
PARENTS OF THE FIELD PROJECT.

Interviewee: Dr Peter Wallensteen.

Date: 30th March 2008.

Venue: International Studies Association Conference, San Francisco.

Interviewer; Dr Chris Mitchell.

Interviewer: .It's the 30th of March 2008, and we are here in San Francisco at the ISA Conference. As part of our "Parents of the Field" project, we're interviewing our friend and colleague, Dr. Peter Wallensteen, who at the moment is at Notre Dame University in Indiana but is probably better known as one of the most important and probably founding members of the Peace and Conflict Program at Uppsala University in Sweden. So. Peter, thank you for agreeing at this incredibly early hour to come and talk to us - we are most grateful for your time and your attention. As I think you know, we're doing a study of people who were involved in the early days of the peace and conflict studies fields, and in those early days, people came into the field from a whole variety of backgrounds - intellectual, personal, disciplinary. What was yours? How did you get involved in "Peace and Conflict Studies" ?

Dr. Wallensteen: Well, we are back to the 1966 period. And I had a double experience, so to say. As a student, I was part of a student exchange program. I went Poland. We were exchanging. Poles came to Sweden. I went to Poland. And they brought me to one of the concentration camps - or extermination camps - that I never heard of. It's called Majdanek. It's outside Lublin. And that was my first, real confrontation with what the Holocaust was all about. Just seeing a big store with the shoes of some of the people that were killed. It was just a small camp and about 600,000 people were killed. But seeing the shoes of maybe 10,000 people give you an idea of the magnitude.

This was an enormous shock. Later I went to Auschwitz, but this first experience was a real shock. And it so happened that I heard about peace research before. I met Galtung before, and he had invited me to come to Oslo, and right after this I came to Oslo. This is in February 1967. And then I encountered Emiliere (?), which made sense out of peace research because this was a very stimulating review. Galtung was a key person, of course. But around him was a whole set of other people of my own age - 21, 22, and 23. And there was an idea that, yes, there is something very bad out in this world, but we shall not be cynical. We shall not just look at it; we have to do something about it. And

with research, we can actually do something about it. Those two experiences made me feel, yes, “peace research” could actually be something. It could have an impact and a meaning.

Interviewer: So it was this that attracted you to working in the field - the idea of research and doing something about it. Was there anything else?

Dr. Wallensteen: Well, it was a general interest in international affairs, of course. I guess when I look at it later on. I mean, I like to write, I like to do research. I like that approach and I can see, that looking back, I've done that kind of things before. But just to put that energy, so to say, that was there into peace research. This double experience was really fundamental in convincing me that this was worthwhile. And as you know - I mean - it didn't exist. There was nothing like this at the universities, there was only the Peace Research Institute in Oslo. (SIPRI had started emerging in Stockholm - it published its first things in 1968.)

So it's very early. And the young crowd that was there was really going into something, and nobody really knew what it would look like.

Interviewer: You used a phrase "peace research" a moment ago. That was very definitely what the field you were entering at that time was called, because my memory of the same period is that I got into a field called "conflict research." Sometimes we called it “conflict and peace” research. But for you it was very definitely “peace” research ?

Dr. Wallensteen: Definitely, yes. I mean that was the name of the Institute in Oslo, the Institute for Peace Research [PRIO]. It was the name of the journal, the *Journal of Peace Research*. That was the name of a book that Galtung did at the time in Norwegian, which was translated into Swedish. It was called "Peace Research." But we noticed very early – I mean coming back from the Oslo experience. And there was already a small group of people - young people - concerned about “peace” research. And then coming back, I felt: “Yes, we can do something with this.” But then we started this, - so to say - *institutional* struggle.

How do we do this? How do we organize in a university? And then immediately, we get the reaction: “No, no, no! You can't call it peace research. That sounds too naïve. It's – no, it doesn't give

the right connotations. You can't really understand wars. It is too complex !” So then we came up with the idea – I can't remember who – but it should be “peace and conflict research”. And then all the older people said, "Yes. That sounds serious." So that's why we have it now as the Department for Peace and Conflict Research.

Interviewer: So there wasn't - in your mind at least - there wasn't a clear separation between the two at all?

Dr. Wallensteen: No. No, in my mind, it was one integrated field. And it's so – in fact, it dealt with conflict issues. Not that this notion, perhaps, was a major thing then. It was more of courses on war, and so on. But it – I mean on this organizational level, there was an idea to create a Nordic commission (or a Nordic committee) for peace. It was for “international studies”, and we then struggled to get peace and conflict research into that, so that the “Nordic Cooperation Committee for International Studies, including Conflict and Peace Research” became the name for this whole thing.

Interviewer: Bit of a mouthful.

Dr. Wallensteen: Yes, but for us it was a success - and our name was in there. It was something more than looking at the world in a cynical way.

