kenneth boulding and the peace research movement

cynthia kerman

The peace research move-
ment is a kind of interface
between the peace movement
and general social science re-
search. Its positive motiva-
tion, like that of the peace
movement, comes from a
social concern to see the dev-
astation of war eliminated
from man's experience. Its
practitioners, however, and
its tools and methods come
directly from the social sci-
ences. It works with sample
surveys, content analysis, sim-
ulation, statistical treatments
of past wars, intercultural
comparisons of belief systems,
images and behaviors. It uses
theoretical models drawn

> The origin of this book in my own mind
> can be traced back to a passionate conviction
> of my youth that war was the major moral
> and intellectual problem of our age. If the
> years have made this conviction less passion-
> ate, they have made it no less intense . . . .
> In particular, this work is the result of a
> conviction that the intellectual chassis of
> the broad movement for the abolition of
> war has not been adequate to support the
> powerful moral engine which drives it and
> that the frequent breakdowns which inter-
> rupt the progress of the movement are due
> essentially to a deficiency in its social theory.
>
> Kenneth Boulding, Preface to
> *Conflict and Defense: A General
> Theory* (New York, 1962), vii

from economics, social psychology, sociology, psychology, political science,
game theory and operational research.

The leading professional journal in the field of peace research is *The
Journal of Conflict Resolution,* published at the University of Michigan;
and its birth, together with that of the Center for Research on Conflict
Resolution, may fairly be said to mark the establishment of the peace
research movement. It came, like any movement, at its particular inter-
section of the appropriate personalities and the opportune moment in
history.

149

In the winter of 1954-1955, shivering American liberals, pacifists and internationalists found few coals of comfort in current events. The reality of nuclear devastation had been facing the world for nine years. The Korean War, hard on the heels of World War II, had been brought to an unsatisfactory close just the preceding year; and the Cold War threatened to burst at any moment into World War III. The shadow of Joseph McCarthy lay over the land; purges and loyalty oaths and the ugly winds of suspicion were the order of the day, although the Senate censure of McCarthy in December of 1954 gave some promise of a new direction.

In that year at Palo Alto, California, were gathered the inaugural group of scholars at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences (CASBS). Selected psychologists, economists, biologists, mathematicians, anthropologists and political scientists had come for a year of thought, study and interaction on the sun-washed hills above San Francisco Bay. Out of this confluence of minds, enthusiasm and resources, in reaction against the dreary prospect of events in the world, was catalyzed the peace research movement. It was an effort to use the quantitative, technical tools that had produced a system that seemed bent on destruction in order to transform that system into one that worked for man.

Some of the ingredients for peace research already had been brought together. Since 1950 (the year McCarthy began his anti-Communist campaign) a few young psychologists led by Herbert Kelman and Arthur Gladstone had been putting out a no-budget newsletter called "Bulletin of Research Exchange on Prevention of War." Its editing had been transferred in 1953 to two graduate students, Robert Hefner and William Barth at the University of Michigan, who were scrounging supplies and putting it out in a photo-offset format from the psychology office. They had interested a group of faculty members, including psychologist Daniel Katz and sociologist Robert Angell, in working with them. The economist Kenneth Boulding, though he was there and had been a lifetime pacifist and peace movement supporter, was not especially involved at the beginning.

In the early months of that academic year at CASBS, Stephen Richardson, a junior scholar there, had been sharing microfilm copies of his father's pioneering studies on the quantification of historical data on arms races and wars. These had been written by Lewis Richardson in the 1920's, but had received no recognition and were available only on microfilm in 1954.[1] Kenneth Boulding, Anatol Rapoport the mathematical biologist, and others at CASBS became immensely excited by reading these studies and seeing what could be done with such a technique. (Boulding now refers to those who read Lewis Richardson on microfilm as the "Early Church" of the peace research movement.) When Kelman, also at CASBS for that year, called together a group of socially concerned scholars to consider his "Bulletin" and how it could be im-

150

proved, it was like a puff of wind on a smoldering fire. The potential they had seen in studies such as Lewis Richardson's blazed into flame with the idea of transforming the Bulletin into a more ambitious inter-disciplinary journal, to establish peace research as a professional activity.

In one of Boulding's figurative images, the hand of fate is daily reaching into a bowl containing many white balls and one black one. The white balls represent continuing life as we know it; the black, nuclear destruction. "There is a race between knowledge and disaster," as he puts it, "but in this race the longer disaster is staved off, the better chance we have of acquiring the knowledge to prevent it altogether." Here was a way to encourage investment in this crucial kind of knowl-edge.

