.

Interviewer: What do you think were the major reasons that it's grown so much? I've been trying to sort this out of my own mind... were there particular break through points, or were there particular people, or were there particular institutions? You've mentioned Michigan, and you've mentioned Stanford and the Center for Advanced Behavioral Research.... Your work here, John's work in London. Who else would you say were crucial? Who else do you think played a role in this expansion?

Because I have the same feeling that you have, thinking back to the mid '60s when I got involved in this. It was a struggle to be somebody in Britain who was a "behavioral international relation specialist", but the idea that there would be a field of conflict analysis and resolution, or peace studies, or whatever... It was just, "Forget it!" And I've been trying to work out what happened and how it happened and why it happened...

Herbert Kelman: Yes.

Interviewer: Who did all of this? Who did all of this?

Herbert Kelman: That's an interesting question. I don't now... it would be a very, very interesting question to try to deal with systematically in terms of the history of ideas - and all of that... I hadn't really thought about systematically, so I'm just thinking out loud, and it's not in any order of importance or significance. Just some random - random thoughts that I try to generate here.

One thing that I think contributed is that there were - and that goes back to my experience in '54-55 in Palo Alto, at the Center... and it goes back to Richardson - to Lewis Richardson - that there were people who were working in established fields, that were able to use methods that are accepted in those fields, and that have a

certain scientific aura because they are quantitative methods, and they involve calculus and so on and so forth.

And the history of having been successfully... employed in the natural sciences, and in economics and to a certain degree in psychology, so there were people who were rooted in these fields with reputation and with impeccable credentials, who decided to apply these methods to problems in this field. And so they brought with it – I mean, in a sense, they brought in an aura of respectability...which – I mean they appealed at the same time to people who came into this not because this was following the line of scientific investigation; they came into it for reasons of social concern and ideological concerns and so on. But they had...some base of respectability; they could not be laughed out of court because they were able to use respectable methods.

They still had problems of the kind that - as I mentioned - Karl Deutsch had here because quantitative methods were not acceptable at that time in a traditional government department. But that has, of course, changed radically. I mean, he was well ahead... today, it's the other way around.

Interviewer: Yes, right.

Herbert Kelman: Even at Harvard, you can't find a historical... that's the way to go. So I think that this is one of the things that helped the field. That it had respectable methodologies - in a way.

Now another thing that I think helped - and this is something that I've actually written about in... my ideas about the peace research movement – that you also had within the traditional field of international relations, a search for more systematic methodologies.

I mean, as you had gradually, in political science as a whole, a search for - particularly quantitative - methodologies and more systematic kind of approaches, and the place they went to were these people. These were the people who were doing it. And so you had also a development which fit into, I think, an intellectual need within the discipline of international relations, which in a sense was coming to a dead end with the total reliance [on realist theory] . I mean, not that these are not very, very relevant still, but the total reliance for that discipline on historical and normative kinds of approaches, and so on.

I think it was the coming together of the people who needed these new methods, and people coming from other fields who had these methods that in a sense – I think – created this – what's the word - there's a word for it, which I can't think right now ?

Interviewer: “Environment” - something like that ?

Herbert Kelman: Whatever it is, it created this. And... I think that made a lot of difference. I think another factor certainly was that both within academia - partly in response to the '60s - and within governments, there was a kind of quest for social relevance. I mean, it came out of different origins, but as governments – at least this was true in this country, I don't know how it is elsewhere – but in this country, as there was a greater development of various kinds of social programs, there became a request for evaluation – for evidence that these programs work.

And so you had, in a sense, socially relevant research, had... an interested party out there willing to provide funding for it. I think... the availability of funds, I think foundations, of course, made a contribution here, and I think that McArthur Foundation, in its earlier days – Ford, Carnegie, and particularly Hewlett then, in later days – I think that made a contribution... even if you go back to the early days, I mentioned the Center for Advanced Study of the Behavioral Sciences.

Interviewer: Yes.

Herbert Kelman: Well, that was a Ford Foundation project. I mean, the Ford Foundation practically invented the idea of “behavioral” science !

Interviewer: I didn't know that.

Herbert Kelman: I mean, they pushed it. I think another factor may be... there has been, I think, over the years, a greater openness to interdisciplinary fields. I think some of it has to do – of course, that began with World War II, but still interdisciplinary fields have had problems, and they still have problems. For example, the part [of the University] that I'm in used to be an interdisciplinary department - the Department of Social Relations and after 25 years, that broke up.