Interviewer: Changing the subject slightly. You mentioned that one of the things that interested you was the idea of doing research into problems of peace and problems of conflict. But one of the things that started out, I think in the early days (and perhaps in similar views) was a very strong orientation to practice, to doing something about the problems of peace. How did that work itself out in PRIO in those early days, with you and the rest of the group?

Dr. Wallensteen: Yes - that's an interesting question. Being at PRIO, the setup was basically this: that Galtung was lecturing every week, and all the time new things. But in a way, he was able to integrate all of our very theoretical arguments into some empirical evidence, and then having a political conclusion. I felt that was really an ideal thing, and thinking about it later on, I still think it is. It is very ingenious when you're thinking about how we, as peace researchers, can then play a role in politics. We can always, as citizens, have our views. This would be normal that we can write editorials, letters, etcetera, etcetera. But if we're going to talk as *researchers*, you need to have that background. You can point - yes; there was a theoretical argument here. There is evidence here in articles, etc – and that, I

think, provides a different position in which we can enter into the debate.

Interviewer: So, in those early days, do you think there was a definite vision that this new field - whatever it was going to be - would be very distinct from other social science disciplines? Or where was the effort going to be made to situate the field that you were developing? Did people have an idea about that, or did it just “happen” ?

Dr. Wallensteen: Well, what we already had there, which existed from 1966, was something called "the Unit Working Group for peace research", and it was a very wide variety of things. So there were people from theology interested in the Lutheran Church and social change. You know, there were some law people. There was one particular sociologist - quite a lot of sociologists - and some political scientists. So their whole idea was that this would be a broad framework in which we could basically debate, do research - but nobody was thinking of it as “a field” in which you would write a PhD. We're probably going – and I did, myself - to write within political science. So I think that idea that we have to do it formally, as a discipline is the only way you – any of us - can survive – destruction, because if you continue to be “a forum” or “a center” of some sort, you will, sooner or later, be completely squeezed out by all the departments, because they are “the” unit. So somewhere along the line - say 1975 - something like that happened. When we had our first course – we started an undergraduate course in peace and conflict studies – then the idea comes, "No. We have to organize this separately." Because the question was: “Where is this course going to belong?” Should it be part of political science or whatever? So the University dynamics, so to say, makes it necessary. That's my definite conclusion, and my colleagues in Tampere drew the same conclusion. My colleagues in Lund drew a different conclusion. But we in Oslo and Goteborg, we drew the conclusion that, "No. We have to formulate this as a subject." And the only way for subject to survive in a University is to have a professor, so we had to go for this idea. Nobody was in favor of a professor, as nobody was really hierarchical. But that was the survival strategy. So we started to push to get a professor in peace and conflict research.

Interviewer: And the idea was to have it established in the University in Oslo ?

Dr. Wallensteen: No, no, no. This went on in Sweden.

-
- Interviewer: Oh, okay.
- Dr. Wallensteen: So the Norwegians are doing their things. Actually, they did establish a professor in peace and conflict research, but this was in sociology. That is where Galtung went in 1969.
- Interviewer: So this was back home for you?
- Dr. Wallensteen: Coming back to Sweden, we had this seminar with all these young people – and some gray-haired people in there. And one of those who really liked us very much was the Director of the University. He saw some potential there, I suppose. So that was how to survive inside Uppsala University.
- And how - for my colleagues in Goteborg - how to survive in Goteborg, for my colleagues at Lund, how to survive in Lund. So we all went on different strategies. And I would say, looking back, that the strategy of creating a department and having a professor is the one that worked.
- But it was a big battle. It was big battle.
- Interviewer: I'm sure. I've seen other kinds of battles along those lines as well. But you succeeded. Goteborg succeeded. Lund, you say, went in a different direction?
- Dr. Wallensteen: Yes. They didn't establish it in the same way. They kept to the original idea, in a sense, of being “a forum”. They also had an assistant professorship – for a while it was a philosopher who held it, for another while, other people. Right now, the position still exists, but isn't within Political Science. Now, they have created a unit within political science. And we, of course, support them. But they never got the same visibility as we did or the strength we had by becoming a department.
- Interviewer: So, going on to conclude this story. The department and the chair at Uppsala were established, and did you then become the first professor in the new department ?
- Dr. Wallensteen: Yes. So the sequence – '67, coming back to Uppsala from Oslo. We start – we have this initiative going. We have the first course in '75. And then in '79, we convinced the government and the Parliament that it should have a plan for the development of peace research at the universities. And in '81 the first position is created, and is called the Hammar skjold Chair in Peace and Conflict
-

Research. (That's 20 years after Hammarskjold died.) Then we have a big battle: how to define this and where it should be. And by '85, I'm appointed in Uppsala. At the same time, my colleagues in Goteborg got a chair and it was appointed in '85. So from '86, you can say, we could start a PhD program. That was really the key thing to get.