Dry kindling was all about them; they were well placed in the midst of prestigious experts. The initial list of sponsors included political scientist Harold Lasswell, anthropologist Clyde Kluckhohn and biolo-gist Ralph Gerard from CASBS personnel, as well as Boulding, Kelman and Rapoport; with this kind of backing they found they could get others. It seemed natural to center the operation at Michigan, with Boulding already there and Rapoport going there, and to ask Hefner and Barth to begin the legwork for the larger journal. Kelman continued in a consul-tative role, and several years later came into a closer working arrange-ment when he also joined the faculty at Michigan.

At a meeting in Ann Arbor in the fall or winter of 1955, the title for the new journal was chosen, *Journal of Conflict Resolution.* By now Boulding was a leading figure in the new movement. He concentrated on the topic of conflict in a faculty seminar in the spring of 1956; he solicited articles for the early issues almost singlehandedly; and he and Barth were the primary fundraisers. Barth and Hefner moved their operations to a small anteroom outside Boulding's office. Although they had succeeded in getting a small grant from the Graduate School to get it started, there remained the problem of finding a department at Michi-gan willing to adopt the infant. The winds of the McCarthy era were still blowing and the effort was viewed with a certain suspicion. The political scientists did not feel any particular calling to open their field to intrusion by outsiders from other specialties, and some officials of the University did not think the venture appropriate. Finally Wesley Maurer of the Journalism Department agreed to give it his department's sponsor-ship and the Journal was born, the first issue coming out in March, 1957.

Even then there was grave danger of infant mortality. When they began they had funds enough for two issues and took subscriptions for the first year. At the end of that year they had three issues out and paid for, and no way in sight to pay for the fourth. The editors and man-agers had just decided to go out of business and were filing down the stairs from Boulding's office when there came a phone call from a woman Barth had talked to, who had a small foundation and had decided

to give her last thousand dollars of foundation money to the *Journal*. Boulding ran to the top of the stairs and called the committee back, and they were in business again.

And so the *Journal* did not die. It has not yet reached its final goal, stated in Boulding's editorial in the first issue, to "devise an intellectual engine of sufficient power to move the greatest problem of our time—the prevention of war." But it has achieved its immediate purpose of becoming a professional organ where the theories and research of psychologists, sociologists, political scientists, economists and others could be shared, focusing around the issue of conflict in many forms, and serving as a general exchange of theories and data in the area of international systems. Boulding has continued on the editorial board, and was the *Journal's* intellectual leader in the early years, gathering articles and stimulating research.

The Journal of Conflict Resolution has succeeded in carving out a place for peace research as a new field of scholarship, in which several companions have since joined it. A Peace Research Institute was founded in Oslo in 1959 under the leadership of Johan Galtung, and it started publishing the *Journal of Peace Research* in 1964. Walter Isard in Philadelphia set in motion an annual conference on peace research in 1963, and the proceedings of this group, the Peace Research Society (International), have been published regularly since 1964. And since 1967, *Peace Research Reviews,* edited in Ontario by Alan and Hanna Newcombe, has published a series of topical issues, each gathering together relevant research findings on a selected question.

Just after the *Journal* was rescued as it teetered on the edge of oblivion, there was a further gift to the struggling peace research group at Michigan. Another potential donor to whom Barth had talked inherited a million dollars and decided to give $100,000 of it for peace research, $65,000 of that going to Michigan. This gift did not go just for the *Journal*. By that time the nucleus of interested faculty who had been working on the *Journal,* with Boulding as a pivotal figure, had developed another idea: a Center which would stimulate and encourage research and learning in this new area—conflict and ways of managing it. They had drawn up a proposal for establishing such a center at the University of Michigan, and with this sizeable gift they were able to reach an agreement with the University. This amount was to start the Center and provide research support for three years, and after that the University would continue to support it with a full-time salary for the assistant director and half-time for the director. Boulding and Robert Angell shared the directorship through most of the Center's life, with William Barth serving as assistant or associate director. Funding for secretaries, supplies and any special research always had to be found elsewhere. The Ford Foundation and the Carnegie Corporation have been the two largest supporters of the work of the Center, with the National Science Foundation also

funding considerable research. The Regents gave formal approval to the agreement on June 26, 1959, and the Center for Research on Conflict Resolution began operating in July, embarking on a program of conferences and seminars, research and training. Twelve years later, in July, 1971, in a general economy move, the University of Michigan unfortunately saw fit to terminate its support of the Center, so its life in that form has ended. The *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, however, continues to be published.

The Center for Research on Conflict Resolution has served as an institutional base for pioneering studies, resulting in publications such as *Disarmament and the Economy*,[2] the landmark documentation of the potential for depression-less conversion from a defense economy to a peacetime economy, and Boulding's theoretical analysis of many models of conflict, *Conflict and Defense*.[3] In the vanguard of current problem-oriented interdisciplinary approaches, it has drawn students and faculty from many related disciplines to conduct research under its wing.

