ISA is approaching its 25th year. Those years have been ones of rapid change. And during these years ISA's intellectual qualities and identity also changed despite the persistence of a small cadre of ISA "faithfuls" who have given their time and energy almost since its inception.

An effort is now underway to write the organizational history of ISA to mark its first quarter of a century in 1984. That history is needed because the generation of ISA leaders who were recruited by Vincent Davis and John Turner will be replaced by a new generation who are now making their mark on international studies. Continuity cannot no longer be assured by the memories of people. Our past will have to be molded into an organizational memory.

What I will not do here is to present ISA's organizational history except to explain what we have become. That requires the help of many and some patient scholarly activity.

ISA is also made up of several component parts, each of which has its own history and intellectual identity. Again, they will not be described except where they directly influenced the development of ISA. The sections and regions must speak for themselves. What I will try to do is to present the intellectual history of ISA, its character, aspirations, and organizational ideology. ISA has a special view of the world, what scholarship should be, and how that knowledge should be used. This intellectual history will be cast, mostly implicitly, in a theoretical context of diversification and integration and of the interaction between ISA's internal imperatives and its external opportunities and constraints.

The Early Years

ISA was formed in the late 1950s in response to dissatisfaction with the standard content of the American Political Science Association and its leadership. The

* A version of this was prepared for the 1982 ISA Leadership Meeting, University of South Carolina. Several have contributed to the initial paper and its revision.
Association, for understandable reasons, was dominated by American politics. As the "behavioral revolution" strengthened its position in the Association, later to be tagged as successful, the direction of the Association became increasingly American in orientation. For a critical component of the ideology of behavioralists, as some of them liked to be called, was hard data, which were, of course most easily accessible in the U.S. Another aspect of behaviorism was its micro orientation, breaking down processes and institutions into their smallest parts, which, logically progresses to individuals. International studies in contrast, deals with wholes, indeed the international system or world and as such requires analyzing micro phenomena in macro contexts.

The fact that ISA was a west coast organization is not irrelevant to its intellectual development. Accessibility to the east and Washington where most political scientists lived physically or intellectually made a regional alternative attractive. A geographical periphery identified a minority from political science and prompted it to national and global status.

I can say little about the early western years. All but one President, Wes Posvar, was from the west between the first year of ISA, 1958, until 1966. Their goals and aspirations remain to be described. They clearly were all concerned about the international system and in particular the study of international relations. And they had policy concerns which meant direct ISA involvement with the U.S. governmental establishment. Official statements asserted ISA to be a group of scholars and practitioners; the scholars were to be interdisciplinary, to distinguish it from political science and the practitioners were to be governmental officials residing in the U.S. and the UN.

ISA was founded with amateur enthusiasm and kept going through the mental and physical contributions of a few people, such as Charles McClelland, who initially was the organization and its publisher. It was a regional organization with few resources to expand.

In 1962 Vincent Davis took over the organizational functions. A grant from the Carnegie Endowment of $15,000 per year from 1964-66 and then $20,000 per year from 1965-67 provided the means for a professional staff at the University of Denver, an Executive Director, Vincent Davis, and an Associate Director,
Maurice A. East. Its early membership of about two hundred had dropped to less than 60 paid members by 1963. From 1964-1970 ISA grew to about 1,000 members. John Turner became Executive Director in 1970. By 1973 membership grew to about 1,900. Growth in the 1960s involved the transformation of ISA from a regional group of international relations scholars to a national organization with several regions and diversified intellectual pursuits. Growth and diversification, however, created a major identity crisis.

ISA and the Scholarly Community in North America.

ISA became a national organization* by what for the times was very heavy external subsidization. It reconciled its regional origins with its national aspirations by establishing a set of regional sections whose histories have been marked by rises and falls in organizational and intellectual prosperity. It also became partly international by establishing both a Canadian and Carribean region. The main accomplishment of the ISA leadership in the 1960s was a national organization.

An identity crisis was beginning in the late 1960s. If ISA were to become a scholarly community of individual scholars dealing with common problems, then region and nation could not be limiting conditions of its growth. Related to this were divisions, which never emerged into open conflict among ISA scholars with the increasing involvement of U.S. soldiers in Vietnam. The question was how to relate to scholars outside of North America. This was a tough issue also because the early ideology of ISA was to combine the perspectives of scholars and "practitioners" and those practitioners were mainly from the U.S. agencies of state, defense, and intelligence. There was even discussion of whether ISA should move its executive offices to Europe. That, of course, was impossible.