So from '67 to '86, this is 19 years. And for me, it's really incredible that it is so difficult to change university structures. I – we – I think “we” – nobody of us anticipated that it would be this difficult. But the strange thing is once you have established it, then you are “in”. Then you are treated as a colleague, and the people are proud that we are there as part of the University - now, we are a part of it. Now we get money in the same way as anybody else. And in fact we're doing reasonable well within the University. But it's like you're passing through a major threshold, and then suddenly – you are established !

Interviewer: Everything is sweetness and light, perhaps.

Dr. Wallensteen: Yes.

Interviewer: You mentioned one thing which, I think, for us is unusual, though we've come across it before in both Denmark and in Norway, which is the role of government in enabling this kind of work to go forward. If my memory for dates is right, the establishment of [the Department in] Uppsala came well after SIPRI. So there was already a SIPRI. But the Swedish government was persuadable about the idea of university programs?

Dr. Wallensteen: Yes. That's an interesting story. I mean SIPRI basically emerges because of Pugwash and the Pugwash Group. And the need was seen by the Minister of Disarmament – at that time was this Alva Myrdal. She saw a need for an institution like that. And, being a politically minded woman, she realized that you need to hang it on to some symbol - or something. So here it comes “1964”, one hundred and fifty years of peace for Sweden, the last war in 1814. So that's when they launched the idea of creating a peace research institute funded by the Minister of Defense, but autonomous, in some sense, as a foundation dealing with armament and disarmament issues.

: So that's how that is created. But Alva Myrdal, in the report that writes this, she says that there is also room for peace research within the universities. So it seemed like you have this SIPRI,

which is - when you think about the name - Stockholm *International* Peace Research Institute. So it's very *international*. It speaks English, does not teach, does not train, and has very little connection, actually, to the academic environment in Sweden. It's always had an international director. There's never been a Swede directing it. And so it's living its own life, so to say. But here are all the young people who are interested in peace research.

So that becomes politically interesting for the Parliamentarians in the area, and they start to push it. And so through the Parliament, you push the government - actually you get a new government which is education oriented. And then, that's how you create it. So what you have in Sweden today, I would say, is SIPRI, with its history - armament oriented, very much focused on technical matters and dialogue with defense and foreign ministries and so on. And then you have the Uppsala Department, which is peace and conflict research.

Interviewer: Right.

Dr. Wallensteen: Of course, this is war and conflict resolution. And then you have the department in Goteborg, which is peace and *development* studies, which is much more a development focus. So in some way, along this way, we developed some kind of division of labor, where one can specialize in one or other area.

Interviewer: You mentioned a few minutes ago that there was quite a bit of resistance in the universities to the establishment. Was this just the normal university resistance to change, or was there something specific about peace research ?

Dr. Wallensteen: Yes. I mean, there was the normal battle between the departments, and the ones who felt old reasons. I mean, I was a political scientist, but political science felt somehow threatened. I wanted to control this, and said: "This is part of international politics." And we were arguing, "No. It's not international politics. This is the study of violence between states and within states." And political science says, "Yes, but that's power, and that's what we do." And we say, "No, we are not interested in power. We want to solve problems." So you have an intellectual battle and an institutional battle. But there is also - definitely - an opposition to "peace" as an idea. And we are in the hidden argumentation, so as to say. You never see this in papers, but they know what went on.

They were saying, "Oh, they are Communists. They are soft on Communism." And...

Interviewer: Initially?

Dr. Wallenstein: Yes – because the Swedish did not – we are not part of NATO, so that makes the different debate from Norway. But we do have this very big military-industrial complex. And many of the people, including myself, are conscientious objectors, and don't want to take part in military service. There is the draft, and we are all somehow been to priests. I was given sort of special civilian duty, etcetera. So we are all under that law. And that is what creates a lot of debate in Sweden, about the military and the kind of threats, and who are really the threats, and how do we deal with the Soviets who are not far away from us?

So it's an important issue. But it was seen that we were weakening - somehow - the Swedish will to defend. Those kinds of underpinnings were there.

Interviewer: They're not untypical of other places, of course.

Dr. Wallenstein: No.

Interviewer: But it's interesting that they come through in Sweden as well.

Dr. Wallenstein: Yes. Because I've always found it amazing when people abroad says, "Of course, since when you have a peace research department - you are so peaceful." But then I remember, you know, it was not easy to establish. It was not a given, so to say. This was not the government coming and saying, "No. We shall have this." No, it was us struggling to get it. Which I think in many ways is a better way of changing things. I think we as an institution will have the more impact in Sweden than SIPRI, which is established the other way around, on the public opinion and so on.

Interviewer: I'm going to return now to your early years in the field, working in Oslo, and then moving to Sweden. Your own thinking and your own development of your work, looking back. Who, apart from Johan [Galtung] were major influences on the way that you thought about peace, peace research and conflict research? Are there any major figures that were influential in your own intellectual development.