II

What, then, has been the focus of peace research through its relatively short history? As a clue, we may turn to the pages of the *Journal of Conflict Resolution*. The purpose of the *Journal* is best transmitted through its editorial statement, practically unchanged over the years:

> . . . to stimulate and communicate systematic research and thinking on international processes, including the total international system, the interactions among governments and among nationals of different states, and the processes by which nations make and execute their foreign policies. It is our hope that theoretical and empirical efforts in this area will help in minimizing the use of violence in resolving international conflicts.
>
> The editors believe that concepts, data, and methods from all of the social and behavioral sciences are needed for the understanding of problems in this field and for the development of a systematic body of knowledge. Moreover, we believe that relevant insights can be derived from analyses of interaction and conflict, not only directly at the international level, but also at other levels of social organization . . . . The *Journal* publishes . . . reports of empirical research (basic or applied), theoretical analyses, critical reviews, as well as speculative or programmatic papers with a systematic focus.

We see here an attempt to funnel insights and findings from the many branches of social science into the problem of conquering or controlling war. "Conflict resolution is social technology," as the long-term managing editor, Elizabeth Converse, put it, "and should be based on social science."

The content of the *Journal* over its first twelve years included, as one

area of emphasis, studies of national decision-making. How are national decisions made; is it a rational or an irrational process; what are the variables and factors involved; how effective is the communication leading to decision? Studies in this field have included analyses of the attitudes of various leadership groups, of public "war-mindedness," of the relations between leaders and led, and of personality types and persons in stress conditions in their relationship to policy decisions. One experimental game reported, for instance, showed personal "hawkishness" to be related not to aggressiveness or deceitfulness but more to cautiousness and conservatism.[4]

A related area receiving much attention is that of bargaining. Bargaining represents a non-war or constructive way of handling conflict. The concentration naturally has been on international bargaining, but many articles have moved toward a general theory of bargaining. Continuing empirical findings in game theory have been evaluated for their real-life significance for international bargaining. The "Prisoner's Dilemma" game has received the most repeated study since it puts players in a situation where they can choose to compete or cooperate, and each has to guess the other's attitude in order to optimize his own gains. The choice of cooperation is risky: one can lose more by this, but also gain more. The parallel with the international "game" is obvious. Conflict within a group and between groups and how these patterns differ have also been examined, as well as the role of a third party in a conflict situation and its possible applications to the international field (that is, an international peace-keeping organization or some kind of arbitrator).

Wars in general—the actual occurrences of wars and the events leading up to them—have been minutely and quantitatively examined, but here the traditional approaches (the general historical studies of past wars and their effects, or of international trade-linked economic causations) have been significantly absent. How nations choose or stumble into war seems to have been the peace-research concentration; what happens after that, peace researchers leave to the historians. Many articles have dealt with detailed problems, technological and psychological, related to arms control. Whether man *has* choice or control in matters of war and peace was found in several studies to be a culturally differing question, which has interesting implications for international planning.[5]

The peculiarities of international systems have been examined in the *Journal's* pages; the perception of "systemicity" in the world of nations is a distinguishing mark of its peace-research orientation. This involves considering nations as "actors" with varying "attributes" and examining the exchanges of goods and behaviors among them. Perhaps we could spell this out in more detail, drawing on Kenneth Boulding's description of what he calls the "international-systems" approach to learning about what happens between nations. In large part, this sums

154

up his view of the theory aimed at by peace research and of the ways this theory might get intellectual purchase to unscrew from man's history the ancient rusty bolt of international violence.

In the first place, such a system is Copernican. That is, it is viewed as a totality, as if from the outside, not from the point of view of any one nation. Second, it is parametric. This implies the mutual interaction of a large number of variables rather than a simple cause-effect relationship. Third, it does not limit itself to equilibrium models but recognizes the dynamic and cumulative processes in operation. Fourth, it is institutional: the sociological and anthropological effects of organizations, symbolic elements and cultural habits are taken into account, and a wide variety of behavioral principles allowed for. Fifth, it looks not only at the characteristics of the actors in the drama but also at the forms of relations and transactions between them. Sometimes it may even abstract so far as to look at the transactions as if the actors were not there. And sixth, it is aggregative; that is, it looks for ways to condense large masses of heterogeneous information into useful quantitative indices, as the economists have done with the cost-of-living index.[6]

Many difficult conflict-related concepts such as violence, power, utility, rationality, consensus and guilt have been presented in casual use or rigorous analysis in the pages of the *Journal*. The total corpus of this work, built as it is on varying assumptions and disciplines and points of view, does not make up any unified theory of conflict or its resolution, but certainly goes far toward forming the beginning of such a theory. Just gathering various models into one place facilitates their comparison and usefulness.[7] Before the dynamics of conflict can be spelled out, the significant variables have to be abstracted: the types of parties, the types of interactions, the types of objectives. Even what is to be included in the term "conflict"—how broad or narrow a segment of human behavior— is not agreed on. But to those dedicated to the process, as with any social science, there must be a broad area of messiness, of trial and error, of all sorts of theoretical approaches, of wide-ranging sampling of the multiplicity of human behavior, before there can be much narrowing to pattern or certainty. Empirically observing behavior; examining what people do in a given situation; processing data through the intellectual, theoretical, rational mold; and insisting on learning prior to doing are the distinguishing marks of the peace research movement as against the peace movement.