But I mean, there's all kind of factors, but so much work - particularly work that requires a lot of technology - has become interdisciplinary and I think there are more institutes and places.

So I think that provided a more favorable atmosphere for work that is advisory by nature – interdisciplinary. I think there are a lot of factors, but I think we have to keep in mind that – really - we aren't talking about a single field. At the very least, you... have to make a distinction between peace studies, which in itself is now, in

a way, what we used to call peace research, but I think there is a big distinction now between peace research and peace studies where peace research tends to be more quantitative and more formalized and so on, and peace studies tends to be more the field that belongs to - perhaps - historians and literary people and so on. I don't know.

I mean I... don't keep up that much with peace studies, but there is in this country a society for peace studies - which really isn't into the quantitative side at all - and peace research or peace science - you know as Walter Izard prefers to call it - has really become very much quantitative and formalized and so on.

But that is different from the field of conflict resolution, which... as I said before, to me I feel that I'm rooted in both of these. My interests in conflict resolution came out of peace research. But so much of conflict resolution is now really - its practice oriented and that's really fairly remote from peace research.

Interviewer:

One of the things about conflict research [or] conflict resolution is that it always has this intense, practical, applied side of things. I mean, not just the work that you and I do, but the whole basis seems to be: "Take it out into the real world !"

I guess this takes you into the larger question that you were talking about earlier. How successful do you think it's been? Not in terms of just creating a field, but of actually having an impact - when you go back into your early recollections of the work that you started up as a young man.

Herbert Kelman:

That's an awfully tough one, because clearly we don't have less conflict. There's a tremendous amount of - I mean... deadly conflict. I'm not concerned about conflict. We all agree that conflict is a good thing. But it's... violent conflict and deadly conflict.

We have a tremendous amount of it. I mean, you know, this is the old cliché that the kind of... internal conflicts, intra-societal, intra-national conflicts, ethnic conflicts and other conflicts between identity groups, have actually increased in the post Cold War era. So, [if]... that's going to be our criterion as to "the level" as a number and the intensity and the level of violence and the... number of deaths and the refugees created and all of these things - have they noticeably reduced in the years since this kind of work has been going on ?

Well, I don't think we can show that, but on the other hand, of course, I could say it's a little bit worse. We haven't done that well.

I don't really know how you can demonstrate that. I mean, I have to take... an intermediate indicator of success, if you will. And that is that there are organizations and people and programs and so on, that are actively concerned with trying to deal with these issues systematically.

I think – have they increased at the same rate as the deadly conflicts have increased? I don't know. But I think there is a kind of level of awareness and a set of approaches and methods and so on that hasn't been there before, and that is now available.

But I must say that it's very easy to get depressed at what we have not achieved. I think the world is still a god-awful place, I mean, considering the presence of genocides... continuing refugee problems, active warfare, civilian deaths, stunted lives. I mean it's awful. It's really awful.

It's very hard to say, under the circumstances, that we have been “successful”. But it's really questionable [which] criteria to use. I guess... the only measure that I can use is that we have more means. I'd like to believe we have more means for preventing and dealing with these kinds of conflicts and both some degree of knowledge [and] some degree of methodology, or technology, or whatever you want to call it. Some degree of organizational facilities and trained personnel and so on... This is what we have in place.

As you know, from my own kind of effort to push the concept of a “facilitating service”, as you recall, following in John Burton's footsteps, I still feel the need for some central organization, although it's more complicated, because the way which John visualized it, and with the way [in] which I visualize it, it was... focused on a particular technique, if you will, and a particular kind of group of people who would be involved in it. Whereas... what has been developed, what has happened in the field, is that you have a growing number of organizations that are using multiple techniques.

I mean Search for Common Ground is the best example of a U.S. based institution. International Alert is the best example, perhaps, of an organization in the European context. So you have more and more peace organizations which look at conflict resolution from the point... which uses a variety of techniques and approaches... of which – perhaps - interactive conflict resolution or analytical problem solving - or whatever you want to call it - is part of the repertoire.

