# Chapter 2
# Peace Research: Dialectics and Development (1972)

This article presents an analysis of the research interests of the fledgling international peace research community and gives a view of the very newly emerging (at the time) field of peace education.[1]

When scholars committed to peace and conflict research first began consciously separating themselves from the older discipline of international relations, particularly during the period of explosive development of new institutions and working groups in the late fifties and early sixties, much time was spent trying to figure out the logical basis for an essentially intuitive revolt against the "International Relations (IR) Establishment." Intuitions of a new way of thinking have a way of leaping out of the existing fields of one's conceptual structures, leaving the mind with the task of reorganizing cognitive maps. In the course of cognitive reorganization that followed on the initial intuitive leap, peace researchers elaborated so many different ways of mapping the peace research field that they acquired a somewhat illusory sense of working in an intellectual movement of enormous diversity in terms of conceptualizations and substantive interests.

At the time of the 1969 UNESCO advisory meeting of experts on peace research, Kenneth Boulding and I took the occasion to examine this assumed diversity, in an analysis of the areas covered by peace research journals and international relations journals in the previous ten years, based on an admittedly cursory survey of titles of articles published. At that time we wrote:

> Not only are there very few significant differences in the proportion of space devoted to different topics by different journals, which all follow much the general pattern with one or two rather specialized exceptions, but there is very little difference between journals which could be identified as belonging to the peace research movement and journals which could be identified as "standard." What is even more striking, there is very little evidence of any substantial trends in the proportions of space devoted to different topics in the last ten years (Boulding/Boulding 1969: 2).

---

[1]This text was first published as: "Peace Research: Dialectics and Development", *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 16(4): 469–475, December, 1972. Copyright © 1972 by SAGE Publications, Inc. Reprinted by permission of SAGE Publications, Inc.

We suggested then that possibly the actual content of that part of the social system which was being studied dominated and masked ideological differences in the researchers themselves.

Now, with the analysis of the 1972 UNESCO Peace Research Repertory data available,[2] we can reexamine this question of the homogeneity of the peace research field in the context of the study of international relations. Certainly the majority of articles in this symposium either assume or are dedicated to fostering diversity. Eide, Wernette, Stohl and Chamberlain, and Carroll are all pointing in one way or another to the issue of adjustment and repair versus radical reconstruction of the international system. Only Tanter and EI-Ayouty assume that there are tools that can be used within the existing nation-state systems; Tanter sees the tools in the hands of national policy makers, and El-Ayouty sees the tools in the hands of UN personnel and member states in their UN identity.

The great declaration of independence on the part of peace researchers from the international relations field, with its promise of new understandings and new solutions to come from a new way of conceptualizing conflict and peace, fizzled out as "the system" took over its new students. This fact has been traumatic for many scholars. The consequence is that, in the very period that complex ecological models which map behavioral events and interaction sequences onto cultural, political, and economic landscapes are being developed in a tradition that extends from Wright (1935), Sorokin (1937), and Richardson (1960) to the Holsti et al. (1968), Singer (1968), and Rummel (1968) studies [see Singer's (1970) discussion of this development], there is an ideological retreat from multivariate analysis as an establishment game.

Once again, as in the earlier, intuitively based separation from traditional international relations, there are sound instincts at work. General systems tools, which can identify conflict escalating and deescalating dynamics, also make possible the automated battlefield. Sophisticated knowledge which could have served human liberation has contributed to further oppression. The retreat from sophistication, however, can be disastrous. When we see "the man" or capitalist imperialism as the source of oppression and violence, we are back to simplistic, mono-causal explanations of war.

---

[2]See Philip Everts' article "Developments and Trends in Peace and Conflict Research, 1965–1971: A Survey of Institutions" of this issue, *Journal of Conflict Resolution* December, 1972 16(4):477–510. Other authors with articles in the same issue who are cited in this paragraph include: Berenice A. Carroll, "Peace Research: The Cult of Power" (pp. 585–616); Asbjørn Eide, "Dialogue and Confrontation in Europe" (pp. 511–522); Yassin El-Ayouty, "Peace Research and the United Nations: A Role for the World Organization" (pp. 539–553); Michael Stohl and Mary Chamberlain, "Alternative Futures for Peace Research" (pp. 523–530); Raymond Tanter, "The Policy Relevance of Models in World Politics" (pp. 555–583); and Dee R. Wernette, "Creating Institutions for Applying Peace Research" (pp. 531–538).