The "social-scientific revolution in the international system," as Boulding terms it, which can be identified with the peace research movement, depends on a group of scholars who combine a moral commitment to stable peace with a devotion to the intellectual method. Among them will surely be those (to use here a limited, purely quantitative measure) who have contributed the largest number of articles to the *Journal of Conflict Resolution* in its first twelve years: Anatol Rapoport, David

Singer, Kenneth Boulding, Inis Claude, Elton McNeil, Bruce Russett and Quincy Wright. Boulding, in referring to the development of theoretical insights in the international systems field, mentions Lewis Richardson, Quincy Wright, Thomas Schelling, Karl Deutsch, David Singer, Charles McClelland, Robert North, Morton Kaplan "and others among whom I might include myself." There is an overlap in theory development, however, between the peace researchers and the strategic theorists such as Schelling and Herman Kahn. The methods of looking at the material are similar, but the main difference is in the choice of problems and in the constraints programmed into the stipulations.

> At many points peace research and national security research overlap. In these days, certainly nobody regards war as anything but a cost to be minimized in the interest of certain other values. Nevertheless, there is a difference between those who regard it as a tolerable cost and those who regard it as an intolerable one.[8]

It would be well, perhaps, to look at some of the personal factors that bring a man in one direction or another. It is a reasonable assumption that this combination of a moral, emotional response with an intellectual way of dealing with a problem belongs to a particular personality package containing a strong double thrust of moral outrage and intellectual commitment. The background and events that brought Kenneth Boulding to his position in the peace research movement provide an appropriate case history of one of its major figures.

III

A careful examination of the people and organizations surrounding Kenneth Boulding in his youth must lead one to conclude that it was not the pull of "significant others" nor "reference groups" that led him to his deep and lasting commitment to pacifism or nonviolence. Neither of his parents was a pacifist; his church, the English Methodist chapel, did not preach it; none of his good friends endorsed it as thoroughly as he; none of his teachers taught it. Pacifism was a wispy, almost invisible thread in the culture he grew up in, which was the port city of Liverpool in the second decade of this century. Yet as a young boy he found it and made it his own. A private inner response to large outward events, without the mediation of familiar people, must have characterized the process.

Boulding was four years old when World War I began. The war had an immense impact on him, both direct and indirect. His father, a plumbing and heating contractor, had a business office in the inner city of Liverpool. But the family in a time of relative prosperity had taken a house across the River Mersey, in the Liverpool equivalent of the suburbs, where they had a tree and a garden, green things around them, salt air and beaches nearby for sand castles. But with the coming of the

war, the decline of his father's business forced the little family back to the rooms above the business in the inner city, a row house whose only yard was a covered pavement in the back, full of heating equipment. It was a move from openness, freedom and light to constriction, crowded living and dirty pavements; and both young Kenneth and his mother (a country girl who had always felt pent up in Liverpool) were completely miserable at the move. It is likely that when he asked "why?" as a child of four must do, he was told, "Because of the war." "The war" could well have assumed the proportions of a personal enemy from that moment.

There were other less direct war-borne experiences. His father was not accepted for the army, but his uncle was conscripted and later returned with permanent damage from shell shock. Cousins, friends and neighbors of the family were killed or maimed, and Mrs. Boulding was often called on to do the comforting. Once she took small Kenneth with her (he was eight or nine) to visit her aunt, who had lost her reason shortly after a son was killed. It was a frightening experience for him, and would have increased the negative emotional freight carried by the image of "war." The military system impressed him as fantastically intrusive, taking away the autonomy of private lives, the terribly important right of making choices.

In addition, there was an individual reason for Boulding's seeking other than violent methods of settling conflict: he was not well coordinated physically, was frequently sick, and found his mental equipment far superior to his physical capacity to resist aggression. And, with his thorough grounding in the Bible in a church-centered family, a logical little boy could find strong support for his nonviolent inclinations in the Sermon on the Mount.

Very early, then, and almost independently, Kenneth Boulding came to his personal commitment to pacifism. By the time he was about fifteen, he was publicly espousing the cause of the League of Nations against that of the military, both vocally and in his school paper. At about the same time he made a lifetime pledge to Christianity. This took the shape of formally joining the Methodist Church; but in his search for a deeper expression of the experience of worship, and at the same time for the roots of the Christian pacifist position, he sought out and began attending the local Quaker Meeting. He became a Quaker during his college years. This was an institutional connection which could bolster the antiwar position he had adopted, and it was also a place where he found an extension of his religious experience which did not conflict with his deepening intellectual grasp on the world.

