

*UNITED NATIONS INTELLECTUAL HISTORY PROJECT
The Graduate School and University Center, City University of New York
365 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10016*

TRANSCRIPT OF INTERVIEW OF

ELISE BOULDING

BY

THOMAS G. WEISS

Needham, Massachusetts, 16 April 2001

THOMAS G. WEISS: This is 16 April 2001. We are in Needham, Massachusetts, Tom Weiss interviewing Elise Boulding. Good morning, Elise. Could you tell me just a bit about your family's background in Norway, and how that contributed, in your estimation, to the person you became, the intellectual interests that you have, the commitments that you made?

ELISE BOULDING: OK, if you will turn around and look up there, you see that clipper ship?

THOMAS G. WEISS: Yes.

ELISE BOULDING: That was my grandfather's. My people were seafaring people, and we have burials and houses going back to the 1400s on the coast of Norway. And when grandfather died and the days of the clipper ship were over, grandmother sold the shipping business and bought the farm. I have family on that farm today. So that was my mother's side of the family. Father and mother were actually cousins, so that history really applies to both of them. Father was one of the group of engineers who were having trouble in Norway in the 1920s finding jobs. So a lot of Norwegian engineers immigrated to the U.S. (United States). I was three years old when we came here.

I grew up in a completely Norwegian-speaking social environment. We never spoke English at home or in social occasions with other Norwegians. So I have a very strong understanding of ethnic identity. I have always had two ways to look at everything. I could look at things through my parents' Norwegian eyes, or I could look at it through my teachers at school who would talk about America as the great land of opportunity and democracy, and so on. But mother said Americans are materialistic and that I should not be like that. She was homesick until the day she died. So Norway was built up in my mind as the place where people really know how to live right on the planet. She remembered marching in the independence parade at

the time when Norway avoided fighting a war with Sweden, but had a peaceful independence process instead. Armies had been all ready for fighting, but the people just lined up not to fight on both sides of the border.

So I grew up with these stories of Norway. As a child, I was frightened by war movies, and I thought, "If ever there should be another war, I know a safe place to go. I can go to Norway and be safe." But when I was a senior in college, Norway was invaded. Of course, by then I was an adult. But nevertheless, it was a real shock to me that a place I had grown up idealizing, with people living so right and so well on the planet, should be subjected to occupation.

So I realized that if there was going to be any peace, people would have to work for it. I could date my peace activism to my reaction to the invasion of Norway. Up until then, I had mostly been playing the cello, and languages, literature and music were my world. I never took a course in social science in college. But I met Kenneth Boulding just a few months after graduation. I had gone to New York City to work for a publishing house for a while, and came to realize that New York City just wasn't good for me. That was an environment I wasn't ready to cope with. So I went up to Syracuse, where my family then was, and entered graduate school. I was planning to write a master's thesis on the influence of the Viking invasions on English literature. Instead, I met Kenneth Boulding at a Quaker meeting. We were engaged eighteen days after we met, and were married at the end of the summer.

I had already started looking out and around and trying to figure out how to be working for peace. But being with Kenneth, who was already an internationally known economist and disarmament researcher, suddenly I was plunged into the world of the social sciences and learned to think about issues of world peace in social science terms. Is that good for a starter?

TGW: A very good starter. Where was it that you grew up?

EB: In Hillside, New Jersey. I have no recollection of learning to speak English. Obviously, I learned. It just happened.

TGW: And the Quaker—

EB: I found Quakers in college. The Quakers I found at the same time that I was experiencing the invasion of Norway, you see. So it just came together. Quakers were my logical spiritual home, at that point.

TGW: So the move to Douglas College was more or less in the neighborhood?

EB: Yes. In fact, I never expected to go to college because of the Depression. My father lost his job for a time, and things were very tight. Actually he was rehired again before too long. That was with Carrier, the air conditioning company. But in the meantime, I was awarded a full scholarship that covered tuition, room, and board at what in those days was called New Jersey College for Women. I was very happy to have that. But I remember being bored during my freshman year. I said, "Is this all there is to college? Isn't there something more I could do?" So I finished college in three years. I didn't think that there was enough to study to keep me busy for four years!

TGW: You mentioned the outbreak of war in Norway. What do you recall of those inter-war years and of the League of Nations experiment? Was it in the curriculum, or was it ever discussed?

EB: You know, it is really astonishing, when I look back on my schooling, the absence of anything like that. The one thing I can remember about school was learning how wonderful the American democracy was. I read a lot of books about immigrant children who made good in the U.S. and so on. So everything was about how wonderful America was. But I remember the

only thing about the League of Nations is that Germany violated the Treaty of Versailles. I actually remember giving a speech in my freshman speech class in high school, explaining why Germany violated the treaty, a speech my teacher invited me to present to the Hillside Rotary Club. I remember getting an “A” and being very proud, but nothing else about the League stayed in my mind! I do remember, now that I think of it, that I read the Newark Evening News every night and the Sunday paper in detail on Sunday afternoon, so I obviously thought about current events at least from sixth grade on, but there was nothing to attach that thinking to! Then we moved to Maplewood from Hillside. Hillside was a factory town. Maplewood had one of the best high schools in the country at that time—South Orange High School. In those days, every senior took a “Problems in American Democracy” course.” But it was all about the U.S. There was very little about the rest of the world. But because my family was Norwegian, I would hear discussion about Europe in our social circle. But I don’t remember any talk about the League of Nations. It was just more about how things were going in the old country.

TGW: What about the Depression? You mentioned that your father lost his job at Carrier. Did this make you keener when the next generation of international institutions was being discussed? Do you recall, for example, Bretton Woods and the discussion that surrounded Keynes (John Maynard) and other people, as to trying to avoid another economic collapse? Was this part of the curriculum, part of what students talked about in the coffee shop, or bar, or wherever you folks went?

EB: When I was in college?

TGW: Yes.

EB: How can I explain it? I played the cello. I played in quartets, and trios, and orchestras. There were kids who talked international affairs. Of course there were. So I couldn’t

tell you. But my world was the world of music. That is, it was until Hitler invaded Norway. Then I really began listening to what was happening in the world. I went to hear Norman Thomas speak on campus, and was deeply impressed—thinking perhaps I should become a socialist. What brought music and public affairs together in my mind was hearing the von Trapp Family, who had recently escaped from Europe to the U.S., give a beautiful concert and then talk about what their lives had been like and how they escaped. Music and work to end war could go together!

About the Depression, I remember vividly when my father lost his job. I went into our pantry and around the house writing down everything we had to see what we could sell to buy food, worrying how we were going to manage to keep going. Yes, the Depression really made an impression on me.

TGW: I would like to return to one of the things I was reading—and we already began this conversation earlier this morning. You wrote, “Kenneth Boulding, with whom I have shared a mind-stretching intellectual and spiritual journey for nearly fifty years.” You said you met in a Quaker meeting house and that was the basis for the initial friendship and attraction. How did the spiritual and the intellectual blend or feed on one another over the years?

EB: What are you asking?

TGW: I just wondered the extent to which the Quaker attraction was first and foremost, and how that built into a social science relationship, and then how the social science relationship went back to the Quakers?

EB: I should explain that Syracuse was known as *the* peace activist Quaker meeting in the country, at that time. And the Syracuse Peace Council was one of the first of its kind. Many peace councils modeled themselves on the Syracuse Peace Council. So, although I had enrolled

in courses in the English department at Syracuse University, it happened that the head of the English department was a leading Quaker and peace activist. So I was exposed to intense discussions about international affairs and the Quaker position on nonviolence, and not fighting, and especially not fighting wars. Quakers were simply against militarism, and believed that there other ways to do things.

But Quakerism was a new phase in my life. In a sense, you see, I thought I had outgrown my religion when I entered college. Thinking, “I am a big girl now,” I wrote a very complicated answer to the religious affiliation question on my college application, the way teenagers sometimes do. But the turmoil of the war situation did lead me back into religion. I found that the silence, and the waiting, and the worship was very deeply meaningful. I remember that Kenneth rose out of the silence of the meeting for worship at which we met—we were practically sitting knee to knee, because he was already a Quaker elder and sitting in the facing bench. He rose and said, “I hate moonlight. Moonlight is half-light and romance, and romance is evil.” Then added, parenthetically, “It is all right to love wife and child.” I thought, “Gosh, he must be married.”

What he was talking about was the moonlight bombing in England. You see, here he was, safe in the U.S., and it was very traumatic that all of his family and friends and his country were all being subjected to these bombings and he was safe. I finally understood the message. He was a very striking speaker. He “struck at my life,” as Quakers say.

So that is how the spirituality and the social concern became intertwined is what I am trying to say. I became accustomed very early to learning how to talk, and the language to use when describing war and peace and conflict phenomena in different settings—in religious gatherings, in a secular setting with secular activists, or in an academic environment. I would sit

in on all the seminars that Kenneth and his colleagues held. It was a very lively intellectual life, both in Princeton and at the Institute for Advanced Study, where he was working for the old League of Nations the first year we were married. And then we were in Nashville, at Fisk University for a year. The social scientists there were an incredible group of people. Old Robert Park, in retirement, was among them. What seminars they held! I think Kenneth was the only economist among them.

Next we moved to Iowa State College—another amazing group of social scientists. So I went to every seminar. This was all a new language, and I read, and read, and read, and digested very enthusiastically. I learned to talk the language of social science. But I also learned how to communicate in the witnessing language of Quakerism. Yes, there is the seed of God in every human being. Therefore, every person is sacred and we must act in such a way that that seed can grow and develop. We must be listening for the spirit, and be guided by our inner voice.

I was very aware of the different languages—sometimes I would think, “Am I a hypocrite because I use different words when I am talking to different communities?” But I didn’t really think I was a hypocrite. I was just trying to communicate.

TGW: An old black guy I worked with in a factory once told me, “There are different strokes for different folks.” I was trying to talk to him in a different language than the one he was using, and he finally made out that it was okay for me to proceed the way I was proceeding.

So your first encounter with institutionalized international cooperation was at the League of Nations. There was a small economic secretariat?

EB: The economic and social secretariat was housed at the Princeton Institute for Advanced Studies. I remember attending the social gatherings. The other participants, of course, were all Europeans. There were very distinguished economists in the group. I

particularly remember Ragnar Nurkse. There were no Americans in that group. They would be talking about current events. Every once in a while, one of them would turn and say to me, very patronizingly, “You wouldn’t understand these things, you’re an American.” And I would be very indignant, because I was Norwegian and I understood them very well.

I came to understand that my Norwegian perspective was very valuable. I think now that one of the reasons I later became international chairperson of the Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF) was that the Europeans of the League felt that I understood the world the way they understood it. They worried about American members not really quite “getting it.” My Norwegian perspective somehow came through when I was in international gatherings. That’s why I felt so at home in UNESCO (UN Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization). I used to go to all their conferences that had to do with peace issues. I was there often, and always felt very much at home there.

TGW: What about the founding of the United Nations, and the specialized agencies, and the Bretton Woods institutions? Do you recall how that looked, how it felt, what other people were saying about it in either of your sets of languages?

EB: That is interesting. I was looking at everything that was happening through the lens of the growing peace research community. Shall I tell you the story of the peace research newsletter of the International Peace Research Association (IPRA)?

TGW: Sure. Absolutely.

EB: We were at the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor. Kenneth and his colleagues started the Center for Conflict Resolution, which was the first center of its kind in the United States. I was a fulltime homemaker. Our five kids were all two years apart—1947, 1949, 1951, 1953, and 1955. I had taken a Master’s degree in the 1940s while I was waiting to get pregnant,

since I didn't get pregnant for the first five years of our marriage. But then once I had my first pregnancy, I really kept going! So by the time we came to Michigan, I already had graduate training in sociology.

I was very much a peace activist in the years our children were growing up. When Kenneth and his colleagues set up the Center for Conflict Resolution, they had a part-time administrative secretary but were completely overwhelmed by mail. Letters were coming from all over the world, people saying, "This is what we are doing about peace and disarmament. What are you doing?" These letters were getting tossed into the wastebasket because there wasn't anybody who had time to answer them. I came over as a volunteer and rescued the letters from the wastebasket. So I always say that the International Peace Research newsletter, and subsequently the International Peace Research Association, grew out the wastebaskets at the Center for Conflict Resolution in Michigan.

What I would do was read and sort the letters and then simply string together what people sent in about what they were doing, retype the excerpts, and then send the compilation complete with names and addresses back out to everybody, creating a network. The newsletter needed a sponsor, and the center was not up to doing this. It just happened that a proposal came before a congress of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom that year to set up a committee on peace research to support this new movement, which was approved, including to support the newsletter. At the Michigan center, they were kind of embarrassed at my slipshod rounding up of correspondence and sending out news. They didn't want to put the academic name of the center and of the university on that newsletter.

That is how it happens that the first issue of the International Peace Research newsletter, volume one, number one, was issued by the International Consultative Committee on Peace

Research, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom. For the first two years, that is how the masthead of the newsletter read. It is absolutely amazing what I recorded over those first two years. Of course, I turned to UNESCO immediately. They started funding the newsletter even before IPRA was founded. It was really due to UNESCO that we were able to hold an exploratory conference at Clarens outside Geneva. It was the Quakers in the Geneva office of the Friends Service Committee, together with UNESCO—that combination made it possible to hold that conference and begin the process of planning, which produced the International Peace Research Association (IPRA).