**Table 2.1** Rank Ordering of Preferred Research Areas by International Relations and Peace Research Journals, American Scholars, and Peace Research Institutes in the UNESCO Repertory, 1959–1971

| Research Area[1] | Int'l. Relations[2] Journals 1959–1968 | Peace Research[3] Journals 1959–1968 | American[4] Scholars 1962 | Peace Research[5] Institutes 1971 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| I. Fundamental Studies and Theories | | | | |
| A. *International Systems* | | | | |
| 1. Historical-Descriptive | 1 | 2 | 2 | – |
| 2. Quantitative-Historical | – | 9.5 | – | – |
| 3. Simulation | – | – | – | – |
| 4. Theory | 2 | 3 | 9 | – |
| B. *Crisis Research* | | | | |
| 1. Crisis Decisions | 7 | 8 | 11 | 8 |
| 2. Tension Measurement | – | – | 4 | 2 |
| C. *Conflict Studies* | | | | |
| 1. History | 6 | – | 10 | – |
| 2. Theory | 4 | 4 | 3 | 1,9 |
| 3. Small Group Experiments | – | – | – | – |
| 4. Causes of War | – | – | – | 3,7,10* |
| D. *Attitudes* | | | | |
| 1. Attitude Survey and Scales | – | 9.5 | 7 | – |
| 2. Images and Perceptions | 9 | 6.5 | 1 | – |
| 3. Attitude Change | – | – | – | – |
| E. *Research on the Future* | | | | |
| 1. General | – | – | – | – |
| 2. Disarmed but Revolutionary World | – | – | – | – |
| 3. Transition to and Nature of Stabilized World | – | – | – | – |
| F. *Integration Studies* | | | | |
| 1. Political Integration | 5 | 1 | 8 | 4 |
| 2. International NGO's | – | – | – | – |
| 3. Impact of Student Exchange | – | – | – | – |
| G. *Economic Studies* | | | | |
| 1. Conversion to a Peace Economy | – | – | 6 | – |
| 2. Economic and Technical Assistance | 8 | – | – | – |
| H. *International Law* | | | | |
| 1. General | – | 5 | – | – |
| 2. Definition of Aggression | – | – | – | – |
| 3. Codification of Co-Existence | – | – | – | – |

**Table 2.1** (continued)

| Research Area[1] | Int'l. Relations[2] Journals 1959–1968 | Peace Research[3] Journals 1959–1968 | American[4] Scholars 1962 | Peace Research[5] Institutes 1971 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| I. *Disarmament Studies* | | | | |
| 1. The Armament-Disarmament Spectrum | 3 | 6.5 | 5 | 5 |
| 2. Deterrence | 10 | – | – | 6 |
| 3. Disarmament Inspection | – | – | – | – |
| 4. UN Police Force | – | – | – | – |
| II. Action Research | | | | |
| A. *Protest Actions* | | | | |
| 1. Efficacy of Protest | – | – | – | – |
| 2. Study of Participants | – | – | – | – |
| B. *Non-Violence* | – | – | – | – |

Notes

1. H. and A. Newcombe, *Peace Research Around the World* (Clarkson, Ontario: Canadian Peace Research Institute, 1966); also see Kenneth Boulding, "Accomplishments and Prospects of the Peace Research Movement," *Arms Control and Disarmament*, 1 (1968)

2. The following six journals are included: *International Affairs* (Moscow); *Foreign Affairs. International Journal*; Issues from 1959 to 1968 for *International Affairs* (London); *Orbis*; *World Politics*

3. Issues from 1959 to 1968 for the following six journals are included: *International Studies* (India); *International Conciliation*; *Journal of Conflict Resolution: International Organizations*; *Journal of Peace Research*; *Proceedings of Peace Research Society* (*International*)

