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MAJOR THINK TANKS AND THEIR STRATEGIES

Jimmy Carter, Ronald Regan, Bill Clinton and George W. Bush shared much in common before entering the Oval office. Besides having served as state governors, each assumed the Presidency with little experience and especially in Clinton’s case little interest in foreign policy. To remedy this, they relied in varying degree on a select group of think tanks, for policy advice and on their personnel to fill key posts in their administration.¹

Amid the galaxy of think tanks in and around Washington, Carter turned to the Trilateral commission, the Brookings Institution and the Business Roundtable, to name just a few, for advice and guidance. He paid special homage to the Trilateral commission by noting in his autobiography that the “commission has provided me with a splendid learning opportunity, and many of the members helped me in my study of foreign affairs.”²

His successor also acknowledged the invaluable contribution several think-tanks made to his 1980 election victory and to his administration. President Regan stated that he called on more people from the Hoover Institution to help in his campaign and in the transition than from any other institute. Several other think tanks including the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS), Heritage Foundation, the American Enterprise Institute (AEI) and the Committee on the Present Danger have also been credited with helping Regan bring about America’s rightward turn.³ President Clinton appeared less confused about which think tanks were helping to prepare him to govern, indeed, to remind himself that the Progressive policy Institute (PPI), the policy Arm of the Democratic Leadership Council, which he chaired from 1990-91, was advising him on a

² Ibid.p.1
³ Ibid.p.1
host of domestic and foreign policy issues, he publicly endorsed Mandate for change, PPI's blueprint for changing America. There are unusual bodies of people behind many of George Bush's ideas. Their influence is partly a matter of ideas. Two of the brainwaves of the 1990s-welfare reform and zero-tolerance policing-were incubated in conservative think-tanks. The Cato Institute has been arguing for privatising Social Security reform for years; the AEI was protesting about rogue states long before anybody had heard of Osama bin Laden. But it is also a matter of people. Donald Rumsfeld and Condoleezza Rice are both Hoover veterans. Dick Cheney and his wife have a longstanding relationship with the AEI.

Think tanks are appealing to policy makers for three main reasons. First, unlike university professors – who are often engaged in esoteric research with little relation to policy think tanks, are in the business of providing policy-relevant expertise to elected officials. In short, think-tanks perform an educational function. Second, think tanks, especially those with ideologically-driven policy agendas, can offer intellectual reinforcement and indeed promote the political platforms of aspiring office holders and elected officials. And third, several prominent think tanks can provide talent pools of scholars and former government officials for incoming administrations to draw on, and can also serve as retirement homes for high level policy makers after they leave public office.

To varying degrees, think tanks in the United States rely on some, and at times all, of the following strategies to enhance their presence on the political landscape. They hold open public forms and conferences to discuss key policy issues and encourage their scholars to give lectures at universities, service clubs, and other civic organizations. Many of these lectures are broadcast to viewers via satellite. Think tanks scholars also testify before committees and subcommittees of Congress and frequently

---

4 Ibid. p.1
5 http://www.hoover.org/about/report/18978274.html
submit op-ed articles to major American and international newspapers. If they are too preoccupied with their own research, think-tanks have been known to hire ghost writers to write up-ends on behalf of certain scholars.⁷

Think tanks also concentrate on gaining access to the broadcast media, especially to network newscasts and political talk shows. If viewers happen to miss an on-screen appearance of their favourite think tank personalities they can usually discover what was said by accessing the institute's web site. Dozens of think-tanks have created websites in recent years, complete with photographs of think-tanks scholars and information on their recent publications and speeches. American interested in being indoctrinated on their way to work can even pop audio taps into their cassette players and listen to the wisdom of leading political pundits from Heritage Foundation and the Cato Institute. For policy makers and members of the attentive public who can get along without briefing tapes but are still interested in what think-tanks say, copies of institute publications can be readily obtained. Depending on the state of their financial resources and the talents of their staffs, think tanks may produce a variety of publications ranging from books, Journals, and opinion magazines to conference papers and newsletters.⁸

Think tanks with some degree of expertise in foreign and defence policies rely on several strategies to convey specific recommendations to high level policy makers. The best opportunity for think tanks to influence US foreign policy is during a presidential election and the transition period that follows. If "people are policy", as Edwin Feulner, the head of Heritage likes to say, then the think tanks are becoming America's shadow government.⁹

The think-tanks' influence is partly related to the intellectual barrenness of America's two main parties. The Democrats and Republicans are little more

---

⁸ Donald. E. Abelson, *n.l.*p.3
than vehicles for raising and distributing campaign contributions. They have no ability to generate ideas of their own, and little control over individual politicians trying to burnish their reputations with new thinking. For instance, in the week and days leading up to the 1992 Election, dozens of articles outlining the individuals and organizations, who assembled to advise the then Governor Clinton appeared throughout major American newspapers and opinion magazines. Moreover, on several network newscasts and political talk shows, individuals advising Clinton on various economic, social and security issues were invited to share their insights on what a Clinton administration would mean for America. ¹⁰

By serving on foreign policy task forces think tanks scholars are well positioned to be recruited into high-level foreign policy posts in the new administration, a development that usually allows them to further extend the influence their institute. Several think tanks scholars have taken this route, including Jeanne Kirkpatrick (AEI), Richard Allen (Hoover Institution), Zbigniew Brzezinski (CSIS), and Madline Albright (CSIS). Other think tanks scholars have been asked to serve on important advisory boards such as President’s Intelligence oversight Board (PIOB) and the President’s Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board (PFIAB), which provide the President with long term strategic advice on foreign policy and defence issues. The transition period following the election also offers think tanks on opportunity to influence those in positions of authority. The Washington based CSIS, home to such luminaries as Zbigiew Brazezinki, Harold Brown, James Schlesinger, and Admiral William Crowe, has organised transition seminars for several incoming administrations. The Heritage Foundation also offers seminars to newly elected Congressmen and Senators. ¹¹

---
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The efforts of think tanks that hope to influence policy makers do not stop there. Some, including the Hoover Institution at Stanford University invite members of Congress and Congressional Committees and their staffs to attend the Washington seminars run by the institution’s staff since 1980 to educate and inform participants on domestic and foreign policies. The Heritage Foundation has even taken steps to guarantee private donors assess to the President and to senior members of the administration. Several think tanks, including Heritage and CSIS have relied on other channels to establish close ties with key departments engaged in foreign policy. Through the Diplomat in Residence Programme, overseen by the State Department, several ambassadors have gone to think between assignments, to conduct research. At times, state department officials have even been sent to think tanks to help improve relations between the administration and think tanks overly critical of white House policies. This occurred, for instance, when Secretary of State George Shuttz directed one of his staff to go to the Heritage Foundation to mollify some of its more vocal cities of US foreign policy.\textsuperscript{12}

The ones that emerged in the first decades of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century were committed to bringing scientific expertise to bear on public policy issues. The advancement of knowledge for the purpose of improving governmental decision-making was their main priority. Much has changed however. Many think-tanks have become more committed to influencing policy than to improving it. They are run like business whose performances are measured on how successful they are in mass marketing their ideas. However, only these think-tanks that maintain a healthy balance between scholarship and aggressive Salesmanship will remain well entrenched in the policy-making process.\textsuperscript{13}

\textsuperscript{12} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{13} Ibid., p.4
MAJOR THINK TANKS IN FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Most think tanks share common objectives of shaping and moulding public opinion and public policy. As the United State prepared to assume the role of a hegemonic power in the aftermath of the World War II, a number of think tanks were making their presence felt in the policy making circles. Through their publications, conferences and meetings with members of the Executive, Congress, and a host of government departments, boards, and agencies, think thanks were able to develop and expand their network of influence throughout Washington.\(^{14}\)

By relying on various governmental and non-governmental channels, think-tanks, either acting alone or in concert with other actors in the political process, have attempted to influence the content and outcome of majority policy initiative.\(^{15}\)

Yet, despite their appeal, only a fraction of the estimated 1,200 think tanks in the United States have made their presence felt in key policy-making circles. The Brooking Institution, the Council on Foreign Relations, the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, the American Enterprise Institute, Rand and the Heritage Foundation, among others, are frequently referred to in the media.\(^{16}\) For example, the media watchdog group *Fairness and Accuracy in Reporting* (FAIR) released a report in 2006 which listed the 25 think tanks which were mentioned most often in the mainstream media news in 2005. The most-mentioned think tank was the center-left Brookings Institution. The next two most-mentioned think tanks—the Heritage Foundation, the American Enterprise Institute, are center-right while the fourth, the Cato Institute, is libertarian. Of media citations, a plurality, 47% were centrist, while 40% were conservative and 13% were progressive.\(^{17}\)

\(^{14}\) Donald E. Abelson, *n. 7*, p.65

\(^{15}\) Ibid., *n. 7*, p.90

\(^{16}\) Donald E. Abelson, *n. 1*, p.4

\(^{17}\) Fairness and Accuracy Reporting, Media Watch Dog Group, Report 2006
Among those concentrating on foreign policy, is the Council on Foreign Relations. The CFR is non-partisan and regarded itself as the most prestigious and influential think tanks. The Brooking Institution pursues a liberal research agenda and hosts regular seminars and working lunches to discuss foreign policy issues. The Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) is also non-partisan but regarded as leaning centre right. RAND built its reputation in defence policy research for the US air force but now covers a wide range of domestic issues in addition to national security themes. The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, the Institutes of Peace, and Woodrow Wilson Center, are leading liberal think tanks with a strong focus on conflict resolution issues. On the right of the political spectrum are the American Enterprise Institute, the Heritage Foundation, the Cato Institute and the Nixon Centre. Other more specialist think tanks include the Atlantic Council of the US, the Centre of Defence Information, and the Institute for international Economics, the Washington Institute for Near East Policy and the Middle East Institute.18

The following U.S think tanks have been selected to show a representative range of views, with budget, staffs size, reputation for doing high quality research analysis and frequent media citation.