Dr. Wallenstein: Oh, yes. I mean Galtung, clearly - very stimulating as a teacher, very provocative, and very creative, I think, particularly in that period, '65 to '72 - or something like that. He wrote a great number of articles, which live on, in some sense. So that was of enormous importance. But for me there were some others who were important. One is Bruce Russett. I came to Yale as a student back in '69. And it was Galtung who helped me to connect with Russett, and he was developing what he called the "Yale Political Data Program".

Interviewer: Yes. I remember.

Dr. Wallenstein: So I came there. I also had a contact with Bob North in Stanford, who had a big project on explaining the First World War - The Ladder-Pressure models and such.

Interviewer: That's right. And he was working with Nazli Choucri, if I remember.

Dr. Wallenstein: Exactly. Yes. So I was there. But somehow he was not particularly interested in me, but I was interested in what he was doing. I wrote, actually in this style, but I wrote a critique of his whole project. But he was not interested. This was '69 and there was a lot of student unrest. So Russett was important and behind Russett, I realized there was another guy who was important. That was Karl Deutsch. I started to read a lot Karl Duetsch's things, which are very creative, right - imaginative, but maybe not solid "research" ? But the kind of ideas like "security communities" that he had - which has now become political jargon - were really very interesting stuff. So that's who set the way for other interesting persons.

Interviewer: Interesting that they're all American.

Dr. Wallenstein: These are all Americans, yes.

Interviewer: Any "homegrown" people that influenced you, apart from Johan? Any Scandinavians? Anybody from the East?

Dr. Wallenstein: Yes. Well, there were, of course, the Myrdals. Particularly Alva Myrdal who I mentioned. She had a - how to say - a little more intellectual interest in all these young people who were doing peace research. Just as an illustration, I was invited to their home, and there were a lot of people, and Gunnar Myrdal is taking the floor and sitting basically in the corner of the room, and everybody

sitting around. And he is saying, "Oh well, maybe I should write to Gromyko about this." And then in back are us youngsters sitting. And Alva comes up to us and says, "Please, come along." And we walk out into the next room, and we sit down with her. I mean she is a celebrity – but she wants to hear what we are doing.

And that was an attitude, which I really thought was – really, I really learned that that is a good attitude for an older person – she was in her '60s – to try to hear what the young people are saying. Her husband want to tell the world what he was thinking, but she wanted to hear what we were thinking. So I learned lot from her and in that sense. So that's the style. Gunnar Myrdal, of course, came with his huge books that are on the national drama and so on. We were all studying that, but we were a bit more of the Marxist line - we were a bit more critical. So these books are still good. And his huge book on "The American Dilemma" is still worthwhile reading. I mean he's an intellectual style which few people in Sweden have continued - which is very strange.

Interviewer: Well, he was certainly very influential outside Sweden as well, of course.

Dr. Wallenstein: Absolutely.

Interviewer: But you came into contact with Bruce [Russett] and with Karl Deutsch while you were in the States?

Dr. Wallenstein: Yes. I was a student in both Yale and Stanford in '69.

Interviewer: Of course. Bob North was at Stanford then.

Dr. Wallenstein: Yes. I guess he had to find a line on that in the department about ten years or eight years ago. We were going to inaugurate a new room and we had to have a name for this room. So I suggested we should call it the Karl Deutsch Room. And it so happened that it coincided with us making Bruce Russett an honorary doctor. So I invite Bruce to come an open the room, together with one of his students. And this student is the Crown Princess of Sweden. She was a student that year. So the two of them opened this room where we have a big picture of Karl Deutsch. So I want to convey, that the next generation here is very much in debt to that person, but, you know, having a completely different experience - he grew up in Czech Republic. But just to establish some link back to the history.

Interviewer: Yes – well, this is probably what we're doing now. I have a lecture, which I used to give to my students about the origins of the field - and where everybody came from. Several students have come up to me and said, 'That was very revealing. It's interesting to know who our predecessors were and how we got where we are. So, you know, I do think that - looking back at figures like Karl Deutsch [who I met only very infrequently] and Bruce Russett, and Johan of course] it's very important they know about these people and they know about their ideas and theories.

Dr. Wallensteen: I should add one more, but that comes in a little later phase. These are all experiences of when I personally tried to form my understanding of what Peace Research is. But ten years later we had a visit from J. David Singer. There was some conference in Oslo, and he invited me to come to Michigan. So I was in Michigan for a whole series of dates - '80, '81, '82, and '84. So I got to understand the Correlates of War project thoroughly, from the inside. And I got to hear about his battles and so on, around all these experiences.

I mean - it's important to understand. But of course, from that I get a bit dissatisfied with the way the Correlates of War project is done. And I think this is what I don't like, and this as well. You do your own thing. So we do our own thing.

Interviewer: Yes - so that's where the series that you and Margareta Sollenberg edited came from ?

Dr. Wallensteen: Yes. That's one of the origins. Rather than reforming David Singer's project – he was right. It's much better to do your own thing - so we did, and that's now the Uppsala Conflict ??? Program. So it's another approach; it's a dialectical thing. I've always been a good friend with David, but this was a different kind of relationship than the CoW project.