4. First-choice research interest cited in response to a questionnaire circulated by the Center for Conflict Resolution, University of Michigan, 1962

5. Ranking based on summed interest scores of Institutes engaged only in peace research (32) out of a 150 research institutes responding to the 1971 UNESCO peace research inquiry

*3-relationship between poverty and violence; 7-imperialism; 10-international economic relations

To review the pattern of research interests of peace researchers I have placed side by side in Table 2.1 (a) rank orderings of research preferences as reflected in the IR and peace research journals of the decade of the sixties, (b) answers to a questionnaire sent out to scholars by the Michigan Center for Research on Conflict Resolution in the early sixties, and (c) the research preferences of the "pure" peace research institutes responding to the 1971 UNESCO survey. The research classification system used is the Newcombe system (Newcombe/Newcombe 1966). The data on which the first three column rankings are based are found in the background paper for the 1968 UNESCO Conference mentioned earlier (Boulding/Boulding 1969), and no great difficulty was experienced in making the topics fit the Newcombe classification for the journal articles and scholars' research interests. It turned out to be very difficult, however, to fit the recent statements of peace research institute preferences into the classification. The reader is invited to go through the list of research interests in Table 9 of the Everts article and try to classify them according to the Newcombe

system. The economic, ideological, and social injustice issues just do not fit the categories very well. Table 2.1 only includes the top ten in each case, and the only way I could deal with the research institutes' preferences numbers 3, 7, 10 (relations between poverty and violence, imperialism, and international economic relations) was to put them under "causes of war." While this does profound injustice to the complexity of contemporary analysis of these issues, it also highlights the temptation to simplistic treatment of economic factors.

Reading all the way across the table for each research category, it is interesting to see what never made it into the top ten, in either the journals in the sixties, the scholars' preference list, or the 1971 research institutes' list: simulation, small group experiments, attitude change, futures research, INGOs and NGOs, definitions of aggression, peaceful coexistence, inspection systems, UN police force, and action research. There is, in fact, still a substantial area of agreement among the various preference sources. The table reveals a continuing interest in decision-making, conflict theory, political integration and disarmament. The research approaches are changing, however, and the theoretical interests lumped under "conflict theory" are very broad indeed, in the absence of other theoretical categories in which to put the theory of integrative and peacemaking processes.

The differences become clear-cut, however, in the areas reflected in the journals and currently rejected by research institutes. The tradition of historical-descriptive treatment of international systems, faithfully supported by both traditional IR and peace research journals and by scholars in the early sixties, drops out of the top ten rankings of peace research institutes altogether. The earlier tradition of economic studies of war disappears, as does the study of international law. Attitudes, images, and perceptions do not appear among the top ten research interests at all.

The concept of transnationalism, integrative transnational processes, and cross-cutting identities in the world community (Mitchell 1970) do not yet appear in the top ten preferences of peace research institutes. The work of people like Alger (1969, 1971), Angell (1969), and Judge (1972; Judge/Skjelsbaek 1972), which provides a very different conceptual framework for viewing the global system than the nation-state framework, is not showing up yet. The fact that this type of work, pioneered by Deutsch et al. (1957) in the fifties, is so slow to appear among the ten best-dressed peace research models shows how slow change in the field, in fact, is.

The fact that interest in images and perceptions has lessened and that interest in transnational networks remains low means that some powerful tools for understanding the dynamics of community formation are being left to one side in the peace research movement. Confrontation seems to have an edge on community in contemporary research.

Confrontation and dialectics as the cutting edge of research may be a necessary corrective to the "servant of the Establishment" image that classic peace research has increasingly conveyed. At the same time, an interesting series of developments in the educational arena have softened the edge of confrontation. The process of helping others make discoveries about social reality goes hand in hand with the process of uncovering new aspects of that reality. New knowledge must be shared,

and, while good teaching has strong confrontational elements, it also has strong integrative elements. The new emphasis on education in the International Peace Research Association (IPRA) with the establishment in the fall of 1971 of an International Education Committee adds another dimension to the activities of peace researchers. The task of both providing the materials and triggering the dynamics of the development of a totally different image of the world than the prevailing nation state model for an entire generation is a staggering one.