By the third year, the letter was no longer a Women's International League letter, it was the International Peace Research Association newsletter. You get that whole story by looking through those early issues. But the amazing thing is how much was going on at that time. I reported country by country around the world what was going on and I reported what was happening at the UN that was relevant to disarmament. That wasn't very much in the early days, but I also reported on UNESCO, which was already busy on peace issues. This first issue, incidentally, is simply an extra copy, which, if you would like, you can take.

As you can see, the peace research community was international from early days. Research centers developed in India, Japan, and Ghana, and all over western Europe right from Scandinavia to Italy and Spain, with Poland, the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe following soon after. UNESCO really helped on this, and reporting on UNESCO itself became important.

TGW: I'd be happy to look through this. So this is 1963. So you found UNESCO open to the idea that one should publicize this information?

EB: Yes, indeed. Bert Röling of the Netherlands was the first secretary-general. The Liber Röling *Declaration on Principles: a Quest for Universal Peace* was really a *festschrift* for

him. That gives you the flavor of what was going on. That book didn't come out until 1977. But Burt Röling's service on the war crimes tribunal in Japan made a profound impression on him. He came back to the Netherlands and he couldn't let it rest. He was a natural ally in developing the International Peace Research Association; he felt we had to use our wisdom to avoid war. I'm sorry. I've lost track of where we were.

TGW: We had gotten to Ann Arbor.

EB: Oh yes. You were asking about my earliest exposure to the UN system, because the earlier exposure to the League was a very limited one. I was explaining to you that my contact with UNESCO was directly related to the formation of the newsletter. I was editing this newsletter and I needed support for it, and wanted help in the networking and in getting people to meet together face to face. So there was a high volume of meeting and networking activities well before email was invented.

TGW: If I may just go back a minute, how did you decide to choose and use the language of sociology when you did your first social science degree, and then subsequently do a Ph.D.? What led you in that direction?

EB: I took a course in sociology while I was waiting to get pregnant. I had been sitting in on all these faculty seminars. These were interdisciplinary. That's something Kenneth did right from the beginning. He always formed interdisciplinary faculty groups wherever he was. So I got the benefit of that. It was Reuben Hill, the sociologist in the faculty seminars, who spoke a language that made sense to me. Economics I had trouble following. For one thing, I am very bad at mathematics of every kind. Sociology was a lingo I could get the hang of. There were political scientists there, too, but sociology I especially liked.

Reuben Hill was an excellent teacher who plunged me right into classical sociological theory. So after I took a course with him, I said, "Yes, this is for me. I am going to sign up for a degree in sociology." Reuben was doing a study of the effects of war separation on Iowa farm families. I did the field interviewing for that, which was a fabulous experience in every respect. I came to understand the concept of family flexibility. If the remaining family members really close ranks to run the farm while the husband is overseas, it's very hard to rebuild the family when he returns. But if there is a place left open, and a constant sense of being in communication and sharing, then the return is much more successful. As we know, there were a lot of broken marriages after the war.

The dynamics of social processes fascinated me. I could see the relevance for conflict resolution and dialogue and listening. I may have debated originally, but I have forgotten whatever mental debate I had about whether I should do political science, or psychology, or sociology. And, of course, the way I treat sociology, it has elements of social psychology. And it has, increasingly now, elements of political science as well.

TGW: How did you balance five kids and activism during the 1950s?

EB: The way I was able to do that was because in Ann Arbor the Quaker meeting made all the difference. We were a group of young families. We all had anywhere from three to six to seven kids. So we were all parents to each others' children, and the children were at home in each of our houses. We all had extra beds for sleepovers. Our kids became deeply involved in the peace movement themselves. For example, our oldest son, Russell, organized a one-day fast for peace that started in high school and spread right down into elementary school. Each fasting kid wore a little label saying, "I am hungry for peace in Selma and Vietnam." We were so proud of our kids. I got an occasional infuriated telephone call from parents saying, "My kids won't

eat, and it's your fault! Your son is leading our kids astray." During the years our children were growing up, I spent many hours preparing materials on peace education suitable for each age group in the Quaker Sunday school from pre-schoolers through high school. I also loved teaching in the Sunday school—that was a priority for me until our youngest son left for college. I have often said that I learned as much about conflict resolution and peacemaking from the kids I taught in the meeting as I did from later academic studies.

Ann Arbor really was a very remarkable community, a very warm and supporting community. And the kids who might have had trouble from their peers—not buying war bonds, and so on—had such strong support from the families who all took this position. But we also insisted that military service should be respected. There was never any question of that. Soldiers should be respected, but our choice was nonviolence and military refusal. So it was very lively. There was lots of discussion and a lot of community activity.

Bob McNamara was our neighbor. He and I co-chaired a committee on urban renewal. We became good friends. When I went to visit them years later in Washington, D.C., Marguerite, his wife, talked about how hard it had been for her at the time when he was secretary of defense. They are a very special family, and their kids were really special, too.

Ann Arbor provided a very warm, active family life environment. So as I began to get more involved in international activities, having to fly here and there—our kids could go home with other kids from the meeting. One summer, Kenneth and I participated in the Salzburg Seminars that were bringing students from Germany and other European countries—from the two sides of the war—together. We brought home a young Australian woman to Ann Arbor to study. That started a pattern that we developed of students living with us who would do babysitting when I needed to be out or away. So it was the Friends meeting and the fact that we

had live-in students during those years that made my activities possible. Kenneth, although we had a very traditional marriage in many ways, was always very supportive of everything I did. He was supportive of my going back to school, supportive of any activity on peace issues that I undertook. The fact that he supported me was very important.

TGW: I'm sure. But was it difficult then to go back and be an advanced student after years off? You had been involved as an activist, but that is quite different from the drudgery, if I may say, of moments alone in the stacks and working with people who may have had far less experience than you. So I am just curious as to what it was like to be an advanced student again.

EB: It's funny, because I was in that first generation of women who went back. In fact, there wasn't anybody else I knew doing this back then. The thing is, both faculty and students all knew me and respected me because I was an activist in the community and I was Kenneth's wife. So I really got better treatment than I had anticipated. I enjoyed the younger people. I enjoyed the faculty and the campus. What was a problem, was getting through statistics. I really sweated blood over that. But I managed it, just barely. Some of the sociology faculty were especially supportive of my peace interests. Bob Angell was one of the founders of the Center for Conflict Resolution with Kenneth. He was a dear. And Dan Katz was so supportive. I had courses in social psychology with Dan, and Ted Newcomb. There were great people at the University of Michigan in those days. Dave Singer was there too and became a very special family friend.

TGW: He had just arrived at about that time?

EB: I guess. I have a note to myself to write a note to Dave Singer, because I just read his latest piece on the Correlates of War Project. I want to tell him I'm glad he's still doing that work. I should tell you something about the atmosphere on campus. Once I began editing the

newsletter in 1962—our last child was born in 1955—I spent a certain amount of time in the Conflict Resolution Center office on campus while the kids were in school, editing the newsletter. That is before I went back to graduate school, you understand.

So I got to know the students. The Americans Committed to World Responsibility started at Michigan, as did the SDS (Students for a Democratic Society). In fact, I remember an early founding meeting for what became SDS. We used to have a New Years Eve party every year at our house for fellow Quakers and anyone else who wanted to come. The party would include a half hour of silent worship from 11:30 to midnight. Then Kenneth would break the silence by reading Tennyson's "Ring Out Wild Bells." That was our way to greet the new year.

So one year, a group of students came who had been in the South during the fall trying to do voter registration. They had had police dogs set on them, and were deeply affected by their experiences in the South. When everybody else went home after the party—I'm sorry, I don't remember what year it was—they just stayed and sat up all night talking. And I sat with them. Finally, they dozed a little bit, right in the living room. At breakfast in our dining room the next morning, they decided that they needed to form an organization. I'm pretty sure that that was the start, or one of the starts, of SDS. One of the students was Tom Hayden. I knew some of them, but not all.

TGW: So this was the precursor, then, of the Port Huron Statement?

EB: Yes, it was. The year Kennedy was running for president, when he came to Ann Arbor, to campaign he was due to arrive at midnight. A crowd of us had gathered in support of the students, who were to present a petition to him to establish a Peace Corps if he should be elected president. You will see a plaque at the University of Michigan Student Union, on the door at the very entrance where this petition was presented to him. I was in the crowd, very

proud of the kids. Kennedy didn't get there until 4:00 in the morning, so we stood there a long time. A night to remember! The Michigan campus was also the home of the first teach-in against the war in Vietnam. That was Kenneth's idea. The kids wanted to shut down the university during the day as a protest. Kennedy said, "Why don't we stay open and have classes all night instead?" Students and faculty agreed and it was a great success. My role was to serve coffee all night.

Another memory—some students from the Americans Committed to World Responsibility group said they wanted a UN university. They raised money to send a delegation to UNESCO in Paris, asking for the formation of a United Nations university. There was no direct follow-up, although some of the students later became involved in an institution known as Friends World College. Years later, when I was appointed to serve on the governing board for the United Nations University (UNU), I told the governing board this story. Nobody believed me, because there was no direct connection between the two events. Nevertheless, these students had had the idea of a UN University several years before anybody else had gotten to moving on it.

The fact is that this very lively student group that I felt very at home with, and was very supportive of, was a very important part of my years as a graduate student. And they probably had something to do with my capacity for optimism. They had it. I had it. We shared it.

TGW: Do you still have that today? To fast forward a bit, are you still basically optimistic? Those were very heady times, the 1960s.

EB: It's very hard to be optimistic now. It's really hard, but I work at it. I know that people look to me for optimism, so I work at it. That's one reason why now I am really trying to focus more on how NGOs (non-governmental organizations) interface with IGOs (inter-

governmental organizations) and the UN system. Oran Young's book, *Governance in World Affairs*, shows that understanding that process of developing new norms at the level of the state is absolutely essential. We are not going to move forward without new norms. So how NGOs can interface with states and IGOs, and how they can stop competing with each other and start far more collaborative networking—those issues, I think, are most important now.

TGW: And that's the source of the optimism now, versus students then? Just to introduce a personal story here, I think my own daughters actually thought, after hearing all these battle stories from the 1960s, that somehow college and university would be the same. Both of them indicate a phenomenal disappointment with the lack of a certain commitment, energy, and optimism within their own cohort.

EB: At Dartmouth, I missed it. But there were student activists there. They came to my classes. I did imaging workshops with them, and things like that. It was there. They came to Dana Meadows, too—whose memorial service I will be going to in Cambridge next Saturday—I am just so crushed by her death. She and I were very close friends. We had the same basic feeling that things can be better, and that what we do can make a difference. And I must say here there are many fine organizations that bring together activists, including students, in the Boston area. The peace studies programs in this region have recently formed the New England Peace Studies Association and have a wonderful group of activist students.

So I have seen them, they are still there. There is United for a Fair Economy. Some of the same old belligerence is arising again against globalization. Of course, I am in a very different situation now. I just see all this from the sidelines. But there is energy out there. The question is, is it enough? I don't know. But it doesn't help to despair. It doesn't help.

TGW: If we could go back a minute to those student gatherings, and your launching the peace research newsletter—one of the things that this project is trying to get its fingers on is the notion of economic and social development. My recollection of activism in this country, and on university campuses, and the peace research newsletter, was one of war—defined pretty much as bombs, and bullets, and disarmament. Do you recall the appearance of all of these newly independent countries, or the whole notion of decolonization, as being something that might change the international landscape? Or, if not, when did this penetrate your own thinking?

EB: Yes. I wrote a piece called, “Learning from the South,” some years ago, now. My closeness to UNESCO all these years affected my own awareness of the “bads” of colonialism. UNESCO caught on to the problem of a lack of understanding and respect for other cultures, particularly the Two-Thirds World cultures. Incidentally, I have always used the terms “One-Third” and “Two-Thirds” World. I never talk about the First World and the Third World. I talk about the “One-Third World” and the “Two-Thirds World.”

You see, UNESCO started very early publishing books on, and had projects that built up to, the first and later a second World Cultural Development Decade. In this country, few people ever heard of those Development Decades. But UNESCO was doing all kinds of stuff relating culture and development. One of UNESCO’s major contributions in this field was the six-volume *History of Mankind* series, from Jacquette Hawkes’ *Prehistory and the Beginning of Civilization*, to Caroline Ware, et al’s *The Twentieth Century: 1914 to the Present*. Covering every continent, this series was a magnificent presentation of the diversity of human history. For my classes at Dartmouth, I was using some of those UNESCO books on world development, things that were published in other countries than the U.S. My colleagues were only using books that were published by American authors. I tried very hard to include non-American authors.

So every time I went to a meeting at UNESCO, I would dash over to the bookstore and pick up the latest things there. It was a rich collection. It became obvious to me very early on that there was a lot of wisdom and tradition in each of these new countries that had to be respected. There was a lot of ethnic diversity that had to be respected, and honored, and dealt with. But you see, the way the West was operating—and especially the U.S., which led the way on this—was the melting pot theory. So they were urging melting pots for countries that desperately needed to honor each of their ethnic traditions. It was a recipe for disaster, and that's what we're witnessing now.

More recently, I have become active in the restorative justice movement. One of the things colonialism did was to outlaw traditional elders circles, and insist on modern courts that try criminals and punish them. But you see, in the elder circles, the traditional practice was to discover the wrong, make it clear, as well as the circumstances under which the wrong was committed, and then to rebuild relationships—first restitution, deciding on what was appropriate. And then relationships were rebuilt. So the concept of punishment was not there. What was there was the concept of restoring relationships in the community. We, the West, threw all of that out in country after country. But most of these countries still have the elders, and still know those traditional practices. So now—you may be aware of this yourself, and I may be telling you stuff you already are familiar with—the movement to rebuild the elder circles and the healing circles is very, very important in many of these countries.