Interviewer: Well, David is always good fun. We had a long interview with him about two years ago, and he was telling us about the early days and the early struggles in Michigan, with conflict resolution center there. It's almost typical of the way in which the existing departments resist anything that's new, or dangerous, or appears to threaten them.

Dr. Wallensteen: Of course, that meant that when he realized that and when I mentioned the trouble we had with establishing peace research, he could immediately relate to that. And he was very supportive. He

wrote good letters and so on, which made other political scientists in Sweden very angry, saying that this is intervention in internal Swedish affairs ! They were aware he was friendly, but “sovereignty” they could argue.

Interviewer: So you managed to build up quite a good network of *personal* contacts, but institutionally in those days, did you find any conferences or any international organizations useful in extending your network and your ideas? Was there a particular annual conference or a particular meeting place where you and others from Uppsala could go – when eventually Uppsala came together and were able to at least think that the beginnings of a field were forming ?

Dr. Wallensteen: Yes. And for a number of years, Galtung ran something he called a “Conflict Theory Week”, which was a week in January - a cold and awful January ! That was another vision, so there were a lot of Nordic participants and, of course, people like Nils Pedder Gledisch and Israel Movallion ??? and a whole company of others were there. This was his creative period, but for us – I think for myself - it was not just being there and taking notes, but it was establishing network with other people. The Nordic setting was important. There was also - and still is - a Nordic Peace Research Conference, and they send me on every second year when biannually they have this meeting. So that was an important context - for us, traveling into other Nordic countries was a big thing. Nowadays it's nothing, but then it was a big thing. So that was important. There was also the IPRA Conference and the International Peace Research Association where some could go. After a while, we discovered the ISA, as an important place as well. Also you know, IPSA had a peace and conflict section for a while.

Interviewer: It exists right now ?

Dr. Wallensteen: No, they closed it down. That's another of those battles, because David Singer and I was very much involved in trying to defend it, but it was closed down. So yes, all these organizational networks - extremely important, I would say. And it was very good for young people to get a chance to come to see, to listen to older scholars, but also to test out their own ideas. And that's the way I try to use ISA these days as well. I encourage young people to come and there's - I think - 18 persons from Uppsala here, and they are all

young people. So it's a good way for them to establish their own, new connections and see which way it's all going.

Interviewer: Further east, did you, in those days, get much contact? You mentioned going to Poland, which was unusual in those days anyway. Were there any serious efforts made from Sweden to bring in people from what we used to call “behind the Iron Curtain” ?

Dr. Wallenstein: Yes, indeed. That's right. There was an institute in Vienna - International Institute for Peace, I think it was called -, which organized meetings in Eastern Europe. Particularly in the '70s, when there was a bit more of détente and so on. There were a lot of meetings, which were very interesting to be at. They were often called “scholarly” meetings, but in reality they were quite political. That meant that we had visitors and so on from Russia, from Poland. I would say mostly – more from Poland. So that was there, but it's hard to say that it had a big impact on the kind of research, or had a big intellectual impact. It was more *politically* significant to be informed, in particular about what was going on.

The Pugwash framework was also was important - taking part in the Pugwash meetings. Most of these involved natural scientists. Yes, the Pugwash setting was significant. And, of course, SIPRI, in its construction, also had East/West representation on the board.

Interviewer: Yes What about the rest of Europe? The question that Charles Tennenbaum raised the other day in the roundtable, if you remember. Was there anything in France? My memory is that there was almost nothing at all. A little bit in Germany – Hilke Tromp in Groningen - certainly, later the West Germans, and then all the Germans become interested in peace, and peace and conflict but not until the '70s - maybe even the '80s. Is that a wrong view, or have I missed something ?

Dr. Wallenstein: I think the Dutch experience is perhaps more significant. There was an international law person – Bert Roling – who was behind setting up this Institute for Polemologie and I think that had Hilke Tromp, as you mentioned. So there was a milieu there, or a connection, which has sort of disappeared. It's a bit unfortunate. And then there was this Institute of Polemologie in Paris, which – what was his name – Gaston Bouthoule - who was doing sort of peace studies. And I remember visiting him. It was quite fascinating. Yes. He had a kind of French view of conflicts in

Africa, as if this was all children, and they were learning, and they were maturing - which was very hard to take. In Germany, with Dieter Sanghaas and Kepinal Fadders ??? where there were, I would say, stronger Marxists - a more hard-nosed Marxist interpretations of the world. Not so empirical. And you can see the start of conflict data [collection] when Istvan Kende in Hungary started some kind of collection on local wars.

Interviewer: Yes. I remember that.

Dr. Wallensteen: It was taken over by Ash – I can't remember the name right now, but it was taken over by the Germans, so it continues in Hamburg and still exists.