The beginning of the 1970s marked a clear turning point in the intellectual direction of ISA toward the world. What ISA was up to that time was largely scholars of the international system, mostly political scientists, almost all from the U.S. with a sprinkling of Canadians, many of whom had academic ties to

* The physical location of ISA headquarters moved east, from California, to Colorado, Minnesota (Ohio), Pennsylvania, South Carolina.
the U.S., and about a dozen members from the Caribbean. Now efforts were to be undertaken to internationalize ISA. A big step was the decision to hold an annual convention in Puerto Rico. That ended with little participation of the Caribbean members for reasons mostly not of the doing of ISA (local political disturbances involving the university).

One organizational-intellectual question was how ISA should deal with scholars from other countries—as individual colleagues or as members of a country. Because of experiences with the growing international professional societies in political science and sociology, there was strong inclination against delegations from countries and the inevitable national politics of irrelevance to scholarship.

Policies on this issue were formulated at a meeting in the spring of 1971 at the Marshon Center under the leadership of R.C. Snyder. ISA had support for expansion from the Ford Foundation, including exploring how we would deal with the outside world. The basic decisions were that ISA was to be an individually based organization, an international community of scholars, identified with no government or nation. The official brochure was re-written to this effect and the standing ISA commitment to the scholar-diplomat conferences, meaning the U.S. Department of State, a very successful and satisfying venture to some, was to be deleted. Although continued on a more informal basis, these seminars were buried from public view. The tension between national and international community would take a very different direction in a few years.

To test its capacity to internationalize ISA organized a conference at the Rockefeller Center in Bellagio in 1971. Its purpose was to discuss with selected Europeans what ISA should do to relate its membership and activities to European scholars. Those were difficult years because of the growing estrangement of European scholars from their U.S. colleagues. The only clear message was that cooperation would depend on the independent status of ISA and the openness of its activities to public scrutiny.

**Intellectual Diversity**

Although the main intellectual focus of ISA was the international political system and more or less mainstream international relations, comparative political
scientists were chosen with some regularity in the 1970s to be vice-presidents. The commitment to intellectual diversity by integrating several disciplines began to be taken seriously. One step was to combine comparative and interdisciplinary activity by creating a section to recruit those who were neither political scientists nor students of the international political system. The Comparative Interdisciplinary Studies Section, had about as broad a intellectual aspiration as ISA itself. But it addressed problems different from those in international relations, international law and organization, national security and foreign policies. Common national problems and that spilled over national boundaries were to be the focus. Sociologists, political scientists, economists, and psychologists would join together to deal with ethnicity or "divided" nations comparatively. Comparative methodology and the perspectives of more than one discipline were to be the organizational-intellectual principles of CISS. A rapid expansion of CISS was started with a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities, later renewed. Those grants, although diversifying ISA, fragmented CISS into about a dozen independent "internets".

The problem of integrating comparative interdisciplinary activities and the study of the international system remained. Up to this point the Presidents and other key officers of the Association were political scientists specializing in international relations. A slight deviation from this was Alexander George. Although there were significant increases in comparative interdisciplinary panels at the annual conventions, the two main areas of development in ISA remained separate.

The first non-political scientist elected President, Kenneth Boulding, tried to integrate intellectually the comparative and international aspects of ISA by making speeches about the relationship between the problems of the international system and general human problems that had no clear national boundaries, such as the environment, ethnicity, world culture, and the human condition in general. But that was before interdependence, world system, and global human rights concepts became fully accepted in the academic community. ISA was ahead of the energy crisis of 1973-74, but lost its leadership to smaller groups in better position to change their descriptions of the world.
Organizational efforts to integrate comparative research were made by electing comparativists to offices in the Association, publishing a comparative research newsletter, attempting to join together certain individuals in panels at conventions and establishing non-international system sections, such as environmental studies and political economy.

Under the leadership of John Turner in the earlier 1970s the membership not only grew numerically but also in diversity. Non-North American scholars joined ISA, the political science proportion of the total membership dropped, and several comparative scholars became active. The core, however, persisted and the political debates that dominated the early years of the executive directorship of Carl Beck were between those who wanted to emphasize the core interests with strong personal relationships and those who wanted to diversify vigorously. The differences that separated those wanting a small, intimate ISA and those seeking expansion and diversification became more conflictive in the late 1970s. For more than a decade ISA had external subsidy for its organizational expansion (Carnegie, Ford, NEH). Those funds had run out and the membership fees as well as the institutional indirect subsidy (University of Pittsburg) limited ISA's growth.

**ISA (North America)**

During the 1970s' attempts were made to recruit individual scholars outside of North America by inviting them to special meetings, subsidizing their travel to conventions, appointing them to the Editorial Board of ISQ, and encouraging members to recruit them.