**BROOKING INSTITUTION:**

Of the 200 most prominent think tanks in the U.S., the Brookings Institution's studies are the most widely cited by the media, and the third most-cited of all public policy institutes by Members of Congress. In a 1997 survey of congressional staff and journalists, Brookings ranked first in credibility among 27 think tanks. It stated principal purpose is "to aid in the development of sound public policies and to promote public understanding of issues of national importance".19 Strobe Talbott, the President of Brooking Institution stated that:

---

The goal of The Brookings Institution, and all other think tanks, is "to provide the policy community with analysis and conclusions to use as the basis for developing new policies, and for modifying or retiring existing policies," says Brookings President Strobe Talbott. "One of our most challenging tasks," he says, "is to identify early on the new and important issues our nation and the world will confront in the future" and bring them to the attention of policy-makers and the public.\(^\text{20}\)

The Brookings Institution is one of the oldest think tanks in the United States. The precursor of the present-day Brookings — the Institute for Government Research — was established in Washington in 1916 by a St. Louis businessman and philanthropist named Robert Brookings. He later set up two related organizations, the Institute for Economics and the Graduate School of Economics and Government.\(^\text{21}\)

Robert Brookings established these organizations because he saw that businesses in the early part of the 20th century were benefiting from the relatively new disciplines of economic research and organizational management, and he believed that government also could benefit. The three research organizations were combined in 1927 to form the Brookings Institution, Which initially focused on domestic social and economic policy. International studies were no added to the Brookings research agenda until after World War II.\(^\text{22}\)

Brookings is organized into three major research areas: Foreign Policy Studies, Economic Studies, and Governance Studies, though those departmental distinctions are increasingly blurred as the Institution takes on the cross-disciplinary issues that define globalized world. It’s organizational structure also includes several research centers, focused on areas such as the Middle East or functional issues such as education policy.\(^\text{23}\) Strobe Talbott became president of Brookings in 2002. Shortly thereafter, Brookings launched the Saban Center for Middle East Policy and the John L. Thornton China Center. The Saban Center for Middle East Policy was founded by a grant from


\(^{21}\) \textit{Ibid}

\(^{22}\) Brookling Institution, \textit{http://www.brookings.edu/about/History.aspx}
Mr. Haim Saban in 2002. The Saban Center has helped the Brookings Institution to dramatically expand its research and analysis of Middle East policy issues. In September 2006, Brookings announced the founding of The John L. Thornton China Center, a major new center focused on the study of Chinese politics and policy. In November 2006, Brookings announced the opening of its first-ever overseas center, the Brookings-Tsinghua Center at Tsinghua University in Beijing, China.

Robert Brookings once said, “Underlying all Brookings activities is a belief in the necessity of framing issues accurately and impartially, of presenting ideas without ideology.” Since its earliest days, Brookings has provided policy-makers and the public with timely, applied research that is aimed at finding solutions to America’s most complex policy challenges. Over the decades, ideas emanating from Brookings played a key role in the mobilizations for World Wars I and II; the creation of the Federal government’s budget process, civil service system, and Social Security; the development of the Marshall Plan; the imposition of price controls during World War Two; the use of sanctions to punish and influence rogue states; the organization of the National Security Council and other foreign policy and defense structures; the commitment to promote development in poorer countries; the evolution of U.S. policy toward post-Soviet Russia; and many other policies.

Since the terrorist attacks of 9-11, the research here has been refocused to concentrate more intently on generating ideas and insights that will lead to the development or revision of policies concerning relations between the West and the Islamic world; the proper balance between vigilance against terrorism and protection of civil liberties; the conflict between Israel and the Palestinians; the need to adjust traditional state-to-state diplomacy to take into account the

---
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rise of non-state players; the debate over preemptive or preventive warfare to counter threats from terrorists and terrorist-supporting states; the development of a long-term international strategy for the post-Cold War world; the future of arms control; and the case for a missile defense system.27

Brookings is often referred to as “a university without students.” Many of our 75 senior scholars have advanced degrees, and quite a few come from university faculties. Their research and writing is subject to scholarly review. Some of the Brookings Fellows are what we call “scholar practitioners.” This description applies to researchers who periodically accept positions in government where they can test their academic conclusions in real-world circumstances, and to former officials who come to Brookings after a period of public service and use their government experience to add a practical viewpoint to our academic research.28 For example, more than a dozen Brookings “scholar practitioners” have served in the State Department or on the National Security Council, including James Steinberg, the Vice President and Director of the Foreign Policy Studies program at Brookings (former Deputy National Security Adviser at the White House and Director of the Policy Planning Staff at the State Department); Helmut Sonnenfeldt (National Security Council senior staff member in the Nixon administration and former director of the State Department Office of Research on the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe); and Martin Indyk. Director of the Saban Center for Middle East Policy (former Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern Affairs and twice U.S. ambassador to Israel). Brookings also has expertise from all the other branches of government, such as former Congressman Bill Frenzel (Republican-Minnesota), one of their resident experts on taxes, free trade, and budget policy.29

Dissemination of policy analysis and recommendations from Brookings takes a number of forms. The conclusions of many research projects are

27 Ibid
28 Ibid
29 Ibid
presented in books and reports. However, a few years ago, when it was realized that policy-makers and their staffs don't always have time to read books and lengthy reports, Brookings also began publishing its findings additionally in shorter, more accessible papers called Policy Briefs. Other think tanks have followed suit. Scholars at Brookings often communicate their conclusions more directly to policy-makers through Congressional testimony, private consultations, and meetings with Congressional and executive branch staff members, and to interested non-governmental audiences through forums, roundtable discussions, and other public events. Policy-makers are often influenced by public opinion, and public opinion is often influenced by coverage in the news media. Additionally, much of what policymakers, their advisers, and the public know about policy issues they learn through the news media. Therefore, it's not surprising that many scholars at Brookings and other think tanks devote a good deal of effort to presenting their ideas and findings through the news media. This takes the form of interviews on television and radio and in print, opinion articles for the op-ed pages of newspapers, press briefings, public speeches, and articles for scholarly journals. More than a year ago, Brookings built its own TV and radio studio to facilitate media interviews. Brookings and other think tanks also publish "media guides" to help reporters locate and interview scholars with specific expertise on the policy issue a journalist is writing about.

The budget to fund all this research, analysis, dissemination, and outreach — and the necessary staff — runs approximately $40 million a year at Brookings. The money comes from an endowment which was originally established by founder Robert Brookings; from grants and donations by foundations, corporations, and individuals; and from such revenue sources as the Brookings Institution Press, which publishes more than 50 books a year, and the Center for Public Policy Education, which runs executive education.

30 Ibid.
31 Ibid.
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seminars for government and corporate managers. Elaborate rules are in place to guarantee that financial providers have no influence over the design and outcome of Brookings research. One of the most challenging tasks of Brookings is to identify early on the new and important issues America and the world will confront in the future. Then, in the Brookings tradition, it focus scholarship on bringing those issues to the attention of the policymakers and the public, providing solid research and analysis, informing the debate, and offering constructive ideas and recommendations. Busy government policymakers have noted the value added in Brookings' ability to combine the analysis of long-term trends with the recommendation of short-term policies.

COUNCIL ON FOREIGN RELATION:

The Council on Foreign Relations is an independent, nonpartisan membership organization, think tank, and publisher dedicated to being a resource for its members, government officials, business executives, journalists, educators and students, civic and religious leaders, and other interested citizens in order to help them better understand the world and the foreign policy choices facing the United States and other countries since its founding in 1921. It based at 58 East 68th Street (corner Park Avenue) in New York City, with an additional office in Washington, D.C. A central aim of the Council, it states, is to "find and nurture the next generation of foreign policy leaders." It established "Independent Task Forces" in 1995, which encourage policy debate. Comprising experts with diverse backgrounds and expertise, these task forces seek consensus in making policy recommendations on critical issues. Through its membership, meetings, and studies, it has been called the most powerful agent of United States foreign policy outside the State Department.
The Council carries out its mission by:\[^{37}\]

- Maintaining a diverse membership, including special programs to promote interest and develop expertise in the next generation of foreign policy leaders;
- Convening meetings at its headquarters in New York and in Washington, DC, and other cities where senior government officials, members of Congress, global leaders, and prominent thinkers come together with Council members to discuss and debate major international issues;
- Supporting a Studies Program that fosters independent research, enabling Council scholars to produce articles, reports, and books and hold roundtables that analyse foreign policy issues and make concrete policy recommendations;
- Publishing *Foreign Affairs*, the preeminent journal of international affairs and U.S. foreign policy;
- Sponsoring Independent Task Forces that produce reports with both findings and policy prescriptions on the most important foreign policy topics; and
- Providing up-to-date information and analysis about world events and American foreign policy on its website, CFR.org.