From the beginning, the intellectual mode was the one in which Boulding could best respond to his environment. Not very good at locomotion or reaching out physically, he reached out mentally. He was good at arguing, asking questions and thinking things out. He was an only child and an only grandchild, so that surrounded by an adult world

157

he had to learn early to interpret and use adult communication. Hampered by an incapacitating stutter and a rejecting slum-school first experience of education, he was fortunate in having parents who, though of working-class background and very little income, valued his potential and the process of education enough to find a better school that would accept him. From the time he was nine, his teachers worked with him to prepare him for the series of examinations that won him scholarships, first to secondary school and then to Oxford. His continuing intellectual excellence brought him repeated scholarships for graduate work at Oxford and then at the University of Chicago.

There was a considerable inner battle in the adolescent Kenneth Boulding between the attraction of the exact sciences and that of literature and philosophy. He had high ability in both and went to Oxford on a scholarship in chemistry. At the end of his first year, finding the laboratory deadening and the pull of the literary very strong, he changed fields to Politics, Philosophy and Economics, with his main work concentrated in economics. In later years his concentration has broadened to touch on all these fields. The social sciences, to which he has given his professional life, are in a way a combining of his bent for science with the humanism and respect for life which he endorsed so early.

IV

The ideas which he developed in the area of international systems and peace research have been sophisticated and refined over time, but it is surprising to find how many of them echo thoughts he expressed very early. They are founded on enduring attitudes about man and his place in the world. As they have continued through his life, they have carried three major themes: man is good; the war system is evil; more powerful knowledge is the way of transforming the system. On each of these themes he found in the surrounding culture some supporters and some detractors. The Quaker tenet of the potential goodness in all men has been shared through the years by liberal Social Gospelers and Christian pacifists, but it stands in contrast to the conviction of original sin on which the Constitution of the U.S. was built and to the garden-variety of this belief reflected in the saying, "We'll always have wars because you can't change human nature." Its corollary, that it is the system which gives man trouble, particularly the national state in all its ramifications, has its swelling ranks of supporters today within the counter-culture. With the third theme, however, that of the route to salvation through knowledge, much of the counter-culture would part company. Here Boulding makes a strange alliance for a humanist, for he is not speaking of traditional wisdom but of technical, quantitative, hard-data knowledge, the kind that inventors and engineers and space-station builders use, the kind that has produced our burgeoning technocracy—but he wants this knowledge applied to social forces.

158

Beyond the high school and college essays, Boulding's first published international-systems writing was a pamphlet called *Paths of Glory*. An explanation of the nonviolent method of defense, it was published in 1937 by the Northern Friends Peace Board, a Quaker committee which concentrated on peace education. Boulding served on this committee while working at his first teaching job at the University of Edinburgh. In 1937, in the United States for a Quaker conference, he was offered a job at Colgate University and made the momentous decision to leave Britain, at least for a trial year. Part of his reason for being attracted to America was his sense of its openness to new and better kinds of social organization, its looseness, plurality and humanness in contrast to his experience of class constrictions in England and the kind of traditional rigidities that left only one way of doing anything. He hoped, too, for a minimizing of the sacredness of the state which a long tradition of divine right of kings had helped to implant. The year became a lifetime.

World War II, subjecting all his school friends and his relatives to bombardment and the continual terror of invasion, put a heavy strain on his pacifism. In the teeth of Hitler's unbelievable affronts to human life and dignity, it became harder and harder for him to cling to his commitment to love his enemies. Only a kind of mystical experience that came to him at a time when hate was almost overwhelming brought him back to a sense of kinship with all men in suffering, sin and hope. He came again to the certainty, as he put it in a sonnet he wrote at about that time, "though love is weak and hate is strong,/Yet hate is short, and love is very long."[9]

Teaching and writing in the field of economics, he carried on at the same time his inner struggle to preserve his love for mankind, poured out in a series of sonnets written over the war years and published as *There is a Spirit: The Nayler Sonnets* (1945). All of his best friends who joined him in pacifism in adolescence rejected the stand when war came, and some rejected him for clinging to it. But stubbornly he stuck to his themes of the goodness of man, the evil in the system, and the logical arguments against war. In a 1942 pamphlet, *New Nations for Old,* he argued for the early end of the war system on two counts, its moral cost and its financial cost: its increasing horror and increasing unprofitability. He did not expect men to become perfect but did not feel this was necessary. The key to his hope was the proposition "that war, as a specific human institution, is the result not of conflicts, nor of human wickedness, but of the political organization of the world into a number of separate, sovereign and irresponsible countries."[10] As he pointed out, there are ways to handle conflicts and wickedness (as is normally done within a country), without war: "the trouble with the world has not been so much a lack of good will, as a lack of knowledge as to how to make good will effective." Consequently, he recommended an international organization not with a military function but as a center

of research and information, a clearing house for statistics and a place for administration of practical problems. The major obstacle he saw was the lack of a sense of responsibility for people outside one's own borders. It was the concept of the sacredness of the nation which got in the way of the needed extension of the sense of community.