On the whole, I feel that's probably a good development because we shouldn't be relying on one technique... I still think the facilitating service that we came up with would be a good institution, precisely because it is specialized and can perform that specialized task, but I don't see it - under any circumstances - as a substitute for any of these other kinds of activities [about] which I feel: "Good, the more the better - perhaps !"

Interviewer: Well, Ron [Fisher] is still pushing that [idea] and still trying to get it organized - so we'll see whether he comes up with anything.

Bringing you back from the past, do a bit of crystal ball gazing. What do you think is going to happen in the future for the field, to facilitated problem solving - or whatever we're calling it? What sort of things can you see in the future? What sort of hopes would you have for the future? What are your aspirations?

Herbert Kelman: Let me say, first - in a way almost partly taking back what I just said - when I said the more the better, and these are all good developments, I do have a little bit of concern about becoming overly institutionalized. I certainly have a concern about developing this field of... I'm certain it would be true for "interactive conflict resolution" - or what have you. Developing this into a kind of a "set technology" that gets applied and so on.

I think there are some... advantage[s] to the way which it had operated in the early days where you had small "entrepreneurs" who had the disadvantage of operating on a shoestring and had obviously... a lot of shortages in terms of means and [resources], but there is some advantage in that and of having such programs university based where you could... be at the cutting edge of thinking about things... and some of that creativity can become lost once you institutionalize it... I might say the same thing is true if you would institute various kind of professional standards that exercise control.

I think these are vital... it is people going around practicing who don't have the sensitivity, so we do need standards. We do need educational programs and some kind of professional organizations with professional standards. We do need that... I've watched these issues... more or less on the side but in the field of clinical psychology and psychotherapy, and I'm very well aware of the fact that we need standards. But we also pay a price for it. I'm a little bit concerned about that. As long as I was wandering off a little bit.

Interviewer: No, we were saying - looking at the future, the things that worried you. Other things, which you think, perhaps, were hopeful signs of further developments. "Where do we go from here?" - I guess is the basis of the question. What would you like to see over the next decade, say?

Herbert Kelman: I don't know. This may be a very parochial kind of response, but I would sort of hope that the connection between academia and [practice] that ... has marked this field, perhaps because it's so relative young, I would hope that that doesn't... completely get broken.

Again, its more of what I said before. That I think ... there has to be a place for continued growth, continued creativity, thinking and... not getting everything so heavily routinized. I think there is always a danger that, when you get a field that is organized and professionalized and so on, that some of that new thinking may be aborted. That would be a danger, but there is no simple answer to it.

The very fact that I've been kind of promoting the idea of the large scale [orgainsation] means that I feel the need to go in that direction. I also am aware of the potential cost. This is one of the things that I would like to just... keep in mind. I think that's a problem for all professions and so I think in the earlier years we've have both the advantages and disadvantages of not being a profession - of being a profession kind of "in the making" and I'm all in favor of getting rid of some of the disadvantages and I'm hoping that we get some help, [but] preserve the advantages - don't know what exactly is the way to do this.

I'm also very well aware of the fact that I don't want to be stuck with romantic notions about "the good old days" and how do we maintain them.

Interviewer: Yes It's interesting how these things come about. I have a student at the moment who is writing a Ph.D. about "creativity" and I'm thinking to myself, on the one hand: "How can you be creative about creativity? How do you study creativity if you've never been creative in your life?"

Do you have any dreams you'd like to finish and fulfill? You are still around and you're still working and you're still - what's your next step in the field?

Herbert Kelman: Yes. I mean in terms of dreams while I'm still around and so on? You know there is the one dream that I just talked about that I made public about the facilitating service. I don't know where that

will go and it may very well be that it won't be a thing - in a sense - where one could say: "Okay, here it is !" It's a function. It will be fulfilled in different ways in different places and [by] different means, and as far as I'm concerned, that's fine. I'm not concerned about an organization with that name and its own headquarters and all of that. That makes it harder to have a dream...

Interviewer: It's very dreamlike.

Herbert Kelman: It is dreamlike. I would like to see that function kind of accepted and understood and utilized. That would be a kind of a dream that I would have. But as I said, you won't be able necessarily to put your finger on it and that would be fine, in principle, but – I mean, it would be fine in principle and in practice, but it would be hard to put my finger on it in terms of saying; "Ah, that dream has been fulfilled !"