I get a lot of newsletters. Some of them describe how people who are trained here, and go to train and dialogue and reconcile in conflict settings abroad, are beginning to understand that what they must do in the countries they work in is to seek out the individuals and groups who already have peacemaking wisdom and work with them.

There is another source of traditional peacemaking wisdom that has a variety of global networks and is also represented at the UN through its many NGO representatives—the world's faith communities. Every faith community has peace teachings, though unfortunately they also have holy war teachings, which have led to some very bloody conflicts. But the effort to highlight the peace teachings and bring them to bear especially in conflicts where there is violence between specific faith communities, should be paid attention to. The World Conference on Religion and Peace, a multi-faith NGO, represents one important set of interfaith dialogues.

The World Council of Churches (WCC), representing the Christian faith communities, has a very strong global peace network known as Peace to the City, that works for disarmament and reconciliation worldwide, but with a focus on local towns and cities, especially in the current WCC Decade to Overcome Violence, 2001-2010. The century-old World Parliament of Religions recently established a small interfaith Peace Council, which has undertaken explicit peacemaking ventures in Chiapas, Mexico and Palestine-Israel and plans to go to North and South Korea next. I am the Quaker member of this small group, which tries to probe deeply into the teachings of forgiveness and reconciliation in specific situations. These teachings can be an important contribution to the development of new norms of trust and caring that will make disarmament and human security possible.

TGW: In a book you wrote, *Building a Global Civic Culture*, you said the idea of globe-spanning associations of private citizens is one of the most striking phenomena of the twentieth century. What do you think the impact of this burgeoning number in the last twenty years, and a steady growth over much of the century, has had on the production of ideas, on the notions of reconciliation, or notions of development, or the composition of security, or gender equality? What exactly is the impact of these associations on the world of ideas?

EB: The problem has been—and that’s why I wrote that piece, “Learning from the South”—that it has been too often a one-way traffic of ideas from the West to those “backward” countries of the South, rather than a dialogue with a mutual listening and learning as a result. The amount of anti-Americanism in the world is growing by leaps and bounds. I think it is at an all-time high, now. We are reaping what we sowed. Europe sowed that too; it wasn’t just the U.S. But Europe is beginning to learn. Have you seen the newsletter *Terra Viva*, published by the Council of Europe?

TGW: No.

EB: The Council of Europe established the North-South Centre, which publishes several newsletters. I read them from cover to cover, because Europeans are finally waking up to the fact that they have got all this learning to do about initiatives in the Caribbean, initiatives in the Mediterranean, and so on. But it is very belated. And the way we are messing up in the Balkans—today’s story on the Croats. Can you imagine the way those UN soldiers have been behaving all this time, and the Croats getting madder and madder? We have got all this conflict resolution skill and knowledge, and is it being applied there? No. The hardest challenge for me to keep my optimism is dealing with what I read in the newspaper every morning. I get so upset every morning.

TGW: Actually, you have mentioned something. We have all this conflict resolution, or we have all of this peace activism theory, and we have international relations theory. What do you think is the impact of theorizing—this could have been Ken’s economic theorizing, or your own sociological theorizing, or political science thought—on the world of policy-making? As you look back over the last fifty years, how would you judge that the academy and the world of theory penetrates both the corridors of governments and of international institutions?

EB: It had certainly penetrated UNESCO, but there is the sad story of the shrinking of UNESCO's influence. There was a time when it looked as if it was being listened to. Now, there is no visible follow-up on the dynamic of leadership of former Director-General Frederico Mayor. UNESCO is in decline, I'm afraid. It's a tragedy. Just a total tragedy. So in the UN system, there hasn't been a receptive audience for what we are doing. UNESCO was an audience, but it has been downgraded in the UN system.

That is, there wasn't a receptive audience until recently, when the UN began facing crises in its peacekeeping missions. One of the spin-offs of the conflict and peace studies field is institutes and programs that give training in nonviolence and in conflict transformation processes. There are many such training programs all over Europe, and major conflict transformation programs at places like Eastern Mennonite University, George Mason University, and Harvard University in the U.S., as well as networks of training programs coordinated by NGOs like International Alert in London, to say nothing of programs in Africa, India and elsewhere in Asia, and Latin America. The UN peacekeeping division is beginning to discover that these trainees can be very valuable in their programs, and in the long run this development may transform UN peacekeeping.

NGOs in general are certainly introducing bits and pieces of peacemaking theory and skills into the international system, and helping to develop new norms. One NGO has played a very special role, since it has had from its inception the goal of creating new ways of thinking about world order, and developing concepts of global governance. I refer to WOMP (World Order Models Project), which was founded in the 1960s by Saul Mendlovitz and Richard Falk of the U.S., and Yoshikazu Sakamoto of Japan. A group of distinguished scholars from around the world has met regularly since 1966 as a very special kind of scholar's think tank. I was fortunate

to work with them in their early decades, when they were imagining alternative futures for the international system. With regard to the UN, their work on structures, norms and governance issues relating to the world court, arms limitation and abolition, and the international system of states has been outstanding. They are respected at the UN and by the NGOs that work on UN issues.

Lesser known NGOs also do very important work on governance issues. When I read the book by the Leverings on the law of the sea¹, this story of how the law of the sea regime got to be finally drafted and signed at that first stage—I found it a very interesting story. And, of course, there are similar studies being done of the landmine treaty, and so on. The process involves an intense amount of work on the part of a small group of NGOs who do a constant message carrying from secretariat to secretariat among all the major powers—and the minor powers, too—to find a sufficient arena of agreement so that a new norm is agreed to. That process, that very intense process, is not yet well understood by NGOs generally at all. So there is a huge gap between the understanding of a few NGOs that really know what has to be done, and the rest of the NGOs that have their own projects, and issue their statements, and write letters, and make declarations. But they don't really understand the nature of the task. So I think that the NGO world has to go in for some very intense learning. I really do.

TGW: Certainly over the last thirty years, NGOs have become an increasingly important and visible element within UN gatherings, probably beginning with Stockholm (UN Conference on the Human Environment), and Maurice Strong's views, but increasingly ever since. What would you say to an NGO's CEO who wanted to learn? What do you think are the important

¹ Levering, Ralph B., and Miriam L. Levering. *Citizen Action for Global Change: The Neptune Group and Law of the Sea*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1999.

elements over this thirty year period? What makes the difference in terms of getting an idea translated into a norm?

EB: I think it's a linkage. It has to be a linkage system. For one thing, NGOs that simply operate from their capital cities are as out of touch with their own grassroots as anybody. A two-way flow from the local to the national and international NGO and back again is really important. You see, the doors are opening. Every year, there are more ways that you can sign into conferences and so on. But I think producing in-depth studies that are relevant for the kind of discussions that are going on makes a tremendous difference. Do you remember with nuclear weapons, when the International Council of Scientific Unions (ICSU) produced a document on nuclear winter? That had an effect. And these were distinguished scientists doing as careful a study as they could at that time. We are trying to do that now with the climate. We are at exactly that point right now with the climate, but it is getting harder because the corporations are hiring scientists who say "it ain't so."

So really taking on the corporations—I think one of the things that has to happen is that corporations have to lose their rights as persons. There is the beginning of a tendency in a movement of NGOs to really ally themselves with one another, to struggle against the power of the corporations. I think more and more they are seeing it, the environmental, the human rights, or economic justice NGOs, because the corporations are there, at every one of those points, barring the way. Over time, corporations will change character and downsize and become environmentally sensitive, with help from NGOs. There are a few encouraging signs of this already. But it will be a long haul. An alliance of NGOs, and creative leaders from the business sector, doing a combination of careful research and continual consultation and dialogue with the

ministries around the world is very important. It's hard work. The one-shot movements don't have any effect.

TGW: You mentioned scientific knowledge or inquiry. And you mentioned earlier Dana Meadows and the initial Club of Rome work. It seems to be one illustration that scientific inquiry has an impact.

EB: Yes, the Balaton Group that Dana formed is a good example of really senior scientists who meet regularly, do careful analyses of certain kinds of problems and are listened to.

TGW: In that specific case, some people would argue they got more wrong than right in 1971, and that indeed we are still paying the price in the form of a scientific and political backlash. Does that strike you as what usually happens, or happens some of the time?

EB: What are you referring to?

TGW: The Club of Rome report on *Limits to Growth* in 1971, and the dire predictions that came out around that, whether it was related to population bombs and on and on and on.

EB: Oh, yes. In other words, they were predicting too dire a catastrophe too soon.

TGW: Exactly.

EB: I think it is true that there is a learning process, and mistakes were made. It does have to be done more carefully. Hopefully, that learning process will go on.

TGW: One of the other techniques that we are trying to figure out during the course of this project, as well as academic, scholarly, or scientific inquiry, and its impact on the world of ideas—another vehicle would be popular reports, or popularized ideas that are then taken by a group of eminent persons, starting with McBride (*Many Voices, One World*), Brandt (*North-*

South: A Programme for Survival) and Brundtland (*Our Common Future*) reports, on a number of issues. When do you think these reports make a difference?

EB: Let's take the example of the McBride report, *Many Voices, One World*. The *Many Voices, One World* report wasn't understood by the people who needed to understand it. In this country, it was completely misinterpreted. The report was the work of the International Commission for the Study of Communications Problems, and was to have laid the groundwork for a New World Information Order. Its groundbreaking recommendations continue to be highly relevant today, as is true for each other report of that era. I found each of those reports very exciting, and I read them carefully. But they didn't get enough attention. Well, they did for a time. I think the others got a better reception than the McBride report did.

It's a process. The fact that we now have identified the moderate countries that can be counted on—Canada, Scandinavia, the Netherlands, and so on—who are willing to get out ahead of the U.S. and NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) is very, very important. I think, basically, that we just have to develop ways of teaching about these issues of the world in such a way that more people will be literate about the state of the planet. I would start with the elementary schools, right from kindergarten through the Ph.D. for those who go that far. We must take responsibility for teaching at each educational level for children and adults. We are a long way from that. We have given up on the old problems of democracy courses in our high schools. I asked about it, and apparently they don't exist anymore. That earlier practice has been forgotten. We have never replaced it with a world civics kind of training.

We have to find ways to prepare the public, who only watch TV, and play on email, and don't have any first-hand exposure to actual policy-making processes. You have the small group of activists, and you have an inert audience who thinks they are well-informed because they

watch the news on TV. So I think the entire educational community has to go on the alert. I am frustrated that there isn't more of a response now to the supposed UN Decade of Education for a Culture of Peace and Non-Violence. If we really thought through the recommendations that the UNESCO Culture of Peace Program made about what you do in schools and communities around the world, and recognized that they include human rights, the environment, and economic justice, and restorative justice—then we would know that we have a big job ahead.

The positive thing that has happened, in those countries that have truth commissions, (however many problems those commissions have) the process that has started, that involves truth-telling about what really happened. There is some degree of remorse—but you can't push that too hard—and apology and forgiveness and so on. But I think you see it most clearly, by contrast, in this country—the United States. We never apologize for bombing . If we finally get around to reparations for African-Americans—as we did, actually for Japanese-Americans after WWII—and get back on track with all the Indian treaties we have broken and violated, and apologize for bombing Hiroshima and Nagasaki, which we have never done, and apologize for Iraq, we will be giving some reality to our currently unreal self-image. We are not just not apologizing; we continue to bomb, including the recent bombing of Kosovo.

So we are operating from a level of citizen indifference, or lack of awareness. Indifferent is almost too strong a word, because people don't even know what they are indifferent to. There is just a total lack of awareness. And unless the NGOs, really collaborate in working on this development of a new level of awareness, we are not going to make it as a healthy civil society. We are just not going to make it.

TGW: I am looking at your bookcase, and there seem to be two flags over there, a Norwegian one and the recognizable blue UN flag. You have been on advisory commissions.

Have you also been employed by the UN? Or were you ever tempted to be employed by the UN?

EB: Oh no. I was never employed by the UN. I just got to be a familiar face in some UN settings. I was frequently invited for their consultations. The only thing that's on my vita are the formal things like serving on the UNESCO peace prize jury, and then the UNU Council. But I worked informally on a lot of projects, and the only record of that is in the Elise Boulding archives, which are all back at the University of Colorado. I kept all those files, so it's all there. I don't have it here.

I did some outrageous things sometimes, but people enjoyed it. Once at a UNESCO research conference I tried to illustrate interdependence. I had everybody stand up. There were about thirty-five people in the room. I got them to stand up and make a circle and put their hands on the shoulders of the person in front of them. Then I sang a song, probably "All Around the Cobbler's Bench." I said, "When I stop singing, you sit down on the knees of the person behind you." They did it. It worked. They loved it. People talked about that for some time afterwards.

TGW: What did the interpreters say?

EB: They loved it. They all loved it.

TGW: You mentioned earlier the students at the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor making a petition to establish a UN ideas place, a UN University. What happened with that proposal, and what's your impression of the product that resulted?

EB: That particular proposal I think sits somewhere in a file in UNESCO. But what happened—in various issues of the IPRA newsletter, I describe a process of development. In 1962, there was a resolution on the Organization of Peace, which I reported in the UN section of the newsletter. In 1962, I reported regarding ECOSOC (Economic and Social Council), that the

Honduras introduction of the resolution on the Organization of Peace was accepted. A committee was to be established to collect documentation and establish national departments of peace. Then there was the Accra Assembly, and some of the happenings there were described. This was all in 1962. 1965 was designated to be the International Year of Cooperation by the UN General Assembly.