Here already were two of the elements which run through all his succeeding writing on the subject: the view that the national state is obsolete and the reliance on research, statistics and information as a way out of reliance on military force. The third constant ,present in the 1942 pamphlet and strikingly brought out in another pamphlet in 1967, is taking man as he is—believing he wants pretty much the right things—and concentrating the effort in making the system work for him, not against him.[11]

Boulding pointed out the obsolescence of the national state as early as 1931 in a prize essay at New College, Oxford. The echoes of this theme have sounded through articles and books to the present; and in *Conflict and Defense* he refined and extended it. Sovereignty depends on the ability to protect from attack. There used to be an area of safety for each country where the cost of transporting violence was too great for an attacking country. But the increasing range of the projectile has effectively reduced the distance between countries, and the increased efficiency of warheads makes it possible to pack incalculable destruction into one missile, so that no nation any longer has an area it can protect: "we can only continue to have a world of separate nations if none of them wants to upset the existing structure, for none can be defended." Boulding's perception of the shaky condition of the national state as an institution, an intuition based on moral and economic grounds in 1931, was documented in 1962 by a theory of conflict and data about man's technical progress. When the range of the deadly missile is half the diameter of the earth, sovereignty becomes, in fact, a fiction.

The vision of the state as the servant, not the master, of man is clearly Boulding's point of view. When an organization ceases to serve, it should cease to exist and not be propped up with false legitimacy.

> The nation-state can no longer be treated as a sacred institution; there must be a deflation of the emotions and values that attach to it, a decline, if you will, in the passion with which people love their countries and an acceptance of the nation-state and the nation-state system as essentially mundane institutions designed solely for public convenience.[12]

If one views war not as the inevitable result of the conflict of human interests but as the rupture of an existing social system, then it is wise to find ways to identify the stresses and strains that can lead to such a break. One such effort has been Boulding's exploration of the theory that wars tend to happen when one country overtakes another in power, a factor closely related to the per capita GNP. If this could be demonstrated,

then the overtakes in GNP—which can be roughly predicted from collectable data—would give a considerable clue to coming stress points. There are no doubt other kinds of data which put together would greatly sharpen the effectiveness of this kind of prediction. And so Boulding gradually refined the second theme from that early pamphlet, an international clearing house for statistics.

Quincy Wright's parallel development of the concept of a "World Intelligence Center" no doubt fed into his thinking.[13] Through interchange and discussion the idea emerged for what Boulding likes to call "social data stations." These would serve as a world network of weather stations, collecting and processing data on populations, rates of economic growth, surpluses and shortages, attitudes, tension levels, shifts in power relationships of classes or groups within a country, voting trends, images which nations have of one another—all sorts of social indicators which could be put together to identify social temperature and pressure and predict cold and warm fronts. Karl Deutsch, Robert Hefner, David Singer, Bruce Russett and other peace researchers have actively worked on the identification of such social indicators.

Boulding urges the development of indices from this mass of information comparable to the economic indices of prices and national income, by which the direction of change can be identified early:

> The problem of the maintenance of peace is one of "conflict control." We are faced in international relations with dynamic processes of action and reaction in fear, armament, and in the images which nations have of one another which go either from bad to worse or from bad to better. If they go from bad to worse too long, the result is a breakdown of the system in war. The great problem of the maintenance of peace is how to identify these movements, to catch them young, and to deal with them before they become unmanageable.[14]

The situation at present, he feels, is so foggy that most international decision makers do not know when they take a step whether they are going up or down, and the information from social data stations would at least tell them which way was up.

But while Boulding was building and modifying his intellectual engine for the prevention and control of war, he was also involved in actively witnessing in response to his conscience against the system which planned and executed wars. He and his wife Elise wrote and sent out in 1942, against the advice of their friends and his employer (at that time the League of Nations Economic and Financial Section, based in New Jersey), a statement asking all peoples to renounce their national allegiances and throw down their weapons. Notified that he would be fired if he sent this out, Boulding resigned his job and made plans for an uncertain future. But the Quaker president of Fisk University invited him to the economics department there, and after a year at Fisk

Boulding went on to Iowa State College. Although ready to go to jail rather than to Civilian Public Service camp or the army, he was taken off the draft hook by being classified 4-F. During the war, while other economists were addressing themselves to the wartime economy, he was writing *The Economics of Peace,* aimed at the problems of reconstruction and development. He fought a legal battle to become naturalized as a U.S. citizen—till then denied to pacifists—which he won in 1948 without taking the oath to bear arms.