As professional social science grew in other countries, they too began differentiating themselves into special organizations, including those for international studies. By the middle 1970s ISA began to change the institutional basis of its international character from individual membership to organizational affiliation. The new constitution required that one of the Vice-Presidents be from a country outside of North America. That provision officially recognized ISA as ISA "North America". ISA began to affiliate with similar organizations in other countries; the first one, Great Britain; and the second, Japan; the third, Poland. This process accelerated after 1980. The consequence was in
fact Chadwick Alger’s goal that ISA see itself organizationally as a global organization but one of several in international studies and in some cases as an organization representing scholars in North America. At the time this development emerged, with some initiatives by ISA leadership, including promoting the yet to be formed “ISA” in Germany, participation of “foreign-scholars” also increased and in the 1980s was the primary source of new members. The foreign scholar reception at conventions became institutionalized (Mexico City??).

The environment had changed, allowing what was difficult to become easy. First, the U.S. was out of Vietnam. Second, the financial power of U.S. scholars diminished, creating greater equality. Third, universities and other institutes in several countries began to finance foreign travel of their faculties and researchers. The symbol of this change was that although it was very difficult or perhaps impossible for ISA to meet in Canada, in 1975 the convention was held in Toronto and under the leadership of Ed Azar had a record number of participants. The much feared accusations of imperialism were never voiced.

To some extent ISA strengthened its local base in the U.S. by adding to its activities promotion of international education in the U.S. The first step under the leadership of James Harf was the creation of an organization for colleges universities (Consortion for International Education). Most recently ISA has added a section of primary and secondary international education.

The policy formulated in 1970-71 was achieved by deed. ISA was now, a part of a network of international scholars. It would participate not only with other scholars in other countries but would also promote international studies in the U.S. by affiliating with the American Association for the Advancement of Science; by efforts to support Congressional funding for the United Nations University; by participating in committees of UNESCO; and by joining with others in certain programs of the United Nations. This departure led to the “two faces” of ISA: ISA as a free standing global organization of individual scholars to ourselves and as ISA North America to others. This ambivalence in the ISA pattern of affiliations. Other international studies associations and organizations petition to affiliate with ISA, the “parent” organization. ISA, however, petitions UN agencies for affiliation and acts as a U.S. body on U.S. commision for UNESCO.
Theoretical and Ideological Tolerance

Openness has been and continues to be the dominant organizational style of ISA. This tolerance is in part a response to the closed character of some established disciplines. When quantitative methods, for example, became ascendant, or simulation promised new insights, ISA was receptive. The early fervor of quantitative methods was recognized in an Interpolimetrics Section.

Those focused on the international system of states and the military as a central instrumentality of a state's integrity were counterposed by those who saw the state system as inherently confines and destructive. Both found an organizational home in ISA as peace and military studies sections. Neither have ever clashed.

Despite the fact that most professional societies were torn apart in the 1960s and 70s by the Vietnam War and U.S. domestic social issues, I can only recall one instance, the equal rights amendment, that divided ISA along ideological lines and that was done in the confines of the Governing Council. Putting U.S. domestic political issues on the agenda of ISA was in part resisted because of ISA's global aspirations, on occasion forcefully argued by the non-North American vice-presidents. Political issues, however, often were simply given a forum in ISA's program. The large organizational space of ISA and its pattern of cooptation that allowed each component to sit on the Governing Council avoided the trauma of our sister social science associations.

Aside from personality differences, there were honest differences about the organizational style of ISA. Organizationally, the question was over the bureaucratic vs. personal relationships between the leadership and officers of ISA and its membership. The issue was solved by the realities. If ISA were to have any chance at financial viability, then it would have to grow, and if it grew, then it would have to bureaucratize its operations to retain credibility of services. Two thousand members were too many for the personal touch. Yet it was possible to retain the continuity of certain collegial intimacies in the sections, regions, and in certain activities, such as an annual leadership conference.
One matter of continuing criticism was the western oriented intellectual imperialism of ISA. This was voiced in many ways: relationships with Canadian colleagues; our presence in Puerto Rico; our insensitivity to Third World concerns; and even our selection of a hotel for the 1983 Annual Convention. The organizational style of ISA again served well. Most with such accusations were encouraged to present their views at least at the Convention. ISA itself on several occasions took the initiative to organize forums to hear this accusation.