The David Rockefeller Studies Program — the CFR “Think tank” — is the Council’s “think tank.” It is an important part of the Council’s mission to produce and disseminate ideas so that individual and corporate members, as well as policymakers, journalists, students, and interested citizens in the United States and other countries, can better understand the world and the foreign policy choices facing the United States and other governments. They do that by thinking, writing, and speaking about a broad range of foreign policy issues.\[^{38}\]


[^{38}]: Gary Samore, Vice President, Director of Studies, and Maurice R. Greenberg Chair, Council on Foreign Relations, http://www.cfr.org/thinktank/
The Studies Program is home of scholars, called fellows. In addition, the Studies Program hosts scholars through visiting fellowships at the Council. Taken together, the fellows' expertise covers nearly every issue related to international relations. Some fellows are experts on specific countries such as China and Egypt or geographical regions like Europe and Latin America. Others are experts on functional topics such as global health, homeland security, international finance, nuclear proliferation, and trade. They write books, articles, and newspaper op-eds on issues in their areas of expertise. They also share their expertise with local, regional, national, and international media, and they are frequently called upon by government policymakers for advice. The Studies Program has three interdisciplinary centers. The Maurice R. Greenberg Center for Geoeconomic Studies works to promote a better understanding among policymakers, educators, and the interested public of how economic and political forces interact to influence world affairs. The Center for Preventive Action works to prevent, defuse, or resolve deadly conflicts around the world by addressing the systemic and structural causes of discrimination, disenchantment, and political turmoil that are likely to provoke armed conflict. The Center for Universal Education focuses exclusively on the provision of quality, universal basic education among the world's poorest children. These centers seek to accomplish their goals by producing and disseminating original research; bringing policymakers, experts, and journalists together to address critical issues; and informing the broader public about important issues through media interviews and public speaking.39

- Council fellows write books on timely and important policy issues, which may be published by the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) Press or by other trade and academic publishers. Critical Policy Choices are books designed to foster debate on key international issues by making the best case for each policy alternative in the form of a U.S. presidential speech.
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The Council on Foreign Relations Press publishes a variety of reports each year:

Independent Task Force Reports are consensus documents on U.S. foreign policy developed through private and nonpartisan deliberations.

Center for Preventive Action Commission Reports are consensus documents that offer recommendations with incentives—"carrots and sticks"—to unite stakeholders and modify the behavior of key local leaders when an armed conflict or a potential conflict arises.

Council Special Reports are concise policy briefs, which provide timely responses to developing crises or contributions to current policy dilemmas.

Council fellows and research staff produce analysis and commentary:

Articles and Op-eds are published in a variety of newspapers, magazines, and journals.

Testimony before Congress on specific U.S. foreign policy issues, often relating to the findings and recommendations of a Council report or paper.

Foreign Affairs offers numerous resources online, including an archive of articles dating back to 1973. With a circulation of 160,000, the bimonthly journal is available by subscription and at bookstores and newsstands. The Foreign Affairs Academic Resource Program produces customized textbooks and anthologies compiled by the editors of Foreign Affairs for classroom use.40

From its inception the Council was non-partisan, welcoming members of both Democratic and Republican parties. It also welcomed Jews and African Americans, with only women initially barred from membership. Its proceedings were almost universally private and confidential. It has exerted influence on U.S. foreign policy from the beginning, due to its roster of State Department and other government officials as members; as such, it has been the focus of many conspiracy theories (Perloff 37, et passim). A study by two

critics of the organization, Laurence Shoup and William Minter, found that of 502 government officials surveyed from 1945 to 1972, more than half were members of the Council.\footnote{41}

Today it has about 4,300 members (including five-year term members), which over its history have included senior serving politicians, more than a dozen Secretaries of State, former national security officers, bankers, lawyers, professors, former CIA members and senior media figures. Seven American presidents have addressed the Council. As a private institution however, the CFR maintains through its official website that it is not a formal organization engaged in U.S. foreign policy-making.\footnote{42} In 1962, the group began a program of bringing select Air Force officers to the Harold Pratt House to study alongside its scholars. The Army, Navy and Marine Corps requested they start similar programs for their own officers.\footnote{43}

Journalist Joseph Kraft, a former member of both the CFR and the Trilateral Commission, said the Council "comes close to being an organ of what C. Wright Mills has called the Power Elite – a group of men, similar in interest and outlook, shaping events from invulnerable positions behind the scenes."\footnote{44}

In 1944 and in 1948, the Republican candidate for President, Thomas Dewey, was a CFR member. In later years, Republicans Eisenhower and Nixon were members of the CFR, as were Democrats Stevenson, Kennedy, Humphrey, and McGovern. The American people think that they have a choice when they vote for a President, but the truth of the matter is, with few exceptions: Presidential candidates for decades have been CFR members.\footnote{45}

\footnotesize{\begin{itemize}
\item[41] Council on Foreign Relations, \textit{n.36}
\item[42] \textit{Ibid.}
\item[43] \textit{Ibid.}
\item[44] \textit{Ibid.}
\item[45] Council on Foreign Relations, \textit{http://www.councilonforeignrelations.net/}
\end{itemize}}
In one of the CFR's annual reports, published in 1978, it listed a membership of 1878 members. Eleven of its members at this time were United States Senators, with even more Congressmen belonging to the organization. 284 of its members listed in this report were United States Government officials.46

The CFR not only has its members in the United States Government, but its influence has also spread to other vital areas of American life. According to Newell: "Its members have run, or are running, NBC and CBS, 'The New York Times', 'The Washington Post', 'The Des Moines Register', and many other important newspapers. The leaders of 'Time', 'Newsweek', 'Fortune', 'Business Week', and numerous other publications are CFR members. The organization's members also dominate the academic world, top corporations, the huge tax-exempt foundations, labor unions, the military, and just about every segment of American life."47

The earliest origin of the Council stemmed from a working fellowship of about 150 distinguished scholars, called "The Inquiry," tasked to brief President Woodrow Wilson about options for the postwar world when Germany was defeated. The team produced more than 2,000 documents detailing and analyzing the political, economic, and social facts globally that would be helpful for Wilson in the peace talks. Their reports formed the basis for the Fourteen Points, which outlined Wilson's strategy for peace after war's end.48

These scholars then traveled to the Paris Peace Conference, 1919 that would end the war; it was at one of the meetings of a small group of British and American diplomats and scholars, on May 30, 1919, at the Hotel Majestic, that both the Council and its British counterpart, the Chatham House in London,
were born. Although the original intent was for the two organizations to be affiliated, they became independent bodies, yet retained close informal ties. 49

In an anonymous piece called "The Sources of Soviet Conduct" that appeared in Foreign Affairs in 1947, CFR study group member George Kennan coined the term "containment." The essay would prove to be highly influential in US foreign policy for seven upcoming presidential administrations. William Bundy credited the CFR's study groups with helping to lay the framework of thinking that led to the Marshall Plan and NATO. 50

Dwight D. Eisenhower chaired a CFR study group while he served as President of Columbia University. One member later said, "Whatever General Eisenhower knows about economics, he has learned at the study group meetings." The CFR study group devised an expanded study group called "Americans for Eisenhower" to increase his chances for the presidency. Eisenhower would later draw many Cabinet members from CFR ranks and become a CFR member himself. His primary CFR appointment was Secretary of State John Foster Dulles. 51

On 24 November 1953, a study group heard a report from political scientist William Henderson regarding the ongoing conflict between France and Vietnamese Communist leader Ho Chi Minh's Viet Minh forces, a struggle that would later become known as the First Indochina War. Henderson argued that Ho's cause was primarily nationalist in nature and that Marxism had "little to do with the current revolution." Further, the report said, the United States could work with Ho to guide his movement away from Communism. State Department officials, however, expressed skepticism about direct American intervention in Vietnam and the idea was tabled. Over the next twenty years, the United States would find itself allied with anti-Communist South Vietnam

49 Ibid.
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and against Ho and his supporters in Vietnam War. The Council served as a "breeding ground" for important American policies such as mutual deterrence, arms control, and nuclear non-proliferation.

A four-year long study of relations between America and China was conducted by the Council between 1964 and 1968. One study published in 1966 concluded that American citizens were more open to talks with China than their elected leaders. Henry Kissinger had continued to publish in Foreign Affairs and was appointed by President Nixon to serve as National Security Adviser in 1969. In 1971, he embarked on a secret trip to Beijing to broach talks with Chinese leaders. Nixon went to China in 1972, and diplomatic relations were completely normalized by President Carter's Secretary of State, another Council member, Cyrus Vance.

The United States faces multiple challenges in the Post Cold War era. All of this makes for a unique moment for the Council. It trying to meet opportunities and obligations alike by being a trusted, smart, relevant, independent, and nonpartisan resource through an extraordinary meetings program, the top website devoted to U.S. foreign policy, the leading magazine in the field, and a think tank—the David Rockefeller Studies Program—that is producing and disseminating much-needed analysis and ideas. Events for Council members remain an institutional priority. Member programming is increasingly organized by series that span New York City and Washington, DC, as well as twelve other cities. It's "Lessons Learned" series brings together small groups of younger members for intimate discussions with distingue leaders, and the HBO-sponsored History Makers series focuses on the contributions made by a prominent individual at critical junctures in international relations. It's popular "Daughters and Sons" events invite high
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school- and college-age children and grandchildren of members for special meetings with high-profile speakers.\textsuperscript{57} In the past year it have held full- and half-day symposia on Iraq, making New York safer, Latin America, alternative energy, and Nigeria. The annual Term Member Conference brought to New York many of our almost 500 term members from across the country. It’s National Conference attracted 350 participants from around the country and the world. And Corporate Program, which encompasses over 240 member companies, held 70 events and 30 conference calls on topics such as geopolitical risk, climate change, and the competitiveness of global capital markets.\textsuperscript{58}

Another element of the Council’s mission is to serve as a resource for traditional constituencies, such as officials in the executive branch, members of Congress, and the media. But it is never enough just to produce good work; it needs to make sure it gets read and heard. In 2006, Council fellows and staff have briefed government officials more than 250 times and have testified 22 times before Congress. Members of the Independent Task Force on U.S.- China relations briefed U.S. government officials, including Treasury Secretary Henry M. Paulson Jr. and Deputy Secretary of State John D. Negroponte, as well as China’s ambassador to the United States Zhou Wenzhong. The Council’s Congress and U.S. Foreign Policy Program held over fifteen meetings with new members of Congress and their staffs. It also held eleven briefings with journalists from news outlets such as the New York Times, Washington Post, Financial Times, Wall Street Journal, Reuters, and Los Angeles Times, and fellows and staff have been interviewed on Meet the Press, in 2006.\textsuperscript{59}