This was not the end of the moral hurdles related to war and peace. In April, 1958, in response to continued nuclear testing, Boulding initiated a "vigil" by the flagpole in the center of the University of Michigan campus, as a symbolic act of penitence and non-consent. In 1960 he stood in front of the Pentagon in another protest vigil with a thousand other Quakers. In April, 1961, he turned down an appealing offer of a visiting lectureship in Hawaii because it required a stringent loyalty oath. He gave the Students for a Democratic Society in their early days a good deal of inspiration and encouragement; for a time the SDS shared office space with the Center for Research on Conflict Resolution (in the old ROTC building!). In March, 1965, he helped to plan and conduct the first "teach-in" on the Vietnam war, in which between two and three thousand students spent all night talking, listening and debating; it was a meaningful alternative to the threatened strike against classes during the day. An observer, Rose Kelman, reports her memory of that occasion:

> The night of the first teach-in—do you remember?—it was about 12:30, black night and bitter cold, and the bomb scare and everything, everybody out on the quad—and Kenneth was supposed to speak. And I can't remember anything else about it but these words: "I see a sneer across the face of America . . . and I don't like it." I don't know if I heard anything after that.

Boulding found ways from time to time to reach into officialdom: to testify before a Congressional committee, to bring facts and moral issues about Vietnam to a talk with a governor. In the fall of 1966 the Boulding protest was turned to the political process when Elise Boulding was asked to serve as a write-in peace candidate for Congress, and Kenneth worked with her on her campaign.

And yet the war went on. There seemed to be no way to reach the decision-makers.

The "love affair with America" that drew Boulding to make his home and his citizenship here had certainly gone sour. The violence of his reactions to the war policies of the government was related to the intensity of his idealism about his chosen country in the early years. He had never fooled himself about the two faces of the national state, but he had hoped for better from the one state that had deliberately embarked on a path based on a respect for life, liberty and pursuit of happiness. On a scrap of paper with no date he jotted three bitter incomplete lines:

162

Don't love your country any more
She's a bitch, she's a bastard, she's a whore
She burns up babies, she roasts them slow . . .[15]

And yet, and yet—disillusioned, betrayed—what does one do? An irresistible, persistent nonviolence, though it brings Kenneth Boulding to despair, forbids him destruction and revolution. Whatever the roots of this nonviolence, it will not let him go. So he must part company with those who despair of peaceful protest and feel the society must be destroyed: the black militants, the Weathermen, the Communists, the New Left. The costs of violence are always in his mind, the costs of revolution: one, two or three generations to get back to the level of living that people had before. The shattering of lives, the building of the habit of violence: "Revolutions have a way of eating their own children." The counterproductiveness of uncontrolled anger has been a repeated theme of his. An anarchist who must have order, he is a revolutionary who cannot stomach revolution.

The position of nonviolence is real and active in his life. It is logical and is based on a sound conception of humanity and of the will of a loving God (if such there is). It is perhaps the only way we can thread our steps across the swinging bridge over the gulf between what is and what ought to be. But the position would be just as logical and tenable for many people who have not chosen to adopt it. Why has he?

As social psychologists Smith, Bruner and White have pointed out, attitudes or opinions serve several functions. The first one we have referred to, object appraisal as a cognitive activity; this is the commonly-understood function of perceiving and valuing elements of reality. There is also a social function for an opinion, as a vehicle by which we orient ourselves to membership groups or reference groups in our environment. The third function is psychological: attitudes serve partly as the means by which internal problems are externalized and acted out in the everyday world. A fear or a wish may quietly influence which objects we perceive in our environment; and our positive or negative attitudes toward the objects we perceive are also influenced by fears or wishes often unknown to us.[16] None of these considerations, of course, influence the validity, the rightness or the genuineness of an opinion; these qualities must be judged on other grounds. The more we can understand of the three functions, however, the better we can understand why a person believes and acts as he does.

The objective function of attitudes, as instruments with which to appraise reality, is illustrated by Boulding's systematic and polemic works. What gives his writing such insight is his habit of examining his own attitudes systematically, as working hypotheses. But they have had, as well, a socializing value for him. Boulding's pacifism helped to define his relationship to groups. It partly came out of an intensification and purification of the faith of the Methodists, and then it led him to, and

was reinforced by, his association with Quakers. Throughout his life he found like-minded people with whom to ally himself, including his colleagues in the Center for Research on Conflict Resolution and, most notably, his wife Elise.

His pacifist attitudes may also have a psychological function as a defense against aggressive tendencies, although it is possible only to make suggestions about their inner workings. Perhaps there is an observable clue to their operation in the fact that he seems to delight in shocking people with his rhetoric, although he usually cloaks the barb in humor. Sometimes, however, his indignation almost gets away from him. His hostility toward the irrational actions of militant youth recently has been more and more expressed. At times he seems to be stirred by wrath of cosmic proportions; and occasionally a colleague, and sometimes his own later, cooler judgment, has toned down a too-violent letter he has written when feeling some essential value subverted.