Interviewer: Oh, that's what happened to his stuff. I remember reading a couple of articles he wrote in *Journal of Peace Research* and thinking, "Is there a Hungarian school " - or something like that.

Dr. Wallensteen: Yes, that was Istvan Kende. I was also curious. I went to Budapest to find out what it was all about, and we ended up in a big discussion about how to define the Soviet "invasion" of Hungary, whether this was – because he said this was a "counter" revolutionary rebellion. And he said, "I have to include it in my data because I'm relying on The New York Times." And it was really odd to be in his house. The whole house was full of bullet holes because there had been fighting nearby. And this was, in his view just a counter-revolutionary "event". Yes, unfortunately he had to call it an "invasion" to stick to his coding rules.

Interviewer: Well, at least he actually had the integrity to do that.

Mr. Wallensteen: He had, he had - absolutely.

Interviewer: I remember going to Budapest in 1972, I think, and there were still many buildings that still had the bullet holes in them. Sorry, that's interesting, but perhaps not totally relevant. Let's take up another thing, which is "peace and conflict research/studies" as a field. We often talk about it as being "multi-disciplinary", but are there key ideas or theories or approaches from other disciplines that we have borrowed and used, which were particularly important to your work in Scandinavia? What was the intellectual basis of what you started to do?

Dr. Wallensteen: I felt that political science was theory-less, so to say. It didn't have much of theorizing. And again, this is an impact from Galtung, I

think, which emphasized a lot of theory and was very structured thinking. So for me, looking at sociology was really very important. I picked up a lot. This will be people at [inaudible] and the whole notion of conflict theory, as some kind of theory. And that, I think, has become very significant - to develop some kind of conflict theoretical framework, and we have that in Uppsala. I mentioned also the "security community" idea - Karl Deutsch's - which came from some sort of interaction studies and so on and so forth. That was very important. Definitely that was quite important. There was a theory push at that time, which I was reminded of when we talked the other day about Systems Theory, and the East, and David Easton. That was a way in which political science started to be a little bit more theoretical. We, of course, were into that also. And Galtung definitely had the idea of some kind of unified peace theory. I always connected it to the Physics Model and he had studied Physics as well, and Einstein had the idea of a unified theory of physics. But maybe Systems Theory also was part of Galtung's thinking - it was definitely part of David Singer's thinking.

Interviewer: Yes, and you reminded me the other day of Kenneth Boulding's old book, "Conflict and Defense: A *General Theory*" - which he very definitely put in there for purpose. I think if you look at a lot of the people whose names we've mentioned, you will find them writing very often in the *General Systems Yearbook*.

Dr. Wallensteen: Yes, that's true.

Interviewer: Karl Deutsch was writing in that, Kenneth Boulding was writing in that. So, round about that time "Systems" was the wave of the future. It's always rather sad looking back at the waves of the future and wondering what happened to them.

Dr. Wallensteen: But one other thing - there was not just theory; there was a bit of methodology, also. There were ways of doing things, which existed in the other disciplines. I'm not sure who invented a four-fold table, but certainly Galtung's thinking was very much based on four-fold tables - and definitely that is in peace research everywhere as a way of trying to organize concepts and so on and so forth. And I take it that's the sociological approach. And after all, he had been studying in Columbia University, and so he picked this up from there, from a sociologist there.

-
- Interviewer: Yes; I think that was a very strong influence on Johan. We have talked to him and we've talked to Ingrid [Eide Galtung] about those days. Sociology, which as far as I can tell, was a very new discipline for Europe, keeps cropping up in the things that they say about what were major influences on what they did and how they thought.
- Dr. Wallensteen: Yes - and I don't want to prolong this, but it is interesting. When we created this "unit" or "department" - or whatever - the main reason for peace and conflict research, and the chairman of this was Victor ????? and he was a sociologist. Among the people who participated, they were also feeling that they had difficulties with the existing structures. They were more willing to accommodate, which the political scientists were not. They just wanted to talk about this research to say that isn't a break away from political science - a very negative concept. But the sociologist would say, "Oh, that's another flower of sociology." So it's an offspring in a nice way. In Swedish, they are two different words. I noticed a difference in the way one sees it. Sociology in those days was very broad - that was the fate of sociology. It became too broad, too many different things. But it was a creative environment theory.
- Interviewer: You know, you can say the same thing about the broadening out of our own field, the peace conflict studies field. If you look at what it's become - what it's become now - it's broadened out. It's subdivided now into peacekeeping, peace making, or peace building. We talk about conflict management, conflict transformation, or conflict resolution. There's a huge diversity. Looking back, do you think this was envisaged at all when we were starting out in the '60s and '70s - that there would be this huge proliferation of studies?
- Dr. Wallensteen: No. I think the whole idea was that it was a very unified field, and fairly limited, but definitely not broad. As I mentioned, in Sweden you had disarmament studies with SIPRI. You had us doing many other things but different from [conflict] management. Then you had the people in Goteborg doing much more development and economics, economic history and other things. So definitely the field became quite broad. But when I think about it, I've seen it more as "Maybe this is the way it needs to go" - as sort of a division of labor. You concentrate on some things, because in order to really have an impact, you need to have five or six people who are doing the same thing; then that will generate more and more.
-

And if you are going to have an impact, maybe we can't all spread ourselves thin, as I think we thought we could earlier - being sort of encyclopedical or renaissance types. Maybe we have to be a little more specialized, and I think that's the way the field is going. And it remains somehow to be able to bring this together so that all the different units can feel that we're actually part of the same field. That might be a problem.