The double emphasis on research and education has been even more clear in the development of the North American arm of IPRA, the Consortium on Peace Research, Education and Development (COPRED). In fact, the name of the organization implies a triple thrust, with equal emphasis on research, education, and development. This means that the responsibility for the development of new social patterns cannot be separated from the responsibility for knowledge creation and knowledge dissemination. In its two short years of existence, the Consortium has grown from the founding group of 35 institutions to an association of over 70 colleges, research institutes, and educational and professional associations. Its development provides an interesting case study of dialectics and development within the North American peace research community.[3]

The clash between the desire to influence national decision makers toward more pacific international behavior within existing structures and the desire to clarify publicly the need for the removal of oppressive institutional structures and their replacement by institutional arrangements that permit conflict resolution without inflicting gross injustice, both at the domestic and international level, has led to the development of three working groups within COPRED, each of which deals with a different aspect of the problem. The Radical Perspectives Working Group (chaired by Berenice Carroll) has taken as its task to suggest and explore new areas of research supportive of structural change. It also intends to keep all the other working groups within COPRED "honest" by ensuring that they are reminded of their responsibility to develop a prominent action-orientation in their work. The Research Inventory Task Force (chaired by Edward Azar) is engaged in a project of inventorying significant peace-related research in a propositional form and to organize and process it for publication and use. The inventory is a fairly "neutral" undertaking. The Research Utilization Task Force (chaired by Paul Hare and Phillips Ruopp), however, gets into the more controversial area of working with interested practitioners (governmental and nongovernmental) to determine the kinds of knowledge they need to have to make policy or to further movements that facilitate peace and justice. Conceivably, task force members could be working simultaneously with dissident peace activists and U.S. and Canadian "State Department-type" personnel. It is too soon to predict how the activities of the radical perspectives and research utilization groups will develop, but the propositional inventory is now well under way.

---

[3]Editor's note: in 2001 COPRED merged with the Peace Studies Association to form the Peace and Justice Studies Association.

The other major activity of COPRED is in the educational field. Those of us who have worked with the organization have been totally surprised by the intensity of the demand for advice and guidance in the setting up of new peace studies programs. Even five years ago, Manchester College, a Brethren school, was the only place in North America where a student could "major" in peace studies. Now there are forty colleges and universities with identifiable peace studies programs and fourteen of these provide graduate training. Another sixty colleges known to COPRED teach one or more courses in the peace and conflict field, and there are probably at least as many that we do not know about. The first COPRED publication scheduled to appear in the fall of 1972, will be a guide to the establishment of peace studies programs on college campuses. This opportunity to train members of the present student generation in a set of analytic and social change skills to deal with conflict at every level from local to international is one of the most exciting developments on the contemporary college scene. The continuing confrontations between campus anti-war movements and university authorities will keep these new programs from becoming conventional departmental majors. The new faculty-student alliances that have developed on a number of college campuses as a result of periodic escalations in Vietnam will have a continuing impact on the university community in those cases where new peace studies programs have been agreed to by the administration in a belated effort to make the university become more "relevant."

A new development on and off the college campus is the creation of peace collectives which combine teaching, learning, research, and action with a commitment to common residence and a way of life which foreshadows the new society the participants hope to create. COPRED has several such peace research and action collectives in its membership, and two new ones are in process of formation this year. The collectives are related to the campus, but also independent, and include professors, students, and community people. The ages and educational attainments vary widely, and the kind of critique of both research and action that emerges from these groups may substantially affect the future of peace research. One of the important principles of functioning of these collectives is that everyone in the group has inputs to make of equal importance with everyone else, and, in order to make this a reality, each member must teach the others what he best knows how to do. This ranges from baking bread and cutting stencils to doing computer analysis.

> At its best this kind of equalitarianism helps each member of the community to reach his highest level of potential functioning, and in place of the traditional super-star model of creativity which measures that creativity in the number of publications, etc. produced, a new communal style of creativity emerges that needs different measures, but can be identified in the continuous acts of shaping new social patterns (Boulding 1973).