During the 1970s the social sciences in the U.S., indeed perhaps in all parts of the world, became more theoretically diverse. The reasons for this are speculative: encounters with scholars from other countries was becoming a regular rather than unusual experience; dominating theoretical paradigms in economics, anthropology, sociology, and the several in political science did not predict well what they claimed they could predict; certain parts of Marxist theory were modernized. This trend, also happened in the broad area of intellectual activities called international studies.

Without justifying their separativeness or explaining their claims to legitimacy I suggest four general "world" views concerning the international or global system are more or less represented in ISA.

The first is the most obvious, an international system of states and the perspectives of international relations, law, organization, and the problems of conflict and cooperation or war and peace. The world system is the outcome of state action. As this view reflected a good deal of reality in the middle of the 20th century, it is the dominant one today in ISA both in terms of individual members and organizational commitment. Within it, of course, there are a variety of viewpoints, even contentious ones.

The second, in terms of numbers of members, is tied to younger scholars and their theoretical interpretations of a global system of interdependence and dependence. This perspective with its emphasis on economic and social relations that explain politics sees the world as a global system and, of course, looks at non-state factors in change, including transnational actors. Those having such a perspective see change during the past few decades as having "transformed"
the world system.

The third is certain developmental theories, both Marxist and non-Marxist. Marxist perspectives spill over on the dependency theoretical orientation but a Marxist "theory" of international system is clearly a minority position. It has mostly been introduced to ISA from Eastern Europe and has made some inroads. A more evolutionary developmental perspective of learning and adaptation can be seen in the writings of Kenneth Boulding and others. Others addressing specific changes, such as the emergence of human rights as a global issue, have a more circumscribed historical perspective. But all are historical in orientation, trying to understand the emergence, development, and change of the modern state system and where it is going in the future.

A fourth perspective is primarily ideological and social, interpreting change in the global system as the division and unification of mankind in terms of nationalism, great religions, and the ideological re-definition of the world society by leaders. Although some in ISA are sensitive to this theory of change at the international level, most are oriented to secular rather than religious forces.

Although ISA has its theoretical biases, I believe that it is open to all perspectives and as ISA reaches to more scholars in different national and cultural contexts, it will become increasingly theoretically diverse.

The Immediate Future

ISA as other organizations must either grow or decline. To grow it must diversify. Diversification creates internal tensions as it disturb existing relationships. Growth costs, indeed may imperil the survival of organizations. Not to grow, however, is to diminish. The alternative is to seek external subsidization by constraining organizational autonomy.

Over the past twenty years as an organization ISA has experienced certain plateaus as an association of individual members. Recently ISA reached another plateau and now is seeking to diversify itself once more.
As a federation of regional organizations, ISA grew to about 1,000 members with a few hundred participating at national meetings (late 1960s). When ISA became consolidated as a national organization, it had about 2,000 members with about 500 at the national meetings (early 1970s). When it actively sought to engage people from other disciplines, it might have reached about a membership of 2,400 (no accurate data are available) and attracted about 1,000 participants at its conventions. A substantial number of ISA members are "new" each year, depending on what ISA does, whom it relates to, and where the Convention is held. Some drop out, never to return; some drop back it after some years.

Between 1980-82 ISA in its usual informal fashion of accumulating a set of seemingly small decisions into a policy moved in two directions. It appealed to different groups in North America, began to intensify its interdisciplinary recruitment, and renewed its efforts to support the regions. But it also aggressively sought affiliations with associations and institutions outside of North America, but on a common interest in the international system.

The hard question facing ISA in the next few years is, as it always has been, the nature of our growth and our organizational soul. If ISA were to attract and hold 3,000-4,000 members in North America, it could significantly reduce its heavy subsidy from the University of North Carolina. To do so it would have to diversify its appeal across different discipline and activities (e.g., education). But in so doing it would dilute its attractiveness to people outside of North America who identify ISA with its old core concern of the international system of states.

If this pattern of growth is even partially successful, then within a few years ISA will again face an identity crisis. Our organizational unity expressed in our Constitution is now being re-defined, something that hopefully can be achieved by 1985, a decade after the last one was adopted. The issue then will be the integration of our increased diversity. The Governing Council will have expanded its membership as a function of getting new disciplinary perspectives (the sections) or affiliating with different organizations (affiliates). The problem will be to find core organizational identity.
The years 1983-85 should be ones of expansion through diversification. At the same time it is necessary to begin again a process of integration through organizational structures. Beginning in 1985 and for the next few years emphasis will have to be placed on what is common rather than on what is new.

Of course, all academic organizations are fragile, vulnerable to external events. But that does not diminish from pursuing our responsibility to create a global community of scholars encompassing the full range of human experience and aspiration for human development.