Interviewer: Well one of the questions that came up the other day in the roundtable from one of my former students was about where are the boundaries of the field? Everybody I know has terrible difficulty in answering that question. Carolyn's [Stephenson] was the best answer, you know: focus on the core and leave the periphery to worry about itself !

Dr. Wallensteen: My idea, from the beginning, was that we should have it within the universities for a number of reasons, but not least autonomy and this teaching aspect. But of course, that immediately runs into the problem of these departmental divisions. So then you need to somehow specify "a field" because otherwise, the others will feel, "Oh no, you're going to take over what we are doing." And there is this feeling, "No, you are imperialists. Nice imperialists, but this is actually our field, don't come in here !" So the structure, in a sense, forces you to make some kind of delineations.

Interviewer: Yes. Otherwise you're regarded as some kind of a pirate –

Dr. Wallensteen: Exactly.

Interviewer: – trying to seize booty - of students, or something like that.

Dr. Wallensteen: Yes - to take the best out of each year.

Interviewer: Yes - I've seen that happen in several universities. You've already dealt with this question to some degree, but I'm going to ask you anyway. Seminal figures in the development of the field ? Who, in your view, have made major contributions to the development of the way the field has gone - from early times?

Dr. Wallensteen: Yes.

Interviewer: I know you've mentioned Karl Deutsch - Johan, of course. Someone like Georg Simmel - but who else, for you particularly, for Scandinavia?

-
- Dr. Wallensteen: Well, I have been very interested in the causes of war, and I would go back quite often to Quincy Wright and Sorokin and the way they did their studies, and now running on a course on classics of this [kind of] research. The students find it interesting to read bits and pieces of what these guys were thinking. You can see that Sorokin used very loose definitions, Wright a bit better definitions, than seeing even more precision with the work at Uppsala. So there is a continuous connection there back, which is quite interesting when you see it. You can assess our development. So definitely, there is a chain there. And you could put [Bruce] Russett, you could put Hayward Allker perhaps into that as well. I'm sure there are more people when I think about it.
- Interviewer: Leaving aside present company, do you think there are any similar influential figures around now who are going to be looked on in 10 or 15 years time as, "Well, they really made an impact on the beginning of the 21st Century?"
- Dr. Wallensteen: Hmm.
- Interviewer: That's another question which is not on the schedule, but I'm curious about your reaction.
- Dr. Wallensteen: It's a tough question. It's a very tough question. Yes, there are. I think there are people, very bright people like Jim Fearum ??? - , [Stephen] Stedman perhaps. There are many people writing about conflict prevention, and also involved in policy making. I don't know if they would define themselves as peace researcher, but their field is comparable in that setting. But they're not really on the level of the Galtung and Deutschs, I don't think. So that's a very interesting question.
- Interviewer: Well, it's something that we can come back to in a couple of years' time and see if somebody has emerged as a leading figure.
- Dr. Wallensteen: I learned one thing, and that is that prognosis is really very, very difficult.
- Interviewer: Yes - I usually get it wrong when I'm silly enough to say "something" is going to happen. Tell us a bit more about the Uppsala program, and how that has developed - and how it links into the rest of the field, if you would. You took us up to the founding of the departments, and your appointment as the first chair. How has that developed, and how does Uppsala link in with the rest of the world?
-

Dr. Wallensteen: Over the last 20 years ? You could say that the real start was with the PhD program in '86. And we have, yearly since then, accepted about two or three students, so it's over a 20-year period. So that means about 50 people have coming through the PhD program. About half have done their finished dissertations by now. The standard is not bad. Another 15 are in the program now to finish. And then there are some that we have "lost", so to say. But compared to other departments, it's pretty good. And I think the PhD program really has been fundamental in the development of peace research in Sweden. And they have done a similar thing in the peace and development in Goteborg - they even had about 30 PhDs. You can say together this has produced something like more than 50 PhDs in the country in this field. And it clearly has an impact because these people are teaching at various universities and colleges. You find them in development aid ministries, etcetera, etcetera. And if you add all the master students, we're talking about hundreds. So it's really a big impact in that segment of Swedish politics which deals with international affairs, development, defense, and so on. So I think we have had a big impact - maybe more than we anticipated, but in a very different way.

This has not been through active political decisions, but in a more sophisticated sense. People come with a much more elaborate understanding of how the world works, but at the same time they have an ethical attitude, yes; we should not have wars.