TGW: I was asking about the United Nations University, and your impressions of the experiment.

EB: Yes, the UN Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR) was a preliminary step. I'm sorry. I wish I could tell you more. I do know that there was an American, Harold Taylor, who lobbied for a world university. And he established a peace college with the Quakers in New York, which still exists—Friends World College. That was originally intended to become an international peace college. By then, a committee was set up to plan for a UN University. That simmered for a while. I'm sure that it's reported on in later issues of the IPRA newsletter, but I don't have a memory of the specific steps in the development of the UNU.

TGW: Perhaps just tell me a bit about your own association with the UN University as an advisor, and a member of their council.

EB: Kinhide Mushakoji, who was one of the vice rectors, set up a consultative group on social development and peace. We met in Mexico, and Paris, and various places. Victor Urquidi of Mexico was part of the group. There was a constant consultative process. It was interesting, but it wasn't very conclusive.

I think one of the problems with the UNU was that it lacked people who were really astute organizers. When I came on the UNU council, Jim Hester was still the rector. I found a talk he had given at some special UN event celebrating his appointment as rector and read it last

night. He said he had spent some years in Japan, and he knew Japanese, and so he felt very at home going to Japan to be rector of the UN University. But he was operating in an American version of Japan, which was just not related to the Japan that I knew. We lived in Japan for a year, from 1963 to 1964. The Japanese scholars movement that led to the formation of the Japanese Peace Research Association was in full swing and I got involved. Some people in Japan used to call me the mother of the Japanese Peace Research Association. I love starting networks. That was my thing.

When Soedjatmoko was appointed rector, the UNU benefited from his striking intellect. And, of course, being a charismatic Indonesian, he carried a special kind of legitimacy and authority. But he wasn't really a good administrator, either. Meeting after meeting, during the time I was on the council, the UNU was working on the development of regional institutes, like WIDER (World Institute for Development Economics Research) and the African institute, INRA (*Institut National de la Recherche Agronomique*) and the one in Latin America, on biotechnology. We discussed endlessly how these institutes should develop and what their relationship should be to the UNU and so on. It was important and interesting, but there was a lot of talk that went in circles. That is a pity, because council members were well chosen as distinguished scholars and public figures from different parts of the world. China was always well-represented by articulate scholars, as was the Soviet Union. There was a wonderful African historian on the council whom I loved to listen to. Father MacGregor had founded the first peace research institute in Peru, and brought a wonderful combination of scholarly and political wisdom to our deliberations, as did Primakov of the Soviet Union. What a pity all those ideas didn't come together! When I think back on those years, I do understand why ACUNS

(Academic Council on the United Nations System) wasn't keen to be too closely tied to the UNU. I'll get to my own image of ACUNS later.

I plugged away at issues of program development year after year. The UNU was also setting up special programs. Nevin Scrimshaw's program on food and nutrition was the first to get off the ground, because he was a terrific organizer. So programs like that got going. We were developing connections with more and more universities on different continents. And I was plugging for the fact that wherever we had a program going, there should be at least one course taught that would be listed as a UN University course on a topic related to their research project. But the council never, never took hold of that idea.

They never got the relevance of simply introducing into the curriculum of the affiliate universities some of the stuff that the UN University was doing, and labeling it as a UNU course, thus becoming more visible in the academic world. They never got it. All they did was pick out particular programs that were hotshot programs, and sent graduate students into those programs. They were not exposed to other parts of the affiliate universities. Nobody else in the university would know they were there. They were just there at that program. They missed all the chances they could have had. In time, things will change. The UNU concept is still a wonderful concept.

I have had no contact with the current rector. But he may be a person who can do what is needed. I don't have the psychic energy to pursue those issues at this stage of my life. I was teaching at Dartmouth at the time I was on the council. We developed a program for Dartmouth students to intern at the UNU headquarters. That's what started me thinking that the UN University could have direct relationships with the universities of the world. It could still happen.

The consultations that led to the founding of ACUNS began while I was at Dartmouth, and I was an enthusiastic participant. ACUNS really took off, and it met the needs that it has met, which are very important needs, and good for the UN system. But it didn't develop an active relationship with the UNU. I regret that deeply.

TGW: Do you think the UNU, or the research that has been commissioned, either by headquarters, or produced in one of its satellites—WIDER probably is the most visible one—do you think these ideas have had an impact on the UN system in the formulation of policy? Also, has it had an impact on scholars?

EB: I think that some of the programs have. The WIDER programs certainly have. And I am really less familiar with the others, so I just don't know. I know that Nevin Scrimshaw's programs on food and nutrition have had impact. But the kind of things that I've longed to see—a stronger program on dealing with conflict, and peace building, has yet to develop. There was a conflict between Johan Galtung and Kinhide Mushakoji about this program. Johan started spelling out everything for the UNU. He's brilliant, you know. He does a lot of great stuff, and I support his TRANSCEND (A Peace and Development Organisation for Conflict Transformation by Peaceful Means). But, by gosh, you've got to do it his way or you don't do it. There was no meeting of the minds, and UNU programs on conflict resolution did continue to evolve, but they never had the central role I had hoped for. INCORE (Institute on Conflict Resolution and Ethnicity) at the University of Ulster is a good program, as is the UNU governance program in a consortium of universities in Barcelona. But the UNU has not provided the leadership in the conflict and peace studies field that I hoped for, particularly in research development. That leadership role has, however, to some extent been taken by UNIDIR (UN Institute for Disarmament Research).

UNIDIR has done marvelous work, and that should be celebrated. I have great respect for each of the successive directors of that institute. And they really are making a difference. I think their studies on the Nuclear Free Zone Movement is a very important example of changing norms in the international system. Tlatelolco (Tlatelolco Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America) in Latin America was the first, and Pelindaba (Pelindaba Treaty on the Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in Africa) in Africa is the most recent one. There is now a whole new set of norms evolving in each world region, norms which the U.S. is currently trying to destroy.

I read something sad on the proposed meeting convened by India with Pakistan and the neighboring countries to create an Indian Ocean Zone of Peace. There were frequent references to the U.S. sending destroyers into the area and making it a very dangerous place. The meeting delegates wanted all the nuclear stuff out of there. That conference was held years ago. Just think if they had been able to move ahead with a nuclear free zone treaty at that time. We wouldn't have the current standoffs between India and Pakistan. UNIDIR is really doing the kind of work that the UNU should be doing.

TGW: So you think it is possible to do solid, objective, cutting edge research within the UN system? You don't have to be outside?

EB: Absolutely.

TGW: Many people think it is much better to do it outside than inside.

EB: Well, what does it mean to be in the UN system? UNIDIR is a free-standing institute. How did it get its appropriations? Member-states.

TGW: Partially member-states.

EB: I don't know why that wouldn't be the same thing. You would distrust national research institutes, then—governmental research institutes. And there are sometimes reasons to distrust them. But, as a matter of principle—I remember the idealism of the UN. Ingrid Eide—who was Ingrid Eide Galtung in those days, Johan's first wife—spoke and wrote so eloquently about what it meant to be a UN civil servant. That you were really a servant for the world civic society. That ideal of the kind of role you played, and your responsibility—your moral and civic responsibility—was a very high ideal in the early days of the UN system. I guess a lot of that is gone, now.

And since UNIDIR is the only center for which I really read all the reports, I can't talk about the others. UNITAR I had close contact with in the early days, and had great hopes for it. They were supposed to be training the UN staff, but that never really took off. And the International Peace Academy, in a sense, played a kind of supporting role there to the UN system. Indar Rikhye did a really statesman-like job in getting it started. I'm not really in touch, now—

TGW: They're much more active now.

EB: So I think the potentials are there. And I think that the real problem is the need to build up collegial relationships. Let's take our own U.S. Institute of Peace (USIP). They hold some very fine seminars on international policy issues and negotiating processes, and on implementation of agreements. They also have good training programs. Certainly UNIDIR—I don't know about the other UN institutes—has scholars in residence every year. Those are prized positions. So there could be a constant back-and-forth flow between academia and the UN research institutes. I think if ACUNS was ever willing to consider just setting up a program, to ensure that flow, that could make a difference.

TGW: You mentioned ACUNS. What was your association with it, and your recollections of what they did and didn't do?

EB: We just started with a couple of meetings at the UN. The discussions started while I was teaching at Dartmouth and serving on the UNU council, but the actual formal organization happened, I think, after I retired. There were several enthusiastic meetings at the UN. I remember Yasushi Akashi participated at first, before he went off to the Disarmament Commission. Jacques Fomerand, who is now the UNU representative at the UN, was an active participant, and Ben Rivlin and the folks at the Ralph Bunche Institute were involved. Our discussions revolved around linking the UNU and the UN itself with academia, so relevant research could flow directly into the workings of the UN system. My Dartmouth colleague Gene Lyons who had been with UNESCO in its early days and felt a strong sense of allegiance to the UN system, stepped right in when I retired. I'm not sure the process would have gone forward if he hadn't just picked it up the way he did. And Dartmouth's provost, Leonard Rieser, was very, very supportive of it as well.

All I did was use my networking instincts. I called people in the area who I knew cared about this kind of stuff—linking their research to the UN and disarmament and relating to a UN University—and they came to the meetings. How much Gene carried the ball for the actual formation, I can't tell you, because by then I was back in Colorado, but he was deeply involved.

TGW: Why don't we spend a moment, before we break for lunch, on teaching? What are your fondest, and unfondest memories of those years in both Boulder and Dartmouth?

EB: Well, I loved teaching. I was getting deaf towards the end of my teaching, so in a way it was a relief when I retired not to have to strain to hear my students. But I really loved it. From my very first year of teaching as an instructor in the University of Colorado sociology

department in 1967 I was involved in developing peace studies programs, both on the campus where I was teaching and on other campuses, with colleagues like Chadwick Alger. These activities led to the formation of the Consortium for Peace Research and Development (COPRED) which came to be the North American branch of IPRA. Both at Colorado and Dartmouth, a key aspect of developing peace studies was to recruit interested faculty from other departments to an interdisciplinary faculty seminar in peace studies. This gave each interested faculty member a chance to make a presentation of conflict and peace issues from the perspective of their discipline, and made it possible to build up coordinated course offerings from the humanities, the social and physical sciences under the rubric of peace studies.

The project developed by Chad Alger, “Your City in the World and The World in your City,” was used in many peace studies classes around the country. It involved arranging for students to be apprenticed to local NGOs. This took a lot of work. In both Boulder and Hanover, it meant I had to discover and contact all the local NGOs, and set up a meeting with representatives from each one, at which I explained the project and got their agreement to accept an intern. Students were then actually helping the NGOs while they were learning the local ropes, because they were in turn teaching the locals about that NGO’s international activities, which many local NGOs did not know about.

In fact I began teaching with the determination never to teach a course that didn’t involve some kind of apprenticeship in the local community. I was developing experiential learning before we had a word for it. So when I taught sociology of the family, for example, there would be an apprenticeship. That was a lot of work—finding a list of families with kids who were willing to have somebody come and sit at the dinner table. I had done that kind of research

myself, back when I was a graduate student—observing family dinner table conversations and analyzing them. So in my family class students were apprenticed to families all around Hanover.

At Dartmouth, I had a lot of freedom to develop experimental learning courses. The human relations class, I gave many kinds of assignments. One was to spend time watching children at play, and analyzing what's going on when children are playing. I suggested places where they could go to watch the children at play. And for the guys in my classes at Hanover who were athletes, I would have them to write a paper on how the team operated in the field. They loved it. They loved thinking about their particular sport in that way.

The human relations classes were always fun. One project was to demonstrate to students the importance of the arrangements of people in a room—this was really sort of a social psychology course—and how those assignments affected how they interacted. Fortunately, there were movable tables and chairs in the room. So the students were divided up into teams—two or three people for each class session, because we only met once a week. Each group of two or three had a chance to arrange the chairs and tables before class. Then the students came into the room, and we went with whatever had been arranged. I would conduct the class in that format. Then, by the end of the class, I would ask them to comment on the quality of the interaction, and how they felt about the different arrangements, and so on.

The most fun arrangement was in one of the last sessions, and they were running out of ideas about what to do differently. They put chairs on top of the tables, they put chairs on the floor, and they removed some chairs from the room, so some people had to sit on the floor. So you had a three-level class. And a very lively discussion! They really learned something about how seating arrangements affect the quality of interaction.

There was one thing I did with any class I taught—make a circle. I refused to teach in any classroom where you couldn't move the chairs around. In one particular class with probably about sixty students, I came in early and arranged all the chairs facing out. That meant none of us could see each other. I conducted the class that way, unable to see any of the students. I asked them afterwards how they felt about it. It made quite an impression on them. They said they had to listen very hard in order to feel connected.

Those were the fun things about teaching. I just enjoyed planning the structure of each course, for any given term. I preferred take-home, open-book exams. I didn't care how they went about answering the question, as long as the papers revealed some in-depth reflection.

TGW: Speaking of reflection, your two big UN experiences were UNESCO and UNU, and you mentioned being able to put hands on people's shoulders. But, in general, how receptive did you find these two institutions to outsiders who had different ways of framing issues?