A dream that you could put your finger on - although it would be a little artificial because it's really not a point in time but it's a process, but you could put your finger on it - would be the establishment of a real Palestinian state. That – you could say it's a member state of the U.N.

That is...a concrete thing that you could put your finger on and that I could dream about. Knowing there is a process. Becoming a member of the U.N. is obviously not the end of the process but that would be a dream. In earlier years, particularly going back in the heady time of the 1993 ... Oslo Accord, maybe even before that, but certainly at that time I would tell people that my dream – my personal dream - is that I would be the first U.S. ambassador to the Palestinian state. But now it's too late for that.

They probably won't want to put me there in my 80's. But it would still be nice if I was still around when the Palestinian state is established and... my current personal dream is not to be the ambassador but to be invited to the inaugural event. That would be nice, if I could still travel at that time.

Interviewer: Well, if the inaugural event takes place soon, I'm pretty sure they'll invite you.

: Going back to the developments of the field, [is there something I should have asked about but didn't ?]

Herbert Kelman: I...just want to make one more point and that is that I neglected to mention earlier and that is that looking at the... not the peace research element of it, I think the thing that's been important to the development of the field is there was a certain set of ideas that has

developed over the years more or less independently in a variety of different arenas.

With increasing communication between them - and I'm talking about ideas such as problem solving, analytic problem solving - if you will, - dealing with issues through direct interaction, mediation by a trained professional third party, essentially - that set of ideas really.

We have, of course, developed it in the arena of international relations, but it is also developed more or less independently in such fields such as family counseling, divorce counseling, dispute settlement in the legal context, labor relations, community relations, environmental issues, issues of fundamental value conflicts, such as the debates about abortion and so on and so forth.

There's a whole range of domains I've left out and several others in which you might say that same set of underlying ideas about dealing with them has developed more or less independently and... I think there's more and more communication between them and in a certain sense of - at least as far as domains are concerned, - conflict resolution training programs such as the one at George Mason, of course, try to deal with a whole range of arenas in which it could be applied.

Of course, certain others - if you're dealing with kind of therapeutic interventions that requires another context for training or if you're dealing with legal interventions - it requires another context of interventions, but there is this whole range. I think this is one of the things that has contributed to the development of the field and to its acceptability because, you know, it just has made sense. Here and there was - to a certain degree - independent, obviously with mutual influence, but independently arisen in these different domains.

Interviewer:

Yes, good point. I want to go back now to the whole business of identity that you were talking about because as you said it can be a very structural or a very personal matter.

You have all of this huge list of labels. We have conflict research, conflict resolution, peace studies, peace research, etc. etc. How do you identify yourself now? When you think of yourself as somebody who's been through the last several decades of work, came from social psychology and came originally from a mixture of sociology and psychology, how do you think of yourself now? Which part - at least which areas, fields, sub-fields - do you think of who Herb Kelman is?

Herbert Kelman: Yes. First of all, I'd like to think that I'm all of them. And I enjoy that. So, I mean sometimes when somebody asks me; "Well who are you or what are you?" and so on – or particularly if they ask me for my title, I would say I am a professor of social ethics. My field is social psychology and my practice is in international relations. My specialization is in the Middle East.

I like the idea that I'm hard to classify. I still enjoy, for example - it's a very minor enjoyment - but I enjoy getting letters that people send me addressed to the Department of Political Science.

I kind of like to – I like to be accepted in a variety of fields, but having said all that, if you were to ask me - you can only take one label, I would say "social psychologist". I don't know why I feel that but it's because – first of all, it's the field in which I feel that I can really claim that I was trained in ... I feel I have very clear credentials in that field.

My credentials are getting weaker over the years, in the sense that I'm not keeping up with a lot of the literature and ... I'm not quite familiar with a lot of the latest writings or even the latest methodologies and so on, but no one can contest the fact that I was thoroughly trained in a very respectable social psychology program and I came out of it as a well trained social psychologist for my time, for the time in which I was trained, and it's a field in which I feel at home...

Certainly international relations. Certainly political science. Certainly ethics that has been [in] my title since 1968. I've been a professor of social ethics but I don't know the classics, I haven't read the classics in this field so I always feel like a little bit of an intruder. I'm somebody who's trying to operate in a field [in] which... I'm not fully embedded. I don't feel that way about social psychology; I feel I'm fully embedded in that field. That is my field and that, in a sense, becomes my identity.