Interviewer: Do you think that that's not particularly a phenomenon that exists just in Sweden and Scandinavia ? I'm thinking about this huge growth over the last 10 to 15 years of establishments, which deliberately or by happenstance are modeled on the kind of program that you started at Uppsala. I'm thinking now about the huge growth of Masters studies.

Dr. Wallensteen: Yes, absolutely.

Interviewer: Now it's moving more and more into the doctoral level.

Dr. Wallensteen: Yes.

Interviewer: Do you think that tis is something, which is – 50 PhDs and masters students – which is going to have a major impact in Scandinavia and Sweden. I'm not so sure about the United States of America or other larger countries.

Dr. Wallensteen: No. That's probably a different story, and the kind of problems you encounter in the US is different. I mean one clearly faces a different system of talks here about peace studies, as we talk about this "research" all the time - and that was assumed. It was not any tactic in that. It was, "No. If we are going to know something about how war and peace functions, we need to have a lot of research." And from the research would follow studies, which would mean undergraduate teaching and so on.

So I've been a wee bit surprised that the US approach has been the opposite. First you establish undergraduate studies. And then you hope these other things will follow.. In my view, one needs to start with research, and then go down, so to say. But I can see the problems, why things are like that in the US. And there is much stronger arguments that the US is a major actor in a number of these conflicts. And there is urgency, in a sense of having an impact. There is a debate that is different.

I'm surprised how few PhD programs there are in peace research related things in the US. I mean - there's George Mason. The Kroc Institute is in Notre Dame, starting this fall. There are a couple of others, but there is not much. There is something in Manitoba in Canada - but on the PhD level, it's surprisingly little. I think if one gets more on that level, then things do start to change.

Interviewer: It's interesting to note that and I think words and symbols mean things, but in the United States, the word "research" doesn't seem to get mentioned very much even in their programming of peace and conflict resolution, or programs in peace studies. I remember talking to Tony DeReuck, whom I think you may know, about why the group in Britain started a Conflict "Research" Society in the '60s. And Tony couldn't understand the question because he felt that you've got to do research - that was the whole point of calling it the Conflict Research Society. But let me push you a bit more on this whole process of getting "a field" started and linked into other intellectual lives on a global basis. Universities, yes - important. Degrees, yes - important. But what other institutional growth do you think there has to be to help a field? Are there other things which helped to spread the ideas, get them accepted, get them thought about, get them to replace the power political paradigms that a lot of people still seem to operate under? Is there - not a better way - but an additional way to the long-term educational route?

Mr. Wallensteen: Yeah. I know clearly, clearly – let me just finish. I mean we had the Peace Treaty program. And then, of course, from there we also developed courses on the master and the undergraduate levels.

Interviewer: So you went that way?

Mr. Wallensteen: It took quite a while to get a complete department, so to say. And in terms of this kind of impact, in a sense, the people coming out of the master's programs are perhaps more significant because they go into these higher offices and so on and so forth, and impact that way. Now, in terms of other forms of impact, or how it relates, definitely, when you have other research milieu it will quite quickly be understood – identified as an area or place where one can actually get knowledge. So the foreign ministry, the development aide, and so on, will come to you and say, "Can you do studies on this and that. And are you interested?"

And you get into very interesting bargaining positions. So we say, "Yes, we are interested, but this is the way we will want to do it." And they would say, "Well, this is what we want to have out to it." And we says, "No. We are an independent, autonomous university. This is –." And you have a fairly strong bargaining position. And we can do, more or less, the way we think one should do. And these reports do get – do have an impact. So there is another way of commissioning things.

Interviewer: Right.

Mr. Wallensteen: And the peace movements is a special experience as well. The peace movements, when you look at the leadership that many of them are from our department, or the one in Yeta Bori. They have the Master's Degrees and so on and so forth. And – but I think that means that they actually change a little when we rushed the Peace Movements Act. **[Inaudible]** problems in a different way. And the relationship between peace research and peace movements is really very, very interesting because the peace movements, of course, constantly support the development of peace research. But the dialog we have had with them is that with these are two separate activities.

In the peace movement, you need to be an expert on making campaigns and so on. But the peace research needs to be good at dealing with methodology. And these are two different skills that all – both are needed for world peace, so to say. So we have an understanding that they think it is very good that we are within

university. We're not part of the peace movement in any formal sense. And that means they can draw on our research and say, "Oh, this peace research. They have the ability. This is what I come up with." And that's good for the peace movement.

And yes, they pick and choose a little to take what they think is relevant for them. But I think in that sense you get quite interesting relationship between the two. And together, that has an impact, say, in the Swedish debate on Six Port issues, and conflict resolution issues. The peace movements are interested in conflict resolution. Or in special movements that are concerned about special issues, say Darfur and so on. And then they would rely on what we do.

[End of Audio]

Duration: 58 minutes