EB: Because there were quality people on the UNU council, we would have some wonderful discussions. But the problem was that the administration couldn't take the ideas and make them gel. One of the council members would serve as chair, and they weren't necessarily individuals with good chairing skills. So my frustration over the inability to come to actual decisions came from that. I think that the UNU staff benefited very much from the quality of those discussions. But since there the administration wasn't as strong as it could have been, the UNU staff weren't made the most of. Mushakoji was a fine scholar. José Abueva was really creative and he did his best. I wish he had stayed longer. And Arboleda developed a fine program in Barcelona. So they had some good people there, but the thing didn't gel as a whole somehow. And of course now they're in that huge new building and, at least when I visited there, with all those empty floors. It's a tragedy.

TGW: Yes it is. It's as if there's nothing to be done.

EB: At UNESCO, there was a lot of receptivity to consultants like myself. I really related to Director General Amadou-Lahtar M'Bow's ideas, and have already commented on how important I think his work in building programs on world cultural development was. But he was politically unpopular in England and the U.S., so much so that both countries withdrew from UNESCO. England is back, but the U.S. has stayed out. Federico Mayor did his best to repair relations, but by now UNESCO's voice is really muted.

But one unique function of UNESCO—convening an annual peace prize jury, continues. I served on that jury for several years, and know that it performs a unique function within the UN system. The jury consists of a representative group of scholars and public figures; and the peace prize itself has been awarded to a commendable variety of individuals and NGOs that have done outstanding creative peacemaking on the world scene through the arts or social action. The networking involved in getting nominations for the peace prize each year is itself valuable in helping peace scholars, artists and activists around the world to know about each other's work. I remember particularly enjoying the jury sessions when Obasanjo of Nigeria served as chair. He was very insightful, and skillful in helping a very diverse group of jury members to arrive at consensus. The UNESCO Peace Prize is just one more example of the valuable contributions UNESCO has made to peace development through a very conflicted half century. One other contribution I should mention is the UN Year of Peace during which UNESCO initiated the still continuing Peace Messenger Program for NGOs.

TGW: Shall we break just briefly for lunch, and I'll draw a line here in my notes?

EB: Okay. Do you mind going down to the Vietnamese restaurant?

TGW: Terrific. This is the end of tape number one.

TGW: This is the beginning of tape number two, Tom Weiss with Elise Boulding here in Needham, Massachusetts. Tell me a little something about the International Year of Cooperation in 1965.

EB: Oh yes. I would maybe go back to Women Strike for Peace, which was a movement against nuclear testing, and the Canadian Voice of Women. Women really started to begin to communicate across continents. Cathy Menninger, of the Menninger Clinic family, had the idea that there should be an International Year of Cooperation of which an important component would be women-to-women contacts. I can't remember now what country introduced the resolution, but she initiated the process that led to its being presented to the UN General Assembly. She was a housewife in Kansas, but also part of an active women's network. The International Year of Cooperation actually happened in 1965. So we really built up the women's networks for that year's activity. The idea was to have women traveling in teams all over the world, women to women, talking about their common concerns. I remember Margaret Mead, and, I'm pretty sure, Eleanor Roosevelt consulting with us on that. We met at Margaret Mead's office, to talk about how to organize this women-to-women touring process, so that women around the world would all get to learn about each others' lives, find out about each other's needs and how we could work together.

That took a lot of planning. And in 1965 there were indeed women's teams that did that kind of traveling. There was a continuing and growing volume of networking among women, so that the ingredients for International Women's Year really came out of the International Year of Cooperation and the networking that happened then. I can't really give you any more details out of my head, I'm sorry to say.

The time had definitely come for an international women's year because, the international women's movement was growing quite strong. At the same time as the UN network was developing, there were national women's secretariats being set up in many member-states of the UN. So, for the first time, you had women having something like a ministry of women's affairs in many countries. There was significant feedback between the processes of women being recognized by their own governments, and UN recognition, and the women's movement at the grassroots level. The timing was right, and the levels were connected, so that the grassroots aspect counted. Also the International Women's Tribune came into existence out of International Cooperation Year. They began training women in the kind of skills, including media skills, that women need in order to be effective in working on the various problems that women have. The Tribune is only one of many women's NGOs. And, of course, the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF) played its part in the movement, too. But WILPF did not come into existence for women's rights as such. It came into existence so women could work on peace and justice issues. But WILPF has always, of course, been concerned that women's voices should be heard.

One of the things that happened as a result of International Cooperation Year—and that really prepared the way for International Women's Year—was the Women's Tribunal on Crimes Against Women that took place somewhere in Europe. Was it Brussels? I can't now remember exactly. But that was when women first began laying out, for the world to see, the practices of rape and violence against women, which was not a public issue before that time. UNESCO then held a conference on violence against women. And the process is still going on of waking up to those categories of violence. But that violence has been so much a part of the pattern of patriarchal society over the centuries that it is a very slow process to develop that kind of

awareness. And I can't follow it all now, but there is so much going on. The recent decision at the UN to declare rape a war crime is a great step ahead. Margaret Mead and I used to, in those early years, starting with International Cooperation Year, make speeches about women as the housekeepers of the world. We wouldn't use that language now, but that was the right language at that time. It would definitely be the wrong language to use today, which shows you that just noting how much the vocabulary has changed in the course of the women's movement gives an important indication of the evolution of the movement.

By the late 1960s, I had a number of networking activities going on. One was to make sure that there was a women's group in every professional society. For example, there was a women's committee in the American Sociological Association, and then in the International Sociological Association. In the ISA (International Studies Association) we set up something too. I was active in the ISA in those days, and, of course, in IPRA. So in all the social science professional organizations, we saw to it that they had a special women's commission dealing with women's issues from that disciplinary perspective. Another networking activity was setting up a peace and conflict resolution section, or peace-building, or similarly titled professional sections in all the professional associations. So first we set up women, and then peace! I was part of getting a war-peace studies section established in the American Sociological Association. Then there came to be similar sections in many professional associations. I don't remember now how it all played out, but most social science professional associations now have sections on gender issues as well as on conflict and peace issues.

At the UNU, the one program I did manage to get instituted was on Gender, Household, and Age. It was a program which surveyed the situation of families, and children, and households, and the elderly in different countries, and how they were doing, and what their needs

were. The project resulted in a UNU publication with that title. Eleanora Masini, an Italian sociologist, was appointed as the project director. I wrote an introduction to the book.

Eleanora Masini and I also worked on founding the World Futures Studies Federation in Rome. She was really the initiator of this. I came in as a helper, and was active in the early days of it. I had translated Fred Polak's *Image of the Future* from Dutch to English. He was one of the first futurists of the new era. I started a futures newsletter, but that didn't last. It was meant to be interdisciplinary, but it was premature. The World Futures Studies Federation became a remarkable network across both East-West and North-South barriers, because of Eleonora's vision and skill. Scholars from the East European countries, including the Soviet Union, and from China and North Africa, participated from early days, and of course the federation has its own newsletter.

Traveling to conferences, and networking, and so on, for women, the future, and peace really kept me very busy in those years. UNESCO supported all of those activities and I must say that the UNU did to some extent take on both women and conflict and peace issues. Just to be fair!

TGW: When do you recall that women, or gender, appeared on your radar screen as a research issue, and not as a personal issue? And when do you think that it actually became front burner material within the UN? The Mexico City Conference was the first big splash, but when did you sense that it actually became central to the discussion of international cooperation?

EB: Let me go back and answer the first question. I have to explain my decision to go back to school. I had a Master's degree. When our youngest child was getting to the upper elementary grades, I realized that I could get out more, was not needed at home during school hours. And I was offered a teaching position in sociology at the University of Michigan. We

were in Japan that year, at International Christian University and I accepted the instructorship they offered for the following fall. Then came their response, “Sorry, we’ve got a real Ph.D. who can teach that course. We don’t need you.” So that experience, plus the experience of not being able to get research grants for my study of Japanese women, made me think about what I was doing with my life. I loved research and wanted to be a scholar. I had started the Women Strike for Peace newsletter, the year before, and I sent out a questionnaire to all the women across the country who were part of the Women Strike for Peace network, asking, “What was the first time you ever really thought about peace and disarmament issues?” There were a number of questions about how they came to be out there on strike, and so on. The write-up of my findings came to be my first published journal article, or one of my first. I took a lot of pleasure in that research. Where were we?

TGW: You were getting to what motivated you to get a Ph.D.

EB: Oh yes. So when we went to Japan, I had just finished the Women Strike for Peace study. We were going to be in Japan for a year, and I was editing the IPRA newsletter. But it also became a wonderful opportunity—the kids were in school all day—to study the Japanese peace movement. In the U.S. there were headlines: “Japanese Women Marching in the Streets.” It was very un-Japanese behavior. So what drove women to go out of their kitchens and into the street? I couldn’t get a penny for research, because I didn’t have a Ph.D. I couldn’t get a grant. So Kenneth simply subsidized it. I hired a Japanese student who went with me and translated for me, because of course I only knew very basic Japanese. So the combination of realizing I would never get a teaching post—and I had enjoyed what little experience of teaching I had had or research grants—made me think, “I will go back and get a Ph.D.”

So when we came back from Japan, I entered graduate school at the University of Michigan. Professor Gale Ness had a lot of data on women's fertility behavior and suggested that I work with his data on women's fertility behavior in the Third World. I started looking at all that data, and I was totally dissatisfied, because it was context-less data. So I determined to draw as well on the human relations area-file data on the roles of women. In other words, what were women doing that resulted, among other things, in their having the number of children they had? That was my doctoral dissertation: *The Effect of Modernization on Women's Roles*.

I showed, by using this data, in many Two-Thirds World countries, women had more freedom of movement than they did in the West. They ran businesses and they traveled. So I developed a measure of how far they could travel or how far they could travel from home. Were they completely confined to the home, or could they do international travel, and what about everything in between? So once I began to get a picture of the diversity of women's roles, from culture to culture, from continent to continent, and to different degrees of developments. I was thoroughly hooked on an important issue. So that's what launched me into my alertness to women's roles.

We moved to Colorado, and I was appointed to the sociology department there. I was active in all these areas—women, futures, peace. I overdid it. I got to the point where I was burnt out. I took a year's leave of absence after I had been teaching for six years—a sabbatical. Our youngest was now in college. I had a hermitage near our family cabin in the Rocky Mountains, and, with Kenneth's full support, took a year of solitude. That year was a wonderful, wonderful year, which I've written about. I have a book called *One Small Plot of Heaven: Reflections on Family Life by a Quaker Sociologist*. The pamphlet I wrote about that year, "Born Remembering," is a chapter in that book.

So I didn't commit myself to what I was going to do in my solitude. I was going to read and meditate and see what happened. I started reading women's history. I was curious as all these different roles for women, I had discovered during my dissertation research. What happened in history? What happened through the centuries of our species? So that's how I came to write *The Underside of History: A View of Women Through Time*. I started it that year. It was a very intense exploration. I had a graduate assistant who would go to the library and find books on the list I would give her which she would bring to me. And I carried them up the hill to my hermitage, on my back, in a knapsack. I went into town once a week to get books and food. So that's how *The Underside of History* began. I think I've said to you before that I've always loved history. I love to expand the horizon of what's happened to the human race. It was hard work, but very interesting and absorbing work. My only visitor was Kenneth, who came out every few days to see how I was doing.

TGW: This was which year, then?

EB: That would be 1973, maybe.

TGW: So a couple of years before Mexico City.

EB: A couple of years before Mexico City, yes. Of course it took a while to finish the book. I started in the mountains, but I took another couple of years to actually finish it. And I didn't go to Mexico City, or any of the other of the women's conferences. I made the choice what my contribution was going to be. And it was not to be active in the international women's movement, *per se*. But I worked at it through all the different professional associations, and, of course, through the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom. I also participated in the early consultations of the new UN institute for research on women, INSTRAW (Institute for

Research on the Advancement of Women). The group was very task-oriented and the institute has done good work.

TGW: But you avoided global conferences on women. Why?

EB: You see, I just had too much else going. I was already participating in all these other international professional associations. And then my year of solitude was to get my priorities straight, and simplify my life a little bit. So that was one of the decisions I made.

TGW: What is your impression about the utility of global conferences as a way to, if not create ideas, at least nurture ideas, or keep them before the public? We have seen a spate of these—first in the 1970s, and then again in the 1990s. Some people see them as jamboree junket talkfests, and others see them as essential to taking a snapshot of where we are on a particular issue, and trying to embarrass or cajole governments into doing something. What is your impression of them?

EB: I have mixed feelings about them. I know that the Hague conference (Appeal for Peace) in 1999 was to initiate the Culture of Peace agenda. But I didn't go though—I was finishing a book on the Culture of Peace. And I heard a lot about it being a jamboree. There were too many people, and little real work got done. But if enough people are inspired to do follow-up activity, then it might still be possible to call the Hague conference a success. On the other hand, there is such a thing as a working international conference. Most international professional associations hold working conferences. So if there is an IPRA conference, it is a working conference. The commissions meet, and things are carefully prepared. And these are times to set agendas for the kind of projects people are going to cooperate on until the next time the group meets. So I think working conferences are important. But the big show and tell conferences are media events. You mustn't look for solid initiatives for continuing projects.

They might develop. They might. But you are lucky if they do, because there may not be enough solid groundwork for continuing projects. Regarding the Hague conference, they are trying awfully hard to support continuing activities from the gathering.

TGW: As I take a quick look at your own work, and lots of people's work, I'm struck at the expansion of the notion of peace, or international peace and security. How would you say that your thoughts about security—we now have various labels, like “cooperative common security,” “human security,” et cetera—but how have your own thoughts about security evolved over the years?