The peace collective is a challenging response to a variety of criticisms of peace research and education. On the one hand, the collectives may reassure peace researchers who feel that the amount of effort going to educational programs represents a deflection from the more urgent issues of research and a more focused attention on social change. On the other hand, they may reassure scholars concerned with the teaching learning process who fear that the new peace studies programs

may all turn into conventional variations of existing courses of study. These collectives relate to but are not boxed in by existing departmental structures and may succeed in carving out new types of conceptual space. This will cause discomfort and disequilibrium within the existing academic balance of power, but also helps pave the way for new, problem-oriented, transdisciplinary enterprises that link campus and community.

The collectives, more than any other recent development, demonstrate that the old boundaries between research, education, and action no longer make sense in academia. Even the more classroom- or laboratory-oriented scholar is affected by the melting of old boundaries.

No peace researcher can avoid some level of confrontation with the war system that contributes to the problems she studies, though she may repress her own capacity for an action response. Even when she is alone in her own laboratory, she is alternately teacher and student as she works with her materials. To the extent that we are sensitive to the unique properties of the individual situations in which we work as researchers and teachers, the variety of possible approaches to study and action is unlimited. The result, therefore, of the spread of peace studies programs related to college campuses should be to increase the diversity in conceptualization and substantive focus in the peace research field. What will hold the field together is not its boundaries but its vital center of concern, the identification of processes and institutional mechanisms that will create what the peace researchers of the seventies call positive peace.

# References

Alger, Chadwick, 1969: "Trends in International Relations Research", paper prepared for the *Conference on Design for the Discipline of International Relations: Scope, Objectives, and Methods*, sponsored by the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Philadelphia.

Alger, Chadwick, 1971: "A Partial Inventory of Data on International Organizations", paper prepared for a workshop on international organization data, International Studies Association Convention, San Juan, 1971.

Angell, Robert, 1969: *Peace on the March* (New York: Van Nostrand-Reinhold).

Boulding, Elise, 1973: "Futurism as the Galvanizer of Education", in: Nobuo Shimura (Ed.), *Educational Reconstruction: Promise and Challenge* (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill).

Boulding, Kenneth and Elise Boulding, 1969: The Homogeneity of International Studies: A Preliminary Analysis of the Content of Journals in the Field of International Studies (Paris: UNESCO, 1969 SCH/ CONF.13/4).

Deutsch, Karl W. et al. 1957: *Political Community and the North Atlantic Area* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press).

Holsti, Ole, Robert North and Richard Brody, 1968: "Perception and Action in the 1914 Crisis", in: J. David Singer (Ed.), *Quantitative International Politics* (New York: Free Press).

Judge, Anthony, 1972: "The Nature of Organization in Transnational Networks", paper presented to the panel on perspectives on global societies, Annual Meeting of the International Studies Association, Dallas, 1972.

Judge, Anthony and Kjell Skjelsbaek, 1972: *Bibliography of Documents on Transnational Association Networks: International Non-Governmental Organization as a Field of Study* (Brussels: Union of International Associations).

Mitchell, John, 1970: "Cross-Cutting Memberships, Integration, and the International System", *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 14 (March):49–55.

Newcombe, Hanna and Alan Newcombe, 1966: *Peace Research Around the World* (Clarkson, Ontario: Canadian Peace Research Institute).

Richardson, Lewis, 1960: *Statistics of Deadly Quarrels* (Chicago: Quadrangle).

Rummel, Rudolph, 1968: "The Relationship between National Attributes and Foreign Conflict Behavior", in: J. David Singer (Ed.), *Quantitative International Politics* (New York: Free Press).

Singer, David (Ed.), 1968: *Quantitative International Politics: Insights and Evidence* (New York: Free Press).

Singer, David (Ed.), 1970: "From a Study of War to Peace Research: Some Criteria and Strategies", in: *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 14 (December): 527–542.

Sorokin, Pitirim, 1937: *Social and Cultural Dynamics* (New York: American).

Wright, Quincy, 1935: *The Causes of War and the Conditions of Peace* (London: Longmans, Green).