The Council’s mission also includes reaching a broader range of citizens beyond it’s membership. It’s overall objective is to connect the Council with—and make it a resource for—voices that are increasingly important to the

\textsuperscript{57} Ibid. p.10
\textsuperscript{58} Ibid p.10
\textsuperscript{59} Ibid pp.10-11
national foreign policy debate, including those of students and teachers, religious and congregational leaders, state and local officials, and community leaders. To date, the Academic Conference Call series has engaged more than 90 distinct colleges and universities. It held 12 sessions of the Religion and Foreign Policy Conference Call series, and 155 state and local officials from around the country viewed the webcast of a meeting on the threat of pandemic flu. The Council's website, CFR.org, is an important medium for bringing analysis and ideas to a broader audience. It is using new technology to its advantage. To take one example, CFR.org has launched a series of multimedia Crisis Guides—an innovative educational series that offers viewers ready access to the current and historical context of the world's major trouble spots and challenges. It's first two Crisis Guides were on the Korean peninsula and Darfur, and it plan to produce at least ten additional Crisis Guides over the next year on such topics as Kashmir, China and Taiwan, the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, climate change, and the United States and Cuba. Ultimately, the Council's initiatives translate into impact.60

In 2006 Foreign Affairs was again ranked the most influential magazine in a survey of policymakers. It also hit an important milestone, with paid circulation topping 155,000. CFR.org now regularly draws a monthly audience of over 300,000 unique visitors.61

Two Council fellows visited and briefed the Multinational Force, Iraq's commanding general David H. Petraeus, and the 2006 Council Special Report U.S.-India Nuclear Cooperation was cited in debates on Capitol Hill when members of Congress were voting on the nuclear pact with India.62

The David Rockefeller Studies Program has been strengthened year by year, with additional focus on the greater Middle East and Asia. Council fellows are studying global issues, from climate change, nuclear nonproliferation, and trade to worldwide terrorism, homeland security, and
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global health. And finally, it has assembled a talented group of foreign policy generalists who are working on the broader means and ends of U.S. foreign policy. In addition, it continues to cover Russia, Europe, Latin America, and Africa.63

The Council expects to play a large role during the 2008 presidential campaign. They host each of the presidential candidates and have kicked off this initiative with an event featuring former senator John Edwards. It is offering the Council to each candidate not only as a venue but also as a resource on a broad range of foreign policy issues. Fellows and staff have briefed Joseph Biden, Hillary Rodham Clinton, Christopher J. Dodd, Rudolph Giuliani, Mike Huckabee, Dennis Kucinich, John S. McCain, and Barack Obama.64

The Council will also serve as a resource for the public at large during the campaign, with a special section of CFR.org delivering up-to-date information on candidates’ views and positions. In short, the Council is doing a good many things to sustain its role as the leading foreign policy organization in the world.

RAND CORPORATION:

The RAND Corporation (Research and Development) is a nonprofit global policy think tank first formed to offer research and analysis to the United States armed forces. The organisation has since expanded to working with other governments, private foundations, international organisations, and commercial organisations. It is known for rigorous, often-quantitative, and non-partisan analysis and policy recommendations. Its self-declared mission is "to help improve policy and decision making through research and analysis", using its "core values of quality and objectivity."65
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From the beginnings of the U.S. Department of Defense (DOD), think tanks have worked closely with both the civilian and military leadership on a wide range of issues, from new technologies to military planning and operations, to help better protect American interests from ever evolving threats. Like the DOD civilian leadership, the uniformed military services require high-quality, objective research on geopolitical trends and the implications of different foreign policy options. Among other things, such research is necessary for realistic scenarios to guide planning and program evaluations, and to develop an understanding of probable constraints on operational flexibility. To their credit, the military services and the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) have used and nurtured a large array of sources for that research, ranging from small institutes, such as the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) and the Lexington Institute, funded primarily with corporate or individual donations, to larger policy research organizations such as the Institute for Defense Analyses under contract to the DOD. The oldest and largest of these research organizations is RAND, which was established with private capital as a non-profit corporation in 1948. About half of RAND’s current work deals with national defense while the rest deals with a wide range of domestic policy issues.\(^\text{66}\)

RAND publishes *The RAND Journal of Economics*, a scholarly peer-reviewed journal of economics. RAND has approximately 1,600 employees and four principal locations: Santa Monica, California (headquarters); Washington, D.C. (currently located in Arlington, Virginia); Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania (adjacent to Carnegie Mellon University and the University of Pittsburgh); and Cambridge, United Kingdom (RAND Europe). RAND has several smaller offices in the United States as well, including the RAND Gulf States Policy Institute in Jackson, Mississippi and New Orleans, Louisiana. In 2003, it opened the RAND-Qatar Policy Institute in Doha.\(^\text{67}\)


RAND is also the home to the Frederick S. Pardee RAND Graduate School, one of the original graduate programs in public policy and the first to offer a Ph.D. The program is unique in that students work alongside RAND analysts on real-world problems. The campus is at RAND’s Santa Monica research facility. The Pardee RAND School is the world’s largest Ph.D.-granting program in policy analysis.  

Approximately 1,600 people from more than 45 countries work at RAND, representing diversity in work experience; political and ideological outlook; race, gender, and ethnicity; and academic training. This diversity reinforces RAND’s core values of quality and objectivity by promoting creativity, deepening understanding of the practical effects of policy, and ensuring multiple viewpoints and perspectives.

Providing a Forum for Public engagement, RAND hosted a variety of events in 2007 to inform the public debate on a broad spectrum of top policy problems. Policy Forums in Los Angeles, Washington, D.C., and Pittsburgh brought together RAND experts with prominent local policymakers and preeminent thinkers to discuss and debate nation-building in Iraq and beyond; the impact and promise of the No Child Left Behind Act; strategies for helping youth exposed to violence; America’s obesity epidemic; efforts to sustain the nonprofit arts sector in U.S. urban centers; new responses to homelessness; challenges in funding public transportation; and more. RAND also hosted lectures by visiting dignitaries including Admiral Thad W. Allen, Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard, who addressed concerns regarding port security and how the service is preparing to deliver effective emergency response in the wake of natural disasters like Hurricane Katrina.

In 2007, more than 2,700 individual media reports featuring RAND research or researchers were published or broadcast by newspapers,
magazines, news services, and television and radio networks around the world. Studies published in 2007 received the heaviest news coverage. In 2007, more than 70 op-eds were published in influential media outlets including the New York Times, Washington Post, Wall Street Journal, Los Angeles Times, Financial Times, The Guardian, and the International Herald Tribune. These commentaries provided timely, reasoned assessments of issues ranging from mounting ethnic tensions in Turkey and Afghanistan’s.72

In 2007, findings from RAND research were made publicly available in more than 1,000 published reports and documents. The majority of these materials, along with over 10,000 other RAND documents published since 1946, are available on RAND’s Web site for free download. Altogether, more than four million copies of RAND publications were downloaded from www.rand.org in 2007.73

RAND’s commitment to making a difference means that the scholarly objectives of expanding knowledge, illuminating issues, and developing new ideas are important means rather than ends. Communicating it’s research findings to decisionmakers who can use them is an essential part of RAND’s mission. In 2007, its dissemination activities were impressively broad, yet effectively targeted to influential decisionmakers capable of using our findings to inform their decisions and influence positive change.74

RAND researchers conducted numerous briefings for top military and civilian leadership on issues of geopolitics and global security; intelligence policy; military force structure; logistics and infrastructure; personnel, training, and health; and acquisitions and technology. In addition, RAND researchers

- briefed White House leadership on findings from a study on counterinsurgency efforts in Afghanistan;

---
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helped senior staff from the State Department, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and other offices and agencies assess the strategic and operational challenges posed by Iran and evaluate options for meeting those challenges;

briefed senior officials in the Department of Homeland Security on issues including passenger rail security;

briefed Department of Veterans Affairs officials on issues related to post-traumatic stress disorder;

made presentations to the Secretary of Education, other U.S. Department of Education officials, and numerous state education officials on the impacts of No Child Left Behind.75

RAND delivers research findings and lends analytical expertise to Congress to help legislators make better-informed decisions about the nation’s many challenges.

RAND researchers testified before Congress on 28 occasions, contributing objective analysis to debates on issues such as the federal role in supporting alternative energy investment, renewal of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act, and understanding terrorist ideology.

RAND convened dozens of bipartisan briefings to discuss findings on issues at the top of the legislative agenda, including challenges facing the global supply chain, the impact of the State Children’s Health Insurance Program on children’s quality of life, and challenges for U.S.–China relations.

Electronic newsletters customized for a congressional audience are delivered monthly to present research findings relevant to timely policy debates on Capitol Hill.76
In addition to the outreach conducted by RAND Europe and the RAND-Qatar Policy Institute to brief their respective policy communities on issues of regional importance. RAND staffs regularly engage with senior policymakers outside the United States to lend insights on matters of international interest.

- RAND’s acclaimed research on strategies to help a Palestinian state succeed once a final status accord is reached was briefed to former U.K. Prime Minister Tony Blair, now Special Envoy for the Quartet on the Middle East.

- Findings from The Beginner’s Guide to Nation-Building were briefed to the World Bank and the entire staff of the United Nations’ Department of Peacekeeping Operations, and NATO distributed copies of the report to 50 top staff members on the ground in Afghanistan.