EB: Well, certainly I have always felt that peace was about human security. But using that language of human security is a relatively recent introduction. It is to remind us what security is about when we are talking about peace, because military security, and very often politically defined security, do not create the conditions for human security. But increasingly, especially in the last couple of years, I have come to feel that human security is so interdependent with the security of all life that I am a supporter of the Earth Charter Movement, and security for life on the planet. We are interdependent with the biosphere, and we can't expect peace if we aren't doing the right thing about soil, and water, and air quality, and our sisters and brothers of our species, and other species.

There is a book I like very much, *The Ingenuity Gap*, by Thomas Homer-Dixon. He states it beautifully, that we don't take into account enough things in figuring out what the consequences are going to be of our actions. There are increasingly, now, just in the last couple of years, some very good new books on human security. The old power paradigm simply doesn't cut it.

So it's been a very slow development from what pacifists meant by security, which has always been fairly inclusive—although we have been less aware of the environment in the past than we should have—a very slow development from the far-out pacifist position to a position taken by a certain number of people who would call themselves relatively neo-realist, who see that realistically security is not maintained by threat.

TGW: Why, in your view, did this security agenda change? What explains the enlargement, so to speak, of the definition, or going back to basics, if the human being is the reason we're interested in this subject?

EB: I'm not enough of a social historian to answer that question properly, but certainly one part of it has been the women's movement. And another part of it has been the conflict and peace studies movement, and its activist wing, the nonviolence movement. A third part has been human rights movement. The environment, and economic justice get in there, too. There has been a gradual building up of understandings within and between initially separate movements. The peace research movement consisted of a very small group early on. Kenneth, for example, and Emile Benoit were really working on disarmament per se and the danger of threat systems. But that was it—just work on preventing arms races. But then people in the relatively early days of IPRA—they came from Scandinavia—said, “Hey, there are economic issues involved.” Johan Galtung was the first to make the distinction between positive peace and negative peace. Negative peace was simply the absence of war. Positive peace involved social and economic conditions conducive to human welfare for all people, and was a far more complex concept. And after Stockholm, positive peace came to include the environment too. What year was Stockholm, do you remember?

TGW: 1972.

EB: And, in fact, when I was rereading my IPRA newsletters, for those years—1972 and 1973—all these issues were coming up at IPRA conferences. Then there was the University Quest for Peace group—a movement, by the way, that related to the development of the UN University. The Quest for Peace group had the vision of a university dedicated to exploring the interaction of cultural, economic and political factors that lead to war or peaceful resolution of conflict, within and between societies. The outcome was the establishment by an international group of academic and public figures of the University for Peace, since there was a concern that the UN University would not focus on peace as a central issue—as indeed it has not. So that is why we have the University for Peace in Costa Rica. It's small, but with a dedicated core group. I note in the UNU's annual report 2000, that a formal relationship has finally been established between the UNU and University for Peace. About time!

So each of these movements were developing separately, but some peace researchers were saying, "Hey, these are all interconnected." Ester Boserup, a Danish economist who was the first to report that women did all the farming in the Two-Thirds World—was an early discoverer of the interconnections. It was beautiful. Scandinavian social scientists were spending more time going around the world, seeing what was going on, than the rest of us. Sometimes they do tend to think they know it all, but they were also in Asia and Africa before their colleagues from other countries were, really at the local level. So they began to see how issues connected. Scandinavian peace researchers, in particular, were some of the first to call attention to that interconnectedness.

Awareness grew very gradually. In the beginning it was a really small group who would say that all life is interdependent, and we have to look at the total system. And, of course, Donella Meadows was saying that. She was really saying it in her Club of Rome report, *Limits*

to *Growth*, though people weren't ready to hear it then. But her later work, and the Balaton Group she founded, has definitely focused on interdependent feedback systems. Cob Hill Farm, and Sustainability Institute, both founded by Dana, are concrete demonstrations of how to live on the planet—and a living memorial to a life cut short too soon.

Because women are farmers in most of the world, they have a special environmental sensitivity, for land, forests and waters—and especially for trees. Vandana Shiva of India, with whom I have worked in earlier days and admire enormously, made the Chipko Movement visible—the women's hugging a tree movement that began when the lumber interests came to tear down the forests. Women's movements around the world, spontaneous local women's movements to save forests, and to save waterways, and prevent dams—they were the ones who had their hands in the soil. They were the ones who really knew where security lay. In this country, the women's movement didn't start that way. It started as a claim for women's rights, beginning with the right to vote. The movement to secure women's place in society and the movement to make the world a better and more peaceful place represent two strands of the larger women's movement and there's a little bit of a strain, or there was, between the two. But they actually come together in a common concern for women to be heard as voices and respected as shapers of a more peaceable society. I think of women as shapers. I called my book on women *The Underside of History: A View of Women Through Time* because women have always been struggling to reshape society away from violence and towards peaceableness.

TGW: Human security—some people are arguing that this is a useful way to organize the UN's future agenda. What are the weaknesses of this concept?

EB: The weaknesses of the security concept?

TGW: Yes, in human security—embracing this large concept. Is there anything that is not on the human security agenda?

EB: Its power rests in boiling it down to specific situations. Note how the Zone of Peace movement started: you take a specific area, and you say, “How can we get rid of weapons here?” You start with something very visible, and very specific, like removing all nuclear weapons, and then you gradually realize that there are other things that are harmful in this region. So I see the Zone of Peace movement as an embodiment of the human security concept. You find these stories of villages and cities and regions that wake up and realize that they can reshape their biosocial environments. It’s good for everybody who lives there. It’s their front yards and their back yards. It comes close to them. So I think that the linkage system works when it’s got a good grassroots base. But if you start at the UN, and say “all these things are interconnected,” the people who are saying that don’t really know that out of their own life experiences. They have probably never dug in the soil; they may never have climbed a tree. So everything comes back to there needing to be a linkage system, and there have got to be strong grassroots in the linkage system reaching up to the UN system. Anything that is not done with that operational linkage won’t work.

TGW: Your notion of a global civic culture linked to this agenda, or something that I’ve been thinking about a lot—global governance—how do these fit in to this notion of a comprehensive security agenda?

EB: Well, of course a global civic culture, like a global peace culture, would be made up of a mosaic of local cultures. The interface of the INGO (international non-governmental organizations), IGO (international governmental organizations) and UN systems are such that a local group can actually be heard at the UN itself. I make this point both in the *Global Civic*

Culture and the *Cultures of Peace* books. In fact, I currently have a project with some teachers to develop “Making Peace Where I Live,” a unit for fifth and sixth graders around the world. We’re working to make this an international movement. The curriculum guide will help children learn about peacemaking by exploring who makes peace in their own backyard. There should be more education about how grassroots organizations work, how GROs (grassroots organizations), and local NGOs (nongovernmental organizations) link to regional and national NGOs, which in turn link to international NGOs. There is a path into the UN for every NGO. That path any human being, with enough persistence, can take. But people have to grow up knowing that path, and seeing it as a part of their world.

TGW: Do you see the future as being relatively bright in terms of increasing number and kinds of interactions between non-governmental organizations—usually transnational ones—and intergovernmental organizations?

EB: Yes and no. There’s not enough cooperation among NGOs. They are too competitive, too turf conscious. They have got to learn to cooperate. They are not cooperating enough. I’m very worried about the future. I do emphasize whenever I can that there are grounds for optimism. But I’m worried that there’s a generation of kids growing up who primarily sit in front of a TV screen or at a computer screen. Kids don’t climb trees anymore. They sit and watch what others do. They don’t play, themselves. They’re in schools where they’re taught to pass tests.

The good news is that there is an experiential learning movement that takes kids into the community where they really learn from the community. And there is a peer mediation movement, so kids get training in listening and conflict resolution. There are also more opportunities for nonviolence training for young people and adults through churches and

community groups. But this is small-scale stuff. These movements are too small, and generally school activities are far too test-oriented. And the decline in individual exploratory reading—I noticed this already when I was teaching at Dartmouth. Kids were reading less, and their writing skills were not as good as they had been when I began teaching. So there are a lot of things to be concerned about in this country. And, of course, so many countries don't have education for very many of their kids at all.

So the fact that they learn so little about the world itself, that they get all their learning on screens, means they will be totally insensitive to all the environmental crises that we're facing. Also they will be lacking in interpersonal conflict resolution skills. They'll be totally unprepared for the sudden avalanche of elderly that's going to start pressing on society, because there will be so many people who will need help to get through their days. Nobody's prepared for that. Already, the number of doctors is declining. The number of nurses is declining. The number of home health care aides is declining. So the group of senior citizens is growing, and everything else is declining. There is going to be a crushing imbalance.

Also, we're running out of water. We're just literally running out of water, because we are mining all the aquifers. Expensive desalination of the ocean is no answer because the ocean is being poisoned by all the stuff we're dumping into it. So we face population increase in general, particularly an increase in the proportion of the elderly, and a decline in the availability of potable water, and the decline in soil qualities, because soils have been mined by over-application of fertilizer, and so on. Lester Brown and the World Watch Institute, they have documented all this. But nobody acts as if it's so. Energy and water crises in California are a sample of what is to come.

TGW: If you were characterizing the single most important intellectual challenge for the next twenty-five years, for the United Nations, and therefore, I suppose, for anyone, would you come down on aging, population, and water?

EB: Setting priorities is a two-edged sword, because all the challenges are coming together. So the real crunch is to understand the interconnectedness, and to realize that you can't make water policy without also making human rights policy, economic justice policy, security policy. You can't just target and set individual, separate targets. You have to see that they're interconnected. And the population—you've got to project what happens as people live longer. All of that impacts back on water and soil and nurses and doctors. So our mentality in setting priorities works against us because we can't work from a paradigm of interdependence. And that's really what Homer-Dixon is saying.

TGW: Is this what you would then put under the rubric of "priority for futures research?" Trying to understand these interconnected dimensions as our number one assignment?

EB: Yes, and I would say that you have got to begin an educational system for understanding interdependence from kindergarten on, in every country. It's a way of thinking. The kids growing up among indigenous people—they're learning every day. The elders are telling them, "You see that bug on that tree? You see where that bug is getting its food? You see where its babies are?" Every day they are being taught from the world around them, but we live inside artificial shells. So we don't get the experience of interdependence.

TGW: You mentioned, a few moments ago, turf consciousness amongst private actors, non-state actors, non-governmental organizations. Does the UN system, in its present configuration, and inherent competitiveness—but I was actually thinking more about the

functional divisions. Doesn't this work against the kinds of holistic thinking, or interconnectedness?

EB: Yes. That's precisely what UNITAR was to have been about—precisely that. That those in training, in any part of the UN system, would come to learn about all the other parts of the system, and the ways in which they would need to network and cooperate. That was precisely what I understood UNITAR was to be about. But it never had the resources to develop adequately. Also, that is what the UNU was to have been about: “To contribute, through research and capacity building to resolve pressing global problems that are the concern of the UN, its peoples and member-states.” It tries to do some networking across UN institutions, but it's a very sporadic process. UNESCO tried to be another contributor to this process, but tended to be ignored by the rest of the UN.

TGW: While we're on this notion of putting issues into boxes, or camps, to what extent do you see the North-South divide, or your One-Third World and Two-Thirds World as being a helpful analytical device, and also a helpful or hurtful political device in terms of trying to get important issues on the international agenda?

EB: Well, since I don't follow the UN now as I used to, I really don't understand what has happened to what started out as the Group of 77, now 135—my sense is that they are weaker, and the New International Economic Order (NIEO) never took off. The urgently needed mutual respect between North and South and adequate global sociocultural modeling never developed, in spite of UNESCO's efforts in organizing the World Cultural Development Decades and New International Economic Order publications. Oddly, the new NGO anti-globalization movement may compel a return to adequate South-North analysis. One of the biggest barriers to such a development, of course, is current U.S. policy. Can it change in time?

Well, it's not all bad news. Actually, in 1978, Congress, under President Carter's administration, created a commission to study the theories and techniques of peace and the existing institutions involved in resolving conflicts among nations, in order to determine whether there should be a national academy of peace. Senator Spark Matsumaga of Hawaii chaired that commission, and I was appointed to serve on it. Serving on that commission was a high point in my life. We held hearings around the country and heard great testimony from a gallery of witnesses about conflict resolution and peacemaking. And yes we recommended that Congress establish a U.S. Academy of Peace to carry out research and training in the field of international peacemaking and maintain an information service in the field of peace learning. Our report came out in 1981 and indeed Congress did establish the U.S. Institute of Peace (USIP).

USIP is a separate though government-funded institution, independent of the Department of State, but it has faithfully funded research and training in peacemaking over the years, and conducted very important seminars on critical international issues, including governance issues of concern to the UN. It brings a variety of voices to the Washington scene, and is currently fostering dialogue on critical transition issues concerning foreign policy under the new U.S. administration.

Unfortunately, the policy of the new administration is not simply to have a general threat capability, but to have a capability to send mobile troop units quickly to anywhere. So here is a policy of training up and getting all the best military machinery for one group that can dash around bombing the hell out of any upstart group, instead of using the growing resource. USIP is telling them about people trained in conflict resolution and dialogue and interactive problem solving. The government should be sending them out to do conflict prevention and conflict transformation. It is important to know, however, that a growing group of NGOs including the

International Fellowship of Reconciliation, International Alert, Encore, and Accord all have teams of people who can work with locals, and do precisely the kind of interactive problem-solving that the world is crying for. We've got those capabilities, but they are not paid attention to by mainstream security specialists, because they see security as military security. So they don't understand that problem-solving capability is absolutely the key needed. It is the missing element in their security planning.