These are traits consonant with his childhood history and adult temperament. His early family climate, though loving, was not without strain; but it was one where the expression of hostility was definitely discouraged and where young Kenneth had in fact often to take the role of harmonizer among parents, aunts and grandparents, composing funny poems or putting on a show to set them laughing. Perhaps, at four and a half, he felt so threatened by rejection or separation when his gay and lively mother became depressed and miserable that even the awareness of hostility was too much for him to let into perception at later times. Perhaps there is something in him that he senses below the level of awareness—as there is in most of us—which would really like to rebel, to destroy, to shatter; but it has remained terribly important to him to keep it within bounds. Indeed, there is a passage in one of his books where he is discussing the high valuation we place on scarce goods, in which he states, "The violent make a religion of love." And one day in a seminar he reported an earlier conversation: "Bob Angell asked me once, 'How is it you're a Quaker and so violent?' and I answered, 'If I wasn't so violent I wouldn't have to be a Quaker.'" Some of the power of the moral outrage probably comes from this pent-up violence, and the intellectual mold into which it is poured comes from the need to hold it in bounds.

In such a case, the rebelliousness of youth, the dichotomy of our times, the looseness or freeness of life-styles in resistance to the dicta of society, the overturning of the university and the world of rational intellect, the letting in of violence as a conscious mode of behavior—all could serve as deeply unsettling movements to one who has held such forces in tenuous balance in himself over a long lifetime.

And so he has moved in the other direction. The turning point was thoughtfully marked by his 1965 article after the teach-in, "Reflections on Protest."[17] Despairing of protest, others have turned toward violence,

164

but he has turned toward knowledge. Peace research, rather than the peace movement, now looks to him like the wedge to crack the war system. The moral commitment is still strong, but irrational acts appear more and more dangerous at a time in society when all bounds are loosening and nothing seems to hold any more. The strong way, the only way, is the way of control and discipline and hard, tough knowledge. If peace research can keep honing in and building that intellectual engine to life the scourge of war off man, Boulding's hand and mind are likely to be in it.

<div align="right">Villa Julie College</div>

footnotes

1. They have since been published: Lewis Richardson, *Arms and Insecurity* (Pittsburgh, 1960), and *Statistics of Deadly Quarrels* (Chicago, 1960).

2. Kenneth Boulding and Emile Benoit, eds. (New York, 1963).

3. New York: Harper and Row, 1962 and Harper Torchbooks, 1963.

4. Marc Pilisuk, Paul Potter, Anatol Rapoport, and J. Alan Winter, "War Hawks and Peace Doves," *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, IX, 4 (1965), 491-508.

5. Robert C. Angell, Vera S. Dunham, and J. David Singer, "Social Values and Foreign Policy Attitudes of Soviet and American Elites," *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, VIII, 4 (1964), 329-491; and Zbigniew Brezinski, "Communist Ideology and International Affairs," *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, IV, 3 (1960), 266-291.

6. Boulding, *The Impact of the Social Sciences* (New Brunswick, N.J., 1966), 70-73.

7. Clinton Fink has done a masterful job of pulling together many segments of conflict theory from the history of the *Journal*, as has Elizabeth Converse in the summation of the problems treated over the years, in the special review issue of December, 1968 (XII, 4). I have depended on their summaries for my very brief capsule-history.

8. Boulding, "Social Sciences," *The Great Ideas Today*, eds., R.M. Hutchins and M. J. Adler (Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica, 1965), 278.

9. "Nor to revenge any wrong," in Boulding's one published book of poetry to date, *There is A Spirit: The Nayler Sonnets* (Nyack, N.Y., 1945), 3.

10. Both quotations in this paragraph are from *New Nations for Old*, Pendle Hill Pamphlet #17 (Wallingford, Pa., 1942).

11. Kenneth Boulding and Milton Mayer, *The Mayer/Boulding Dialogue on Peace Research*, eds., Cynthia Kerman and Carol Murphy (Wallingford, Pa., 1967).

12. Boulding, *Beyond Economics*, 299-300.

13. Quincy Wright, "Project for a World Intelligence Center," *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, I, 1 (March, 1957), 93-97.

14. Boulding, *Perspectives on the Economics of Peace*, Part I of *Economic Factors Bearing Upon the Maintenance of Peace* (New York, 1961), 23.

15. Personal papers; by permission of Kenneth Boulding.

16. M. Brewster Smith, Jerome Bruner, and Robert W. White, *Opinions and Personality* (New York, 1956).

17. *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, XXI, 8 (October, 1965), 18-20.