- RAND Europe’s research on detecting fraud and error in the U.K. social security system formed the basis of a World Bank distance-learning module that is being used to train Bank clients and staff worldwide on social security fraud issues.\(^77\)

The achievements of RAND stem from its development of systems analysis. Important contributions are claimed in space systems and the United States’ space program, in computing and in artificial intelligence. RAND researchers developed many of the principles that were used to build the Internet. Numerous analytical techniques were invented at RAND, including dynamic programming, game theory, the Delphi method, linear programming, systems analysis, and exploratory modeling. RAND also pioneered the development and use of war gaming.\(^78\)

RAND operates three DOD-sponsored, federally funded research and development centers (FFRDCs). FFRDCs are research programs operated by private non-profit (non-commercial) organizations under long-term contracts. They develop and maintain essential expertise and capabilities important to

---
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their sponsors and operate in the public interest, free from real or perceived conflicts of interest. 79

RAND's creation enabled the Air Force to retain and extend the considerable civilian scientific contributions during World War II. As part of a larger program of research on air power at RAND, the Air Force seeded the development of a path-breaking analytical effort aimed at understanding the Soviet Union. Some of RAND's research addressed the development of Soviet strategy, doctrine, and military systems. The Air Force also requested analyses of the Soviet economy, foreign policy, science and technology programs, among many other topics. Soon the Air Force, and then the Office of the Secretary of Defense, turned to RAND for research on China, Eastern Europe, Japan, Southeast Asia, the Middle East, Latin America, and Western Europe. Although smaller in scale than the analyses of the Soviet Union, these studies also provided the Air Force — and through RAND's widely-disseminated published reports, the rest of the U.S. government and the public — with an independent body of research on a broad range of topics. These included economic strength, military capabilities, insurgencies, hegemonic intentions, and leadership succession possibilities in many nations and regions around the world. 80

In fact RAND is doing an increasing amount of work for governments around the world. The pattern of detailed country studies and broader regional analyses has been especially effective in work on Europe. RAND has a substantial presence in Europe, with three offices and research programs in both defense and non-defense fields. A series of analyses of conventional arms control using advanced combat models, and of the related question of limits on air power, had substantial influence on the U.S. position and ultimately on the resulting Conventional Forces in Europe (CFE) Treaty. Moreover, much of the
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early thinking about the rationale for alternative paths toward NATO expansion was done at RAND and other think tanks. \(^{81}\)

Over time, RAND developed complementary lines of research for the Army, as well as for other federal clients such as the intelligence community. And the DOD steadily increased the number and diversity of its external sources of research, also using others in the growing world of “think tanks” such as the Council on Foreign Relations, the American Enterprise Institute, and the Brookings Institution. \(^{82}\)

RAND’s federally funded research and development centers have a special role in helping to meet the research and analysis needs of their DOD sponsors. The FFRDCs are: Project AIR FORCE; the Army’s Arroyo Center; and the National Defense Research Institute (NDRI), which primarily serves the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Staff, and the defense agencies. Each of these centers conducts a broad, integrated program of research that addresses emerging security needs and their implications for the sponsoring organizations: the development of new strategies, doctrines, tactics, and concepts of operations; the application of new technologies; and issues related to logistics, manpower, training, personnel, health care, and systems acquisition. \(^{83}\)

For each FFRDC, RAND commits to developing and maintaining a set of specified, “core capabilities.” This is all done with close familiarity with the structure, doctrine, operations, and personalities of the sponsoring organizations. Indeed, one of the strengths of FFRDCs, whether operated by RAND or other non-profit entities, is their stability and long term, strategic, and close-in relationship with their military or OSD sponsors. \(^{84}\)

\(^{81}\) *Ibid* pp.22-23
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The research agenda-setting process is an iterative one that begins with the development of a long-term research plan that is revised annually. Continuous discussions between RAND research leaders and general officers or civilians of comparable rank enable RAND to develop an annual research program of individual studies, which is then approved by a high-level advisory board. In the case of Project AIR FORCE and the Arroyo Center, the advisory boards are chaired by the services’ vice chiefs of staff; in the case of NDRI, the chair is the principal deputy under secretary of defense for acquisition, technology, and logistics. Individual studies are typically commissioned by one or more senior officers or officials, who help shape the scope, phasing, and timetable of the research — providing comments, suggestions, and critiques along the way.\(^{85}\)

Think tanks are now called upon to contribute to a new challenge: the emergence of terrorism as a worldwide threat and of homeland security as a national priority of the highest order. RAND researchers have been studying terrorism for more than 30 years, and are today helping the United States government develop a comprehensive analytical approach to defend against terrorist attacks. Bigger bombs, better guns, and new weapons systems alone are not enough to defeat terrorists, who operate far from traditional battlefields. America also need a better understanding of who terrorists are, how they operate, what motivates them, and what can be done to stop them from expanding their ranks. RAND’s research and analysis is playing an important role in helping to improve government policy and decision-making in these vital areas.\(^{86}\)

Think tanks that work with defense and intelligence agencies once focused exclusively on regional and functional topics, but these organizations are now also being called upon to help the military address the new challenge of terrorism and homeland security, says RAND Executive Vice President Michael D. Rich. RAND researchers, who have been studying terrorism for more than 30 years, are now helping decision-makers develop a comprehensive analytical approach to defending against terrorist attacks and, at the same
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time, they are doing an increasing amount of research on other issues for governments around the world. 87

Current areas of expertise include: child policy, civil and criminal justice, education, environment and energy, health, international policy, labor markets, national security, infrastructure, energy, environment, corporate governance, economic development, intelligence policy, long-range planning, crisis management and disaster preparation, population and regional studies, science and technology, social welfare, terrorism, arts policy, and transportation. 88

Since the attacks on America on September 11, 2001, the RAND FFRDCs - like those of the other FFRDCs operated by other institutions, such as the Center for Naval Analyses, that regularly assist the DOD — have been called upon by their sponsors to modify their research agendas. The legacy of past work and resulting capabilities, coupled with the flexibility of the institutional arrangements and close working relationships between sponsors and researchers, operators, and analysts, have equipped the FFRDCs for these new dimensions in the nexus of foreign policy and defense planning. The “old” issues haven’t gone away, of course. They have simply been joined and complicated by the more recent ones. RAND’s experts on a broad range of national security issues have been helping America’s armed forces defend the nation for more than 50 years, dealing both with threats that are now part of history and with threats that will be on tomorrow’s front pages. 89

**PRACTICE OF INFLUENCE:**

The administration and Congress rely heavily on the think tank community for a great deal of analytical input and public policy advice. The frequent personnel movement back and forth among the ranks of the administration, Congress, and the think tanks ensures that the input is policy orientated. In addition to a vast out put of publications, both of advocacy
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and independent scholarly nature, the think tanks stage a continuous menu of conferences, workshops, seminars, and lectures on a wide variety of foreign and security policy issues. They provide a common meeting ground for frequent interchange of views and networking among policymakers, diplomats, legislators, business, academia, media, and the NGO community.\textsuperscript{90}

Despite relatively low profile, think tanks affect American foreign policy makers in distinct ways. According to Richard N. Hass:

> From the perspective of U.S policy makers, today's think tanks offer five principle benefits- they generate “new thinking” among U.S decision makers, provide experts to serve in the administration and Congress, give policy-makers a venue in which to build shared understanding on policy options, educate U.S citizens about the world, and provide third party mediation for parties in conflict.\textsuperscript{91}

**(1) The idea Factory:**

Think tanks have played a substantial role in popularizing and legitimizing ideas about the role of government and the proper organization of society. As one close observer noted as early as 1989, “if there is a new politics of ideas in the United States, these organizations (think tanks) are certainly the primary participant in it."\textsuperscript{92}

There greatest impact is generating ‘new thinking’ that changes the way that US decision makers perceive and respond to the world. Original insights can alter conceptions of U.S. national interests and influence the ranking of priorities, provide roadmaps for action, mobilise political and bureaucratic coalitions, and shape the design of lasting institutions. It is not easy, however, to grab the attention of busy policy-makers already immersed in information. To do so, think tanks need to exploit multiple channels and marketing strategies. Publishing articles, books and occasional

\textsuperscript{90} Frazer Cameron, \textit{n.18}

\textsuperscript{91} Richard N. Hass, Think Tanks and U.S Foreign Policy: A Policy Makers Perspective, in Role of Think Tanks In U.S Foreign Policy, \textit{US Foreign Policy Agenda, International Information Programme, Electronic Journal of the US Department of States}, (7)3, November, 2002.

papers, appearing regularly on television, op-ed-pages and in newspapers interviews, and producing reader-friendly issue briefs, fact-sheets, and web pages. Congressional hearings provide another opportunity to influence policy choices. Unencumbered by officials positions, think tanks scholars can afford to give candid assessments of pressing global challenges and the quality of government responses.\textsuperscript{93}

Certain historical junctures present exceptional opportunities to inject new thinking into the foreign policy arena. World War II offered one such instance. Following the War's outbreak, the Council on Foreign Relations launched a massive war and peace studies project to explore the desirable foundations of postwar peace. The participants in this effort ultimately produced 682 memoranda for the state Department on topics ranging from the occupation of Germany to the creation of the United Nations. Two years after the end of the war, the Council's marquee Journal, Foreign Affairs published an anonymous article on “The source of Soviet conduct.” The article, which was in fact authored by U.S. diplomat George Kennan, helped establish the intellectual foundation for the containment policy the United States would pursue for the next four decades. Then in 1993 Foreign Affairs published Harvard Political Scientist Samuel P. Huntington's “The clash of civilizations” a seminal contribution to the debate surrounding American foreign policy in the post-cold war era. Since September 11, 2001, studies by CSIS, Heritage, and Brooking have all contributed to the discussions within the government over the proper strategies and organizations needed to confront the terrorist threat at home and abroad.\textsuperscript{94}

Presidential Campaigns and transitions are ideal occasions to set the foreign policy agenda. As Martin Anderson of the Hoover Institution explains, “It is during these times that presidential candidates solicit the

\textsuperscript{93} \textit{Richard N. Hass, n.91, p. 4-9.}
\textsuperscript{94} \textit{Ibid., pp. 4-9}
advice of a vast number of intellectuals in order to establish policy positions on a host of domestic and foreign policy issues. Presidential candidates exchange ideas with policy experts and test them out on the campaign trail. It's like a national test-marketing strategy." The most celebrated case occurred after the 1980 election, when the Regan administration adopted the Heritage Foundation's publication, "Mandate for change", as a blueprint for governing. Another instance was a 1992 report by IIE and the Carnegie Endowment proposing an "economic security council". The Clinton administration implemented this proposal in creating a National Economic Council. 95 Opportunity 08, a project of the Brookings Institution in partnership with ABC News, aims to help Presidential candidates and the public focus on critical issues facing the nation, providing ideas, policy forums, and information on a broad range of domestic and foreign policy questions.96

Providing Talent:

Besides generating new ideas for senior government officials, think tanks provide a steady stream of experts to serve in incoming administrations and on congressional staffs. This function is critical in the American political system. In other advanced democracies, like France or Japan, new government can rely on the continuity provided by a large professional civil service. In the United States, each transition brings a turnover of hundreds of mid-level and senior executive branch personnel. Think tanks help presidents and cabinet secretaries fill this void. Following his election in 1976, Jimmy Carter Staffed his administration with numerous individuals from the Brookings Institution and the Council on Foreign Relations. Four years later, Ronald Regan turned to other think tanks to serve as his brain trust. During two terms in office, he drew on 150 individuals from Heritage, the Hoover Institution, and the American Enterprise Institute (AEI).97
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The current Bush Administration has followed a similar pattern in staffing the upper echelous of its foreign policy apparatus. Within the state Department, senior officials with think tanks backgrounds include the Undersecretary for Global Affairs, Paula Dobriansky, previously senior Vice-President and director of the Council on Foreign Relations’ Washington office; the Under secretary for Arms control and international security. John R. Bolton, formerly Vice President of AEI, the Assistant Secretary for East Asia and the Pacific, James Kelly, previously President of the Pacific Forum of CSIS, and the Assistant secretary – designate for International Organization Affairs, Kim Holmes, formerly Vice President at the Heritage Foundation. At the Pentagon, meanwhile, Peter W. Rodman assumed his position as Assistant Secretary of Defence for International Security Affairs after a stint as director of national security programmes at the Nixon center.98

In addition to supplying experts for incoming administrations, think tanks provide departing officials with institutional settings in which they can share insights gleaned from government service, remain engaged in pressing foreign policy debates and constitute an informal shadow foreign affairs establishment. This "revolving door" is unique to the United States, and a source of its strength. In most other countries one finds a strict division between career government officials and outside analysts. Not so in America. Madekine Albright, Colin Powell’s Predecessor as Secretary of state, once headed the center for National Policy. Her former deputy, Strobe Talbott, is now President of the Brooking Institution.99

Convening Professional:

In addition to bring new ideas and experts into government, think tanks provide policy-makers with venues in which to build shared understanding if not consensus, on policy options among the “foreign policy
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public". the opinion makers and shapers drawn from across the professions. As a rule, no major foreign policy initiative can be sustained unless it enjoys a critical base of support within the broad foreign policy community. Among think tanks, the non-partisan Council on Foreign Relations has been most adept at this convening role, hosting hundreds of meetings annually in New York, Washington, and major cities around the country. For U.S. officials, events at major think tanks offer non-partisan settings to announce new initiatives explain current policy and launched trail balloons. For visiting foreign dignitaries, the opportunity to appear before prominent think tank audiences provides access to the most influential segments of the U.S. foreign policy establishment.¹⁰⁰

**Engaging the Public:**

Even as they convene elites, think tanks, enrich America’s broader civic culture by educating U.S. citizens, about the nature of the world in which they live. The accelerating pace of globalization has made this outreach function more important than ever. As the world become more integrated, global events and forces are touching the lives of average Americans. Whether the issue is ensuring foreign markets for farm exports, tracking the spread of infections diseases, protecting U.S. software from piracy abroad, ensuring the safety of American tourists overseas, or safeguarding our ports against terrorist infiltration, the U.S. public has a growing stake in foreign policy, Eighty world Affairs councils, scattered around the United states, provide valuable forums in which millions of adults and high school students can discuss international events. But formal think tanks, too are increasingly engaging U.S. citizens. In 1999, the Aspen Institute launched a Global interdependence Initiative, “a 10-year effort to better inform, and more effectively Motivate, public support for forms of U.S. International engagement that are appropriate to an interdependent world”.¹⁰¹

---
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Bridging Differences:

Finally, think tanks can assume a more active foreign policy role by sponsoring sensitive dialogues and providing third party mediation for parties in conflict. As part of its congressional mandate, the US institute of peace has long facilitated such informal, “Track II” negotiations, as well as training US officials to mediate long-running disputes. But other, more traditional think tanks have also extended their mandates to participate actively in preventive diplomacy, conflict management, and conflict resolution. Beginning in the mid-1980s, the Carnegie Endowment hosted a series of meetings in Washington, bringing together leading South African politicians, clergy, businessmen, labour representatives, academics, and exiled liberation figures, as well as members of Congress and executive branch officials. These gatherings, occurring over eight years, helped establish the first dialogue and built understanding on South Africa’s future during a delicate political transition. Likewise, CSIS has launched projects to improve ethnic relations in the former Yugoslavia, to bridge religious-secular divisions in Israel, and to facilitate Greek-Turkish dialogue.  

Such unofficial initiatives are delicate undertakings. But they have great potential to build peace and reconciliation in conflict-prone regions and war-torn societies, either as a complement to U.S. government efforts or as a substitute when an official American presence is impossible. In the darkest corners of the world, they can serve as the eyes, the ears, and even the conscience of the United States and international community.

POLICY EFFECTIVENESS: NETWORKS FOR AFFECTING POLICY MAKING

Many think tanks are said to be influential but what is meant by influence is invariably imprecise. Conceptual devices such as policy communities explain the routes of influence but can not quantify the impact.
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Think tanks are ‘hidden participants’ in policy. Whereas decision making in the formal political arenas by political parties, legislature and executive is a more transparent process, while think tanks do not have a clear, consistent or legally designated route to policy influence, their policy entrepreneurship in policy provides informal but haphazard access and opportunities for agenda setting. They invest in a gradual, incremental creep of new ideas into prevailing thinking. \footnote{This process is captured in the quoted statement by Keynes.}

Practical men, who believed themselves to be quite exempt from any intellectual influences, are usually the slaves of some defunct economist. Madmen in authority who hear voices in the air are distilling their frenzy from some academic scriber of a few years back. \footnote{Ibid., 219}

Think tanks are in the business of developing, refining, repacking, and most importantly, marketing ideas. To this end, they employ a number of strategies to convey their thoughts to policy makers and to the public. These range from testifying before congressional committees and submitting editorial pieces to major newspapers, to inviting elected officials to participate in think tank sponsored seminars. \footnote{Diane Stone, Capturing the Political Imagination: Think Tanks and the Policy Process, Frank Cass, London, 1996, p.18}

However, rarely there is a one-to-one correspondence between a book or a study and a particular policy change. There are numerous intervening forces that mediate and alter the impact of research that shroud any cause and effect relationship that may exit between policy institutes and government decision making. Hence, influence can not be measured. Proof of it is elusive and, at best, unreliable. Think tanks indicators such as media citations or appearances of staffs before Congress and various committees merely signify that think tanks have attracted the attention of the media and politicians. It does not demonstrate that the thinking or perceptions of the

\footnotesize{\textit{Ibid.}, pp.4-9}
public or politicians has been influenced or that some policy initiative or reform has resulted. Asking the question, 'How do you measure the influence of independent policy research institution?' Misses the point. It is more important to ask first, what do they do that is relevant, and how? In nut shell, while it is difficult to accurately measure the extent to which think tanks influence specific policy decision, it is possible to identify the various strategies and channels they rely on to gain access to the corridors of power. By doing so, one can begin to observe how and to what extent think tanks have become entrenched in Washington's decision making network.

Think tanks recognise their specific role in the policy making process. Some think tanks find that their utility will be in helping to frame the parameters of public debates. This can be accomplished, as several think tanks have discovered, by appearing as regular guests on network newscasts and political talk shows, publishing articles in newspapers, producing documentaries on cable networks, enlisting the support of high level policy makers to endorse their publications, and sponsoring public lectures and workshops for academics, students, journalists, elected officials, and members of the private sectors. If this is the main objective of some think tanks, then it is possible to assess their relevance and relative influence during the agenda setting stage of the policy making process. Though labour intensive, data on print and broadcast media visibility of think tanks can be obtained. In examining the media visibility of think tanks in the United States, Kent Weaver and Andrew Rich offer some interesting observations about the various factors that may influence a think tank's media profile. Among other things, they discovered that the size and location of think tanks correlate highly with the amount of media exposure institutions generate. Large think tanks located inside the Beltway receive considerably more
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coverage in major US newspapers, many of which are based in Washington, than smaller think thanks in other parts of the country.108

Conversely, if some think tanks regard their primary role as influencing Congress, a goal acknowledged by Heritage Foundation President, Edwin Feulner then the performance indicators they rely on to assess their impact and the strategies they employ to improve them will differ. Convinced that scholarly publications alone could not significantly influence the outcome of policy debates, the American Enterprise Institute, the Heritage Foundation and other advocacy think-tanks began to develop a variety of marketing and lobbying techniques to capture the attention of decision-makers.109

**Competing in the Market Place of Ideas**

Think tanks vary considerably in terms of size and scope, financial resources and areas of specialisation, yet they appear to rely on similar governmental and nongovernmental channels to enhance their visibility - in the policymaking community. However, the various strategies think-tanks employ to market their ideas may depend as much on the audience they are attempting to reach and the importance they assign to a particular policy issue, as on the financial resources they are able to draw on. For instance, the Heritage Foundation has repeatedly stated that its main target audience is Congress.110 On the other hand, think-tanks, such as the National Bureau of Economic Research and the Brookings Institution, which attempt to reach a more diverse audience including policy-makers, civil servants, academics and university students, assign a much higher priority to producing scholarly analyses than to lobbying members of Congress. As a result, they allocate a considerably higher percentage of their animal budget to research than to marketing.111
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Recognising that all think-tanks do not share the same commitment to research or the desire to be lured into the political arena, they continue to rely on many channels to transmit their ideas to their target audience. While many of these channels can be pursued. Independently and for a variety of purposes, think-tanks frequently rely on a combination of them in an attempt to influence the content and outcome of key political debates. The 1993 vote in Congress over the ratification of the North American Free Trade Agreement and the ongoing discussions in Congress and the Executive over health care reform, are but two examples of when think-tanks have sought to influence important policy issues. It is difficult to measure the extent to which think-tanks, either acting alone or in concert with other actors in policy communities, are ably to influence specific decisions in the White House and on Capitol Hill. Nonetheless, their efforts to inform policy-makers about the implications associated with a wide range of issues deserve closer attention.\footnote{112}

Although often overlooked, think-tanks appear to make the greatest contribution to the development and refinement of ideas during presidential elections. As Martin Anderson of the Hoover Institution points out:

\[\text{[I]t is during this period that presidential candidates solicit the advice of a vast number of intellectuals in order to establish policy positions on a host of domestic and foreign policy issues. Presidential candidates exchange ideas with policy experts and test them out on the campaign trail. It's like a national test marketing strategy.}\footnote{113}

In several recent elections, presidential candidates have even publicly endorsed blueprints written by think-tanks which outlined the key domestic and foreign policy priorities for the incoming administration.\footnote{114}

In addition to participating in campaigns and contributing independent studies for candidates to digest, think-tanks depend on a number of other strategies to reach decision-makers. Among the most common methods think-
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tanks employ is to invite members of Congress, the Executive, the bureaucracy and their staff as well as journalists and other opinion leaders to lunches, dinners, seminars and conferences.\textsuperscript{115} Since think-tanks are constantly releasing new studies and discussing ongoing research programs with government officials and academics, these forums offer an opportunity for scholars from think-tanks to showcase their ideas.\textsuperscript{116}

To reinforce their ideas, some think-tanks offer courses on various aspects of American politics and invite policy-makers to participate in their programs. For instance in 1978, the Institute for Policy Studies (IPS) established the Washington School to educate policy-makers about a wide range of foreign and domestic policy issues. According to Scott Powell, an ardent critic of the IPS, the organisation created the Washington School to provide a forum for IPS scholars to exchange views with policy-makers.\textsuperscript{117}

To facilitate the exchange of ideas between think-tank scholars and Washington policy-makers on critical domestic and foreign policy issues, the Hoover Institution established the Washington Seminars in 1980 under the direction of Associate Director and Senior Fellow Richard T. Burress.\textsuperscript{118} According to a Hoover Institution memo circulated in February 1990:

> When the seminars first began, one major fact was evident: many of the Washington participants had never met before or were only slightly acquainted. The significance of this point was illustrated by one participant who wrote, 'I found it particularly useful to come to know some of my colleagues from Washington ... a few days together at Stanford did wonders for communication among the Senate staff establishment'.\textsuperscript{119}

Since the program started, the Hoover Institution has held over a dozen two-day seminars involving approximately 12 to 15 participants. The seminars, which focus on a specific theme, are led by one or two Hoover scholars.
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Discussions on foreign policy however, are more broad-based. The seminars have been attended by Democratic and Republican members of the House of Representatives and Congressional staff members from the House and Senate Committees on Foreign Relations, Appropriations, Budget, Armed Services, Finance, Foreign Affairs, Ways and Means, Intelligence, and the offices of the Senate Majority Leader and the House Speaker, Minority Leader and Majority Whip.  

The seminars are usually followed up by meetings in Washington to bring together individuals who have participated in the program, Hoover scholars and other government officials. According to the Hoover Institution, 'these meetings and seminars are now playing a critical role in the ongoing dialogue between scholars and policy-makers, which is so important to the effective development and implementation of legislative and executive department policies and programs'.

By presenting lectures at universities; professional and trade associations, government seminars and policy research institutions, think-tank scholars can also showcase their own ideas. As Howard Wiarda, former Director of the Center for Hemispheric Studies at the American Enterprise Institute points out, 'at some future time when a policy-maker is looking for someone to give him advice, he [may] call on the speaker he heard at one of these forums'.

Gaining access to various media outlets also provides members of think-tanks with an opportunity to transmit their ideas to policy-makers and to impress potential donors. By appearing as regular guests on network newscasts and a host of political talk shows, think-tank analysts are not only able to enhance their exposure but that of the institutions they represent.
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According to Dr N. Glenn Campbell, former director of the Hoover Institution, think-tanks encourage their scholars to submit op-ed articles to prominent American newspapers on a regular basis. He states:

In addition to books, a program has been devised to get these ideas before the general public in a timely fashion in daily newspapers throughout the country. We urge scholars to extend their writing beyond books and professional journals into the general public arena. Research results in the form of short essays written by scholars are sent to newspapers for publication on the page opposite the editorial page.

During their annual fund-raising campaigns, directors of think-tanks often approach corporate sponsors armed with statistics on how many opted articles were written by their scholars in the past year and the number of times their staff members appeared on radio and television talk shows and newscasts. The names of their staff who are currently serving in high level government positions and former officials who are working in their think-tank are also proudly waived before prospective donors.

Think-tanks are acutely aware of the importance of attracting funding. However, at the same time, they cannot afford to ignore the needs of 'policy-makers, the primary consumers of think-tank knowledge. Since scholars in think-tanks, unlike academics in universities, are expected to produce timely and policy relevant studies, policy-makers are turning increasingly to think-tanks for information and advice. Realising this, some think-tanks have taken additional steps to capture and maintain their attention.

The American Enterprise Institute was the first think-tank to recognize the importance of providing succinct and informative analyses to policymakers. Yet, few organisations have been as successful in this regard as the Heritage Foundation, the quintessential advocacy think-tank. Specialising in 'quick response' public policy research, the Heritage Foundation can provide each
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member of Congress and the Executive with hand-delivered executive summaries of current public policy issues within 24 hours. In their one to two page Executive Memoranda, researchers at the Heritage Foundation outline what they consider to be critical information on issues being considered on Capitol Hill and in the White House. As the Heritage Foundation points out in its 1990 Annual Report, our 'entire communications' strategy is based on a simple premise: that policy-makers usually don't have the time to wade through and interpret long, complex books and reports, let alone much of the legislation they're being asked to vote on'. Since the Heritage Foundation admits that its premise role is to influence the Washington public policy community, it is not surprising that it inundates members of Congress and Executive with its policy views, In addition to the Executive Memoranda, the Heritage Foundation distributes several other brief reports to inform and educate policymakers.

In the process of increasing their exposure in the policy-making community by relying on the aforementioned channels, think-tank scholars are able to establish valuable contacts throughout government. The presence of former high-level officials at think-tanks also plays a pivotal role in facilitating access to key decision-makers. As former Secretary of State George Shultz notes, 'a prominent political person around a think-tank opens up multiple channels for think-tank specialists'. Placing the names of former high level decision-makers on their institutional letterhead also helps think-tanks attract research funding.

There are several examples of former government officials who have sought refuge in or returned to think-tanks after leaving public office. For
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instance, following his defeat in 1976, President Ford established an affiliation with the American Enterprise Institute. Similarly, after completing her responsibilities as US Ambassador to the United Nations, Jeane Kirkpatrick returned to AEI. Former Secretary of Defense Richard Cheney also joined AEI after President Bush's election defeat. Zbigniew Brzezinski, President Carter's National Security Adviser, accepted a position at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, in 1980, joining other such luminaries as Henry Kissinger, Harold Brown, Admiral William Crowe and James Schlesinger. Following the completion of their responsibilities in the Reagan administration, Secretary of State Shultz took up residence at the Hoover Institution, while his colleagues, Richard V. Allen, William Bennett, Jack Kemp and Edwin Meese accepted positions at the Heritage Foundation. Meese and Richard V. Allen, President Reagan's first National Security Adviser, who now heads his own Washington, DC consulting firm, also maintain an affiliation with the Hoover Institution. Some prominent decision-makers in the Bush administration have also established close ties to think-tanks. For instance, following his election defeat, Vice President Dan Quayle discovered that the Hudson Institute in Indianapolis, Indiana provided him with a congenial environment to contemplate his political future. 133

Given the amount of expertise available at these and other think tanks, it is not surprising policy-makers frequently turn to them for advice. And in exchange for providing their insight on important policy questions, think-tank scholars are rewarded in a number of ways. On some occasions, they are invited as experts to testify on a wide range of topics before committees and subcommittees of Congress. For instance in 1991, 46 members from the Brookings Institution, 18 members from the American Enterprise Institute and 16 members from the Economic Strategy Institute testified before congressional committees. 134 Appearing before congressional committees and
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subcommittees provides think-tank scholars with an important channel through which to comment directly on proposed legislation. It also allows some think-tanks to establish greater credibility in the eyes of decision-makers.  

Moreover, think-tanks serve as 'prime recruiting grounds for new government talent'. As Kent Weaver notes, incoming administrations frequently turn to research institutions to fill vacant posts. He writes:

Think-tanks' role as a supplier of personnel to government is in large measure a result of the permeability of administrative elites. Unlike in most parliamentary systems, cabinet ministers in the United States are not drawn exclusively from parliamentary caucuses, and senior department officials are not drawn primarily from the public service. There are multiple paths to such government posts, a lot of posts to be filled whenever an administration changes, and a lot of ex-government officials who cycle out of government service but want to remain involved in policy formation. Think-tanks fit naturally into this system in the United States.

Both the Carter and Reagan administrations relied extensively on think tank scholars to fill high-level posts. As noted, President Carter recruited dozens of members from the Trilateral Commission, the Council on Foreign Relations, the Brookings Institution and a handful of other 'liberal' think tanks to serve in his administration. President Reagan on the other hand drew heavily on the talent pool of scholars available at more conservative think-tanks such as the Hoover Institution, the American Enterprise Institute, and the Center for Strategic and International Studies, the Committee on the Present Danger and the Heritage Foundation to implement his Conservation agenda. During and after his 1992 campaign victory, President Clinton also tapped into the expertise available at some Washington, DC think-tanks. He invited a number of scholars affiliated with a group of Washington-based think-tanks, including the Progressive Policy Institute and the Economic Policy Institute, to occupy high-level positions in his administration.
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By serving in the Executive, the bureaucracy or on the staff of congressional committees and subcommittees, think-tank scholars have a unique opportunity to contribute to policy development. Instead of simply commenting on US foreign policy in a scholarly study, they often find themselves in a position to help shape America's role in world affairs. Moreover, once think-tank scholars accept government posts, they are in a better position to recommend their former colleagues for various jobs. 139

Developing and strengthening their ties to government officials is vital for think-tanks. Unless they are able to create an extensive network of contacts throughout the governmental hierarchy, they will have little input into the formulation of policy positions. Consequently, it is not surprising that Washington's leading think-tanks devote so much time and effort to building alliances with members of Congress and the Executive.

Ties with government officials

Think Tanks also recognize the importance of solidifying ties to officials in the major institutions responsible for international relations: the State Department, the Defence Department and the National Security Council (NSC). Obtaining access to the various Presidential advisory boards concerned with foreign policy is an additional avenue think tanks rely on to convey their ideas. 140

The State Department does maintain formal ties with several think tanks through its diplomats in Residence programme. Between assignments, diplomats can take up residence at think tanks to write, conduct research and deliver lectures. Diplomats have been assigned to the American Enterprises Institutes, the Hoover Institution, the Centre for Strategic and International Studies, the RAND Corporation, the council on Foreign Relations, the Carnegie Endowment for International peace and more recently, the Heritage
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Foundations. The State Department usually sends diplomats to think tanks to conduct research.

At the Department of Defence, the views of some research institutions are highly valued and acted upon. In a study, the *Wizards of Armageddon*, Fred Kaplan examines in intimate detail how, for over three decades, defence strategies at the RAND Corporation helped develop America's military strategy. Specialising in the tactics of conventional and nuclear warfare, the RAND Corporation, with the assistance and support of Department of Defence officials, was in effect able to serve as an extension of the Pentagon.

The relationship between the RAND Corporation and the Department of Defence reveals that how some contract research institutions have been able to obtain a strong foothold in the decision making process. Defence strategies at the RAND Corporation helped develop America’s military strategies. Specialising in the tactics of conventional and nuclear warfare, the RAND Corporation, with the assistance and support of the Department of Defence officials, was in effect able to serve as an extension of the Pentagon. The Institute for Naval Analysis, the Hudson Institutes and the urban Institute are other examples of contract think tanks which have assigned various government departments formulate policy positions key domestic and foreign policy issues.

In the white house, members of think tanks have several opportunities to contribute to policy development. By participating on the Presidents Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board (PFIAB), the President’s Economic Policy Advisory Board (PEPAB), the President’s Intelligence Oversight Board (PIOB) and the President’s general Advisory Committee on Arms Control and
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Disarmament (GAC), think tanks scholars can have a direct impact on the foreign policy pursued by the Presidents.\textsuperscript{146}

By serving on the PFIAB, policy advisors have access to highly sensitive informations. They are in a position to provide direct input into foreign policy decision made by the President.

Participating on other advisory boards provides members of the think tanks with additional opportunities to become involved in the foreign policy making process. The President's Intelligence Oversight Board (PIOB), which was created by President Ford on the recommendation of the Rockefeller commission, afford think tanks scholars such an opportunity. The purpose of the three member’s board is to monitor the activities of the intelligence community and to advice the President as to the legality and propriety of intelligence activities. In 1981, President Reagan asked W.Glenn Cambell to chair PIOB. Cambell, who was also a member of PIOB, was still serving as director of the Hoover Institution at the time of his joint appointment.\textsuperscript{147}

In addition to these, President receives advice on the wide range of domestic and foreign economic policies from the President's Economic Policy Advisory Board (PEPAB). The idea of establishing the PEPAB was conceived by Martin Anderson and modeled after the PFIAB. Convinced that such a body could play a valuable role in assiting him implement his economic agenda, President Reagan announced the creation of the twelve member PEPAB on 10 february, 1981. Other than Anderson, who serves as the Board's secretary, the PEPAB included a number of economist from prominent think tanks, such as Arthur Bruns (American Enterprise Institute), Milton Fridman (Hoover Institution), Pual McKraken (AEI), Herbert Stein (AEI), and Thomas Sowell (Hoover Institution).\textsuperscript{148}
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Through various institutional channels, think tanks have become actively involved in the policy making process. Whether by inviting members of Congress and Executive to seminars and conferences or by accepting high-level government or advisory positions, think tanks scholars have establish ties to key policy makers. Yet, while think tanks continue to devote considerable resources to establishing and strengthening their ties to decision-makers, they are relying increasingly on the media to enhance their visibility in the policy making community.

**Media and Think Tanks:**

The print and broadcast media in the United States have come depend increasingly on a handful of prominent policy specialist to provide succinct and informative analyses of important domestic and foreign policy events. Among those called upon on a regular basis to share their political insights are Secretary of State, National Security Adviser to President, Secretary of Defence and Ambassador to UN and other States. While these individuals have held influential government positions and considered prominent political scientist, they share other common attributes. They are affiliated with prominent Washington think tanks. ¹⁴⁹

By relying on policy experts from a number of think tanks to offer commentaries on a host of political issues, the media are attempting to provide their audience with a more comprehensive understanding of complex political issues. Yet, by doing so, they are permitting members of think tanks to gain access to important channels through which to influence and shape public opinion. While it is often difficult to accurately measure the extent to which policy experts can influence and alter public attitude, their willingness to use the media to advance the mandate of the organisations they present can be disregarded. Although the media can often benefit by soliciting the insight of

¹⁴⁹ Ibid., p.81
policy analyst in think tanks, the consequences of this symbiotic relationship may be less benign.\footnote{Ibid., p. 81}

The emergence of advocacy think tanks in the late 1960s and early 1970s has had profound impact on the relationship between policy research institution and media. While early research institute were often mention in the popular press, the work they conduct and the government officials they advice were rarely revealed.\footnote{Daniel Guttman and Barry Wilner, *The Shadow Government: The Government Multimillion Dollar Give a Way of its Decision Making Power to Private Management Consultants, Experts, and Think Tanks* (New York: Pantheon, 1976)} However, for many new think tanks, exposing rather than concealing their activities has become a preferred method of operation.\footnote{Angelita Herrin, ‘offering the Best Thought: Think Tanks Go After Attention’; *The Miami Herald*, 26 February 1989}

As think tanks become more active participants in the decision-making process, and as the competitions for corporate funding intensified, directors of research institutions began to recognise the important role the media could play in transforming relatively obscure research organisations into prominent players in the policy making community. Rather than simply exchanging ideas with learned colleagues in a private board room, think tanks began to search for a more divers audience.\footnote{Donald .E Ableison, *n 111*, p.82}

Few think tanks are more acutely aware of the vital role the media can play in transmitting their ideas to the American public than Heritage Foundation. As the foundation’s President, Edwin Feulner, points out, think tanks should skillfully advertise their research products, because like, manufactured goods must be properly marketed to capture the consumer’s attentions.\footnote{Phil McCombs, ‘Building a Heritage in the War of Ideas’, *Washington Post*, 3 October, 1983}

It does not matters how many books and studies you produce’, you have got to market your product [and] get it off the bookshelf.\footnote{Carol Matlack, ‘Marketing Ideas’, *National Journal*, 22 June 1991} Similarly, the American Enterprise Institutes, Hoover Institution, Centre for Strategic and
International Studies and other influential think tanks that recognize the importance of attracting media attentions.\textsuperscript{156}

In addition to encouraging its scholars to write op-ed articles for prestigious American newspapers and to accept invitations to appear on network newscast and political talk shows, on occasion purchased television time to sponsor programme advocating a political positions.\textsuperscript{157}

It is difficult to ignore the vital contribution policy experts can make to increasing public awareness about the political, economic, and social dimensions of American domestic and foreign policy. On the other hand, while the journalists will continue to rely on policy experts to provide political commentaries, they should realise that educating the public is not the sole objective of think tanks.

By becoming more aware of what motivates think tanks in the political arena, the American media will be in a better position to determine how and what extent the advice of policy experts should be solicited. In additions, by acquiring themselves with the ideological orientations of various policy research institutions, journalist will be better able to provide their audience with a balanced interpretation of political events. Conