

Dr Thomas Schelling
Dept Economics
Harvard
Dear M. Schelling.

6/28/75
TW831.

I was most pleased to have a chance to see you at the Center a while ago; and to find another intelligent person who agreed on the priority we should be giving to "stateless warfare" as a threat to security, not just a flea bite.

Perhaps you have been following the kidnapping of the Stanford students at Gombe by the anti-Mobutu guerrillas from Zaïre. The event has tested ~~both~~ the social and ethical convictions of a number of us with respect to matters of dealing with kidnapers, paying ransom and the like. Dave Hamburg is sweating it out in Dar-es-Salaam; but I am in (second-hand) hand contact with him, and I know that he would particularly welcome your own thoughts, ways and means of negotiation in such circumstances. I realize this is necessarily somewhat abstract; though if you are interested Betty Hamburg can fill you in on some more factual details. (by phone from Stanford; or with some delay Dave himself.)

One particular question you may have thought about is that of "good faith" in such dealings. Screening my own impressions I guess I am startled by how often such dangers have been fulfilled. I realize that kidnapers have sometimes killed their victims before

or after they have received the ransom; but it surprises me that they ever deliver on such contracts.

In your study of conflict, have you kept any kind of historical notes on such matters? Do you have any general advice to offer? Do you know of any published studies on the matters? (The good faith of bargaining after an assault.)

There are so many cases involved in bargaining over hostages: I hardly know where to begin. It seems likely that you, more than anyone would have thought systematically about it.

One particular question: is dealing with kidnappers ~~or~~ a negotiator is of course exposing himself to capture — and to the paying of the ante! [I am thinking that Dave might place himself in such a situation!!] But I cannot recall when that has ever happened. Can you think of a counterexample? — or if not, why not. (Of course I distinguish the history ~~of~~ and politics of inter-state relationships, where the parties anticipate future dealings — considerations that must have been in mind in thinking about homicidal solutions to problems like Cuba.)

I am posting this from N.Y. en route
from Geneva to Stamford. May I ask you to
show me if you have any time-ly responses;

and in any case to return a copy of this manu-
script to remind me of my own questions when
I am back at my office.

Thanks you
Joshua Lederberg.