I might also add that... recently, I looked at how many of the things that I've written over the years... and by the way courses that I have taught, have a sub-title which says, "A social psychological analysis, a social psychological perspective, social psychological dimensions, etc."

In other words, I have operated in many fields, and I like that. That's sort of consistent with... a self-image that I'd like to maintain - that I'm not a narrow disciplinarian, and I touch a variety of different subjects and I particularly like the fact when people in those fields... think of me of being serious. I think – yes, I mentioned it before this – how I felt when Sammy Hoffman used my piece in a book on international relations theory.

I like to be taken seriously by people and so I like that, but I'm operating in these fields and I feel my credentials for operating in these fields come from the fact that I'm a social psychologist and I'm applying social/psychological concepts and methods to a varying degree and literature in which I am embedded so in that sense - as I said - if I have to choose a single identity that's what I would choose.

Usually I'm not restricted that way so if people ask me; "What are you ?" I usually nowadays say: "I'm a social and political psychologist." I think that includes the social, but it has the political too – I make it very clear the arena which I've been operating for many, many years is the political arena.

Now beyond that... of course, I still make no claim of being a Middle East expert, largely because there's large areas of the Middle East I'm not familiar with and I'm also not really embedded in the classical writings and the classical languages and so on - so I don't regard myself as a Middle East specialist per se, but I do like to believe that I'm knowledgeable about the Middle East, at least about the contemporary Middle East.

The field of conflict resolution ? I feel comfortable in identifying myself with the field of conflict resolution. The field of peace research, as narrowly defined - no. Because I'm not doing what is now often seen as peace research. I'm not doing quantitative research and so on. But broadly defined, particularly going back to its origins, yes, I consider myself to be in practice one of the founders - in my own way - of the peace research movement. I'm still more of a movement person in peace research than a scientist, in the way in which Walter [Izard] or David Singer would like to think about it. I don't know if that answers the question.

Interviewer: That's a hell of a good job. Last one. Who else do you think we ought to talk to and interview about the developments of the field. Dave Singer ?

Herbert Kelman: I certainly think you should. Yes.

Interviewer: Who else comes to mind that you've worked with and [who has] seen the thing develop over the years?

Herbert Kelman: Although I think you would get a very different perspective, I think you should talk with **[inaudible]** if you are thinking about peace research and even certain approaches to conflict resolution,

although he's not really quite embedded in conflict resolution, as we know it.

Interviewer: He's on our list.

Herbert Kelman: He's on your list? Are you thinking about people who go back a ways?

Interviewer: People who go back a ways.

Herbert Kelman: Yes. So... a number of the younger people are out there. I don't know about Ron Fisher. Is he too young for your purposes?

Interviewer: No, he's... he's coming up to the tape.

Herbert Kelman: Next generation.

Interviewer: The next generation.

Herbert Kelman: Next generation I think. I think very highly of Ron and I think he belongs in... by the way Harold Guetzcow is, is still around. He's quite old, but he lives in California and I think he's frail, but he's around and I just recently, not too long ago, saw something that he had written in an issue of sort of honoring Chad Alger.

Interviewer: Chad's on our list.

Herbert Kelman: I don't know – I don't think that Tom Milburn– and I don't know if that name means anything.

Interviewer: Oh, yes, I know Tom.

Herbert Kelman: I don't think he's in good shape. He's alive, but I know his son and I think he told me he's not doing very well. You know, there are so few women on the list. You have Elise [Boulding] ?

Interviewer: Yes, we saw Elise... she's living up in Medford.

Herbert Kelman: Yes, yes. I'm in touch with her. There are not many other women in that earlier generation.

Interviewer: No, there aren't.

Herbert Kelman: There was a woman who was very much involved in peace education activities, whose name escapes me, based in Columbia at one point – at Columbia University.

Interviewer: Mort would probably know her.

Herbert Kelman: Her name escapes me right now. I mean there's any number of younger women, but not people going back to the early days. It's really interesting.

Interviewer: Well we are looking at “parents” of the field, so it's the early-days people we have to get.

Herbert Kelman: Who am I omitting?

Interviewer: Well you've given us a couple of good ideas.

Herbert Kelman: Somebody – well, I don't know about Bruce Russett He is definitely younger...

Duration: 173 minutes