It's very sad knowing that there are such capabilities and they are being so widely ignored. Secretary of State [Colin] Powell understands the problem, but he unfortunately does not determine security policy.

TGW: Do you see that the primary vehicle to moving toward these problem-solving skills, or the UN system's embracing problem-solving skills, or NGOs' pooling their resources and using problem-solving skills—the solution is education?

EB: Yes, but experiential education. You see, it's got to be community-based learning. You can write internet programs for this kind of stuff, but that isn't going to teach them. It's just got to be face to face. Incidentally, I do want to mention one encouraging thing. The UN Security Council did pass a resolution that was brought to it by International Alert, and a network of the NGOs which are doing exactly what we are talking about, a resolution stating that there must be women in all peacekeeping and peacebuilding units of the UN, emphasizing that women's peace-building skills must be made use of. The fact that the Security Council would affirm such a resolution, I think, is hopeful. Acting on it is quite another matter, but at least the statement, the verbal commitment is there now.

TGW: As you look back to your encounters with the UN system over the years, how would you compare the quality of the people who work within the Secretariat, with those whom

you respect on the outside in a research institute, or a university faculty, or an NGO involved in doing research about human rights? Is it fair to compare them?

EB: Well, one of the problems with the UN system, which you know very well, is that countries get to select and promote candidates. And the candidate for any particular job in the UN system promoted by the government whose turn it is to hold that job may not have the necessary capabilities. So we get some inadequate UN officials. But then, sometimes, we also get outstandingly good people. So it's not inherent in the UN system, but it is inherent in the current system of every country having a turn to nominate for certain positions, without adequate regard to qualifications. I know there are boards that make decisions on appointments because I remember when the UN rectorship shifted. That was a big deal. We spent hours talking about what the qualities of the new rector should be. So I know there is a process there. But we're back to the old sovereignty issue—each state can push what it wants, and national politics plays a role in appointments. So I think it really has to be worked on.

The position of director-general of UNESCO is a case in point. While there have been outstanding directors-general, the position has also been something of an international football to be kicked around. As long as such appointments are arbitrary, we're not going to have a workable UN system. We have got to move to clearly established qualifications for each job, with due respect for different cultural styles of leadership.

TGW: And what's the role for leadership in all this within the UN system, in terms of pushing out ideas and norms and principles? Is there a big role, or are they just totally circumscribed by process?

EB: There is certainly a role for a charismatic UN secretary-general such as Dag Hammarskjöld, who established the precedent of UN peacekeeping. Kofi Annan's Agenda 21

on the environment was also of key importance as setting new directions for member-states. There have been very creative directors of UN institutes such as UNRISD (UN Research Institute for Social Development) and UNITAR, who have produced research documents that have laid the groundwork for UN resolutions in the fields of arms control and development. Also, the charismatic leadership of Alva Myrdal ensured that the UN Commission on Disarmament made significant contributions to norm development regarding disarmament. NGOs also provide leadership in getting a process going that winds up with a new international norm, a new regime. In the case of the landmine treaty it was Jody Williams. For the UN Conference on the Law of the Sea it was Samuel and Murial Levering. For arms control treaties, Joseph Rotblat of Pugwash (Pugwash Conferences on Science and World Affairs) and the ICSU gave some very important leadership. But beyond that I also have some hope for intergovernmental regional associations. I have real hope for the Council of Europe's North-South Centre. Whenever I have finished a newsletter from the North-South Centre, I feel better. They really are dealing with North-South issues, and they are finding the best people to work on those issues. For example, on the minorities issue recommendations from the center have resulted in EU (European Union) resolutions encouraging states to give recognition to minorities that have been hitherto forbidden to teach in their native language, and otherwise encouraging respect for oppressed ethnicities. This is real peace-building and conflict prevention stuff in areas where there has been a lot of bitterness. Unfortunately, the European Union did not focus on the Balkans soon enough.

The OAU (Organization of African Unity) doesn't have anything comparable to the North-South Centre, but in time I trust it will have. I just don't know enough now about the shape of the different world regions to say. In Latin America the Treaty of Tlatelolco came out

of the work of a continent-wide network of NGOs. Juan Somavia, now the head of the ILO, gave a lot of leadership to that NGO effort. He was a great person to work with, a wonderful man. I'm glad he's at the ILO, but he doesn't have very much power there. I kind of wish he had stayed at ECOSOC (Economic and Social Council). In North America, Canada has provided strong leadership for arms control treaties in the UN. The U.S., unfortunately, has provided little leadership on major international issues except for Eleanor Roosevelt on human rights.

TGW: As you look back over your long and distinguished career, how do you see your legacy? Or what do you think people twenty years from now might go back and look at that would be still of interest?

EB: Oh heavens. I'm not used to thinking in those terms. I have been a little surprised at how out of style my concept of the underside of history—what women have been doing all along—that the gender issues are so focused on rights that an appreciation of the variety and diversity of women's ways of working is not being given enough attention. That makes me sad. However, there is beginning to be more attention to the strengths of women's culture in peacemaking, so there is hope for the future.

The tremendous international campaign to end violence against women, which began in the early 1960s, has been and will continue to be an important component of the women's movement, but the patriarchal concepts that underlie that violence live on, so there is still much work to be done. Some of that work involves a better understanding of the two cultures, the women's culture and the men's culture, in order to replace it with a partnership culture.

My most recent book on *Cultures of Peace*, which follows the “underside” theme of my study of women in history, that peace cultures, which in fact are partnership cultures, have always existed but are hidden in the historical record, seems to have captured some welcome

attention in the peace scholar—activist community. Because I record those cultures both in terms of scholarly research and my own lifelong activist experience in the NGO world, as well as with parts of the UN, the book seems to have an empowering effect on readers. This is exactly what I hoped for!

In terms of my work in developing IPRA and COPRED, I think that the peace research associations will survive, and they will adapt. The big need is for the researchers and the practitioners to interact more. They have formed separate organizations. I have been saying for some time that they need to collaborate. That happens in the North American COPRED, but it doesn't really happen in IPRA. There will certainly be continuing peace research. Something I haven't really done anything to develop, but have been supportive of, the extraordinary network that's developing of practitioner women, the conflict resolvers, is a global network that I am very hopeful for.

There is now an Africa-wide network so that every country in Africa has a women's association that is in touch with every other one. So there is a continent-wide network of women who are all doing peace and conflict resolution work. But I've done nothing, except in very indirect ways, to facilitate that. Each has to have its own voice.

A related movement is the peace team movement in the Gandhian tradition of the *shanti sena*. I helped by starting a peace team newsletter back in 1993 to connect all the different peace team groups around the world, and writing up a proposal for peace teams to be enlarged and to cooperate with UN peacekeeping forces. The current movement for a Global Nonviolent Peace Force to work cooperatively with the UN is related to those earlier efforts and I am happy for that.

Another area of my activity that has currency today is future studies. I refer to my translation of Fred Polak's book, *The Image of the Future*, and my development of imaging the future workshops. The notion that if you can develop an image of the desired future in your mind, then that gives you a sense of the strategies and the paths you might take to get there, is a concept that has really taken hold. That is, you can't work for a future you can't picture. But if you can picture it, you can generate ideas of how to work for it. This is a complex phenomenon, you understand: first you imagine the future, and then you imagine how you got there. Then you confront the key question, how am I going to get this process started? What am I going to do starting now?

TGW: In our own efforts to try to measure ideas, we are looking at four propositions. I just wonder whether you might take an instant to see whether we are on target. The first is that ideas—in your case, perhaps gender, conflict management, and the concrete tools for conflict management, the notion of sustainability and future thinking, these rather large notions—have they actually changed public policy discourse? The ways states define their interests, or the way states define their identities, and therefore what kinds of policies become imaginable as a result of ideas?

EB: I guess policies have become—that was very critical, the word you used—"imaginable." And there is an enormous difference between a policy being unimaginable, and being imaginable. So, in that sense, there is progress—in fact that process is already under way. There is a national Public Conversations Project based Watertown, Massachusetts supported by a number of foundations and institutes. And Harold Sanders's book on public dialogue and the work of his Kettering Foundation also furthering this new movement. New dialogue networks are springing up all the time. But the understanding of interconnectedness is

still a problem. However at least within the limitations of policy-making, there is now an understanding that once you clarify what it is you want in the future, there are strategies to take you there. But you have really got to be thinking in terms of the political life of a country. And, of course, at the UN level, the process of developing the commitment to uphold the social norms by member-countries continues to be a struggle.

But I think people understand the problem, that you have got to have a policy and it has got to operate over time. There is a future, and there are consequences. But the sophistication of the understanding of the consequences is sadly lacking.

TGW: Are ideas useful in vying for platform when two norms, or two goals, or two sets of principles conflict? I am thinking here about growth and sustainability, or peace and justice, and these kinds of things. Are ideas useful weapons, to use a good military analogy, for people who are trying to push their priorities, their notion of which one of these norms ought to come out on top?

EB: Well, I think that when you put it that way, we have got to say that the win/lose paradigm simply doesn't work. Losers will simply gum up the works. So it isn't a question of which one is going to win out. It's a question of how you can dialogue, have an interactive dialogue between competing policy groups to come out with something which is responsive to the deepest concerns of each side. And that's the whole business of listening, respecting the other, care for future generations. What all these groups do that I have been talking about who are trained to go around the world interactive dialogue—that has to happen with national policy processes.

TGW: Much of your career, and much of our conversation, focused on what I guess we now call “networking,” putting people together. To what extent have ideas, or new ways of

framing issues permitted different kinds of coalitions to come together that hadn't been possible before an idea was thrown on the table? To what extent is research and new framing of issues important in mobilizing different kinds of people who were either inert or didn't see their allies?

EB: I am hopeful that the UN peacekeeping/peacemaking/peacebuilding sector will be able to work with the new coalition of peace teams developing nonviolent peace forces, to evolve a pattern of cooperation in areas of conflict that will decrease the military aspect of intervention and increase the nonviolent aspect. The more that examples of the superior problem-solving capacity of nonviolent action and conflict transformation over military action become visible on the international scene, through research and training and practice, the more viable disarmament steps will seem—both to the general public and to security “experts” at national and UN levels. I hope this same gradual transition can take place over time in national and UN police forces, as peace teams demonstrate how civil and community violence can be managed nonviolently.

Similarly, I hope the worldwide restorative justice movement represented by the alliance of NGOs on crime prevention and criminal justice, which seeks to replace punitive and retributive justice with restitutive justice that brings about community reconciliation, will be able to produce enough evidence of the social and economic cost-effectiveness of restorative justice to persuade criminal justice authorities and policy-maker to bring about a transformation of prison systems worldwide. In both cases reframing the issues is involved. Meanwhile the international environmental movement is bringing about a reframing of energy issues in terms of the exploitation of nonrenewable resources of the planet by similar cost-effective analysis of the use of renewable energy resources.

TGW: The other variable we are trying to get our hands on is the extent to which ideas really are most important, once they actually become embedded in an institution, or take the

form of an institution. Harkening back to your letters in the waste bin, and IPRA, or the existence of an environmental ministry after Stockholm whereas there hadn't been one before—to what extent are ideas taken more seriously once they take a bureaucratic form?

EB: Can we come up with an example there?

TGW: I am thinking, for example, for Stockholm you had Rachel Carson and other people writing about the importance of the environment. Post-Stockholm you had ministries of the environment, you had new environmental NGOs, you had community groups who were concerned with this problem. So my sense is that ideas become more important, or critically important, once they actually take an institutional form.

EB: Well, I won't agree with the word "important," but they do become viable as social processes. Yes, definitely. They don't become more important—because they were always important—but they become more viable. The examples I just gave of the institutionalization of nonviolent peace teams and police forces would be relevant here.

TGW: Is there a question I should have asked you, and didn't get around to asking you that you wished I had asked you?

EB: I think I mentioned something at lunch, but I can't remember what it was.

TGW: We had talked about futures research, and whether the UN was the place to do that, or whether it was better to keep it outside of an intergovernmental context.

EB: Our ability to think about the future has been so hampered by our fixation on technology, so that it's very difficult—I have to work hard on getting people into the future in a serious way. Very often I've been encouraged by the action responses of participants in future imaging workshops. But these are select groups. I'm not sure about a UN institute on the future.

In one sense I would like to see it, but in another, I don't know, given all the constraints on who might wind up directing it. I think that has to be left open for now.

I think that the one thing that I am most concerned about now is the rate at which we are wiping out traditional knowledge of all kinds. We must start preserving traditional knowledge and building up a knowledge stock for local libraries around the world that is really representative of what we know about how to handle the exigencies of life and how humans handle them on the planet. There is so much more there than westerners know. The indigenous people don't know the stuff that we know, and we don't know the stuff that they know. So if I were to name one priority for the future—something to get attention which does not get attention now—it would be that. To really build up that knowledge stock, through extensive oral history work and recording of languages that are going extinct. Get people like Vandana Shiva into the UN and get that organized. She is a wonderful organizer. Also involve youth groups in Africa and Asia, such as the Aang Seian, the House of Peace, in Tanzania, which sends youth delegations to Europe and North America to share their indigenous peoples' culture, spirituality and traditional knowledge with deprived urbanized and technologized Westerners. Young people have the energy to impart to the world what their elders have taught them. That's enough for now!

TGW: I want to thank you immensely for spending several hours with me. I am very grateful, as others will be.

EB: I am really touched that you thought it was worth coming out here to hold this conversation. I enjoyed it—and you have set me thinking!

INDEX

- Aang Seian (House of Peace), 67
 Abueva, José, 38
 Academic Council on the UN System (ACUNS), 31-32, 34
 Accra Assembly, 29
 Africa, 22, 33, 50, 62, 67
 and women's networks, 62
 Agenda 21, 59
 Akashi, Yasushi, 35
 Alger, Chadwick, 36
 American Sociological Association (ASA), 42
 Americans Committed to World Responsibility, 15-16
 Angell, Bob, 14
 Ann Arbor, Michigan, 11-13, 15
 anti-Americanism, 21
 anti-globalization movement, 56
 Appeal for Peace (Hague conference), 47-48
 arms race, 49
 arms control, 61
 Asia, 22, 50, 67
 Balaton Group, 25
 Balkans, the, 21, 60
 and the European Union, 60
 Barcelona, Spain, 32, 38
 Benoit, Emile, 49
 biotechnology, 30
 Boserup, Ester, 50
 Boston University, 17
 Boulder, Colorado, 35, 39
 Boulding, Kenneth, 2, 5-9, 11, 13-14, 21, 44-46, 49
 Boulding, Russell, 12
 Brandt report, *see North-South: A Programme for Survival*
 Bretton Woods institutions, 4, 8
 Brown, Lester, 54
 Brundtland report, *see Our Common Future*
 Brussels, Belgium, 41
 Building a Global Civic Culture, 20
 California, 54
 Cambridge, Massachusetts, 17
 Canada, 26, 61
 Canadian Voice of Women, 40
 Caribbean, the, 21
 Carson, Rachel, 66
 Carter, Jimmy, 57
 Center for Conflict Resolution, 8-9, 14
 Chiapas, Mexico, 20
 China, 30, 43
 Chipko Movement, 51
 Clarens, Switzerland, 10
 climate change, 24
 Club of Rome, 25, 50
 Cob Hill Farms, 51
 Colorado, 35-36, 45
 conflict resolution, 50, 57, 63
 Conflict Resolution Center, 15
 Consortium for Peace Research and Development (COPRED), 36, 62
 Costa Rica, 50
 Council of Europe, 21, 60
 Correlates of War Project, 14
 Croatia, 21
Cultures of Peace, 47, 52-53, 61
 Dartmouth University, 17-18, 31-32, 35-37
Declaration of Principles: A Quest for Universal Peace, 8-9
 decolonization, 18
 development, 18, 20
 Development Decades, 18
 disarmament, 2, 23, 35, 60, 65
 Douglas College, 3
 Earth Charter Movement, 48
 Eastern Mennonite University, 22
 economic justice, 24, 27, 49, 55
 Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC), 28, 61
Effect of Modernization on Women's Roles, 45
 Eide, Ingrid, 34
 environment, *see* sustainable development
 environmental movement, 65
 Europe, 4-5, 10, 21-22, 41, 67
 European Union (EU), 60
 Falk, Richard, 22
 Fisk University, 7
 Fomerand, Jacques, 35
 Friends Service Committee, 10
 Friends World College, 16, 29
 future studies, 63, 66
 Galtung, Johan, 32, 34, 49
 Gandhi, Mahatma, 62
 gender, 20, 43, 61, 63
Gender, Household, and Age, 43
 Germany, 4
 George Mason University, 22
 Ghana, 10
Global Civic Cultures, 52-53
 global governance, 52
 Global Nonviolent Peace Force, 62
Governance in World Affairs, 17
 grassroots organizations (GROs), 53
 Great Depression, 3-5
 Group of 77 (G77), 56
 Hague conference, *see* Appeal for Peace
 Hanover, New Hampshire, 36-37
 Harvard University, 22
 Hawaii, 57

- Hawkes, Jacquette, 18
 Hayden, Tom, 15
 Hester, Jim, 29
 Hill, Reuben, 11-12
 Hillside, New Jersey, 3
 Hillside Rotary Club, 4
 Hiroshima, Japan, 27
 bombing of, 27
History of Mankind, 18
 Hitler, Adolph, 5
 Homer-Dixon, Thomas, 48, 55
 Honduras, 29
 human rights, 24, 27, 55, 59, 61
 and NGOs, 24
 human rights movement, 49
 human security, 48, 51-52
 ideas, 20, 21, 24-25, 47, 55-56, 59, 63-65
 and coalition-building, 65
 and eminent persons reports, 25
 and global ad hoc conferences, 47
 and interagency competition, 55-56
 and international non-governmental organizations,
 20
 and non-governmental organizations, 24
 and North-South relations, 21, 56
 and public policy, 63
 and UN leadership, 59
Image of the Future, 43, 63
 India, 10, 22, 33, 51
 Indian Ocean Zone of Peace, 33
Ingenuity Gap, 48
Institut National de la Recherche Agronomique
 (INRA), 30
 Institute for Advanced Studies (Princeton), 7
 Institute on Conflict Resolution and Ethnicity, 32
 inter-governmental organizations, (IGOs), 17, 52
 International Alert, 22, 58
 International Christian University, 44
 International Commission for the Study of
 Communications Problems, 26
 International Council on Scientific Unions (ICSU),
 24, 60
 International Consultative Committee on Peace
 Research, 9-10
 International Fellowship of Reconciliation, 58
 International Labour Organization (ILO), 60, 61
 international non-governmental organizations
 (INGOs), 52
 International Peace Academy, 34
 International Peace Research Association (IPRA), 8-
 10-11, 36, 42, 49-50, 62
 Institute for Research on the Advancement of
 Women (INSTRAW), 46-47
 International Sociological Association, 42
 International Studies Association, 42
 International Women's Tribune, 41
 International Women's Year, 40
 International Year of Cooperation, 29, 40-42
 Iowa, 12
 Iowa State College, 7
 Iraq, 27
 Israel, 20
 Italy, 10
 Japan, 10-11, 30, 44
 Japanese Peace Research Association, 30
 Kansas, 40
 Katz, Dean, 14
 Kennedy, John Fitzgerald, 15-16
 Kettering Foundation, 63
 Keynes, John Maynard, 4
 Kosovo, 27
 bombing of, 27
 Latin America, 22, 30, 33, 60
 League of Nations, 3-4, 7-8, 11
 Levering, Murial, 60
 Levering, Samuel, 60
Limits to Growth, 28, 50
 London, UK, 22
 Lyons, Gene, 35
 Maplewood, New Jersey, 4
Many Voices, One World (McBride report), 25-26
 Masini, Eleanora, 43
 Matsumaga, Spark, 57
 Mayor, Frederico, 22, 39
 M'Bow, Amadou-Lahtar, 39
 McBride report; *see Many Voices, One World*
 McNamara, Marguerite, 13
 McNamara, Robert, 13
 Mead, Margaret, 40, 42
 Meadows, Dana, 17, 25, 51
 Meadows, Donella, 50
 Mediterranean region, 21
 Mendlovitz, Saul, 22
 Menninger, Cathy, 40
 Menninger Clinic, 40
 Mexico, 29
 Mexico City, 46; *see also* UN World Conference of
 the International Women's Year
 Michigan, 9
 Mushakoji, Kinhide, 29, 32, 38
 Myrdal, Alva, 60
 Nagasaki, Japan, 27
 bombing of, 27
 Nashville, Tennessee, 7
 Needham, Massachusetts, 1, 40
 Ness, Gale, 45
 Netherlands, 11, 26
 New International Economic Order (NIEO), 56
 Newcomb, Ted, 14
 New England Peace Studies Association, 17
 New Jersey College for Women, 3
 New World Information Order, 26

- New York, New York, 2, 29
Newark Evening News, 4
 Nigeria, 39
 non-governmental organizations (NGOs), 16, 20, 22-24, 27, 36, 39, 41, 53, 55, 57, 60, 61
 and corporations, 24
 and peace studies, 36
 and sustainable development, 24
 as originators of peacekeeping theory, 22
 nonviolence movement, 49
 North Africa, 43
 North America, 61-62, 67
 North American Treaty Organization (NATO), 26
 North Korea, 20
North-South: A Programme for Survival, 25-26
 North-South Centre, 21, 60
 North-South relations, 56
 Norway, 1-3, 5
 and peace activism, 1-2
 invasion of, 2-3, 5
 nuclear arms, 24, 33, 40, 52
 Nuclear Free Zone Movement, 33
 Nurske, Ragnar, 8
 Obasanjo, Olusegun, 39
One Small Plot of Heaven: Reflections on Family Life by a Quaker Sociologist, 45
 Organization of African Unity (OAU), 60
 Organization of Peace, 28-29
Our Common Future (Brundtland report), 26
 Pakistan, 33
 Palestine, 20
 Paris, France, 29
 Park, Robert, 7
 Peace Corps, 15
 peacekeeping, 58, 65
 and women, 58
 peace movement, 12
 peace research movement, 49
 peace studies, 17, 35-38, 62
 peacekeeping, 22
 Pelindaba Treaty on the Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in Africa, 33
 Peru, 30
 Polak, Fred, 43, 63
 Poland, 10
 population, 25, 54-55
 Port Huron Statement, 15
 Powell, Colin, 58
Prehistory and the Beginning of Civilization, 18
 Princeton University, 7
 Public Conversations Project, 63
 Pugwash Conferences on Science and World Affairs, 60
 Quakerism, 2, 5-7, 10, 12-13, 15, 20, 29
 Ralph Bunche Institute, 35
 restorative justice movement, 65
 Rieser, Leonard, 35
 Rikhye, Indar, 34
 Rivlin, Ben, 35
 Rocky Mountains, 45
 Röling, Bert, 10-11
 Röling, Liber, 10
 Rome, Italy, 43
 Roosevelt, Eleanor, 40, 61
 Rotblat, Joseph, 60
 Sakamoto, Yoshikazu, 22
 Salzburg Seminars, 13
 Saunders, Harold, 63
 Scandinavia, 10, 26, 49
 Scrimshaw, Nevin, 31-32
 security, evolving notions of, 48-49, 58
 Selma, Alabama, 12
 Shiva, Vandana, 51, 67
 Singer, Dave, 14
 Soedjatmoko, 30
 Somavia, Juan, 60, 61
 South Korea, 20
 South Orange High School, 4
 Soviet Union, 30, 43
 Spain, 10
 Stockholm, Sweden, 23, 49, 66; *see also* UN Conference on the Human Environment
 Strong, Maurice, 23
 Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), 15
 Sustainability Institute, 51
 sustainable development, 24, 27, 49, 54, 60, 63-66
 Sweden, 2
 Syracuse, 2, 5
 Syracuse Peace Council, 5
 Syracuse University, 6
 Soviet Union, 10
 Tanzania, 67
 Taylor, Harold, 29
 technology, 66
 Tennyson, Alfred Lord, 15
Terra Viva, 21
 Third World, 45
 women's fertility in, 45
 Thomas, Norman, 5
 Tlatelolco Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, 33, 60
 TRANSCEND (Peace and Development Organisation for Conflict Transformation by Peaceful Means), 32
 Treaty of Versailles, 4
Twentieth Century: 1914 to the Present, 18
 UN Commission on Disarmament, 60
 UN Conference on the Human Environment, 23, 49
 UN Conference on the Law of the Sea, 60
 UN Decade for a Culture of Peace and Non-Violence, 27
 UN Educational, Scientific, and Cultural

- Organization (UNESCO), 10-11, 16, 18-19, 22, 27-28, 35, 38-39, 41, 56, 59
- Culture of Peace Program, 27
- Peace Messenger Program, 39
- UN General Assembly, 29, 40
- UN Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR), 32-34
- UN Institute of Peace (USIP), 34, 57
- UN Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR), 29, 34, 56, 60
- UN Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD), 60
- UN Security Council, 58
- UN staffing considerations, 59
- UN University (UNU), 16, 28-29, 30-33, 35, 38, 43, 50, 56
- UN World Conference of the International Women's Year, 41, 43
- UN Year of Peace, 39
- Underside of History: A View of Women Through Times*, 46, 51
- United for a Fair Economy, 17
- United Kingdom (U.K.), 6
- United States (U.S.), 1, 3-4, 6, 19, 22, 26-27, 33, 39, 56-57, 61
 - and international leadership, 61
 - and reparations for African-Americans, 27
 - bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki by, 27
- United States Academy of Peace, 57
- United States Congress, 57
- United States State Department, 57
- University for Peace, 50
- University of Colorado, 28, 35
- University of Michigan, 8, 14-16, 28, 43, 45
- University of Ulster, 32
- University Quest for Peace, 50
- urban renewal, 13
- Urquidi, Victor, 29
- Vietnam, 12, 16
- Vikings, 2
- von Trapp Family, 5
- Ware, Caroline, 18
- Washington, D.C., 13, 57
- Watertown, MA, 63
- Williams, Jody, 60
- World Futures Studies Federation, 43
- women, 40-43, 45, 51, 58, 61
 - and peace networks, 40-41
 - and peacekeeping, 58
 - and population, 45
 - and sustainable development, 51
 - and the UN University, 43
 - and work, 61
 - violence against, 41-42, 61
- Women Strike for Peace, 40, 44
- Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (WLFPP), 8-10, 41, 46
- women's movement, 41-42, 46, 49, 51, 61
 - and evolving notions of security, 49
- Women's Tribunal on Crimes Against Women, 41
- World Conference on Religion and Peace, 20
- World Council of Churches (WCC), 20
- World Cultural Development Decades, 18, 56
- World Institute for Development Economics Research (WIDER), 30, 32
- World Order Models Project (WOMP), 22
- World Parliament of Religions, 20
- World Watch Institute, 54
- World War II, 27
- Young, Oran, 17
- Zone of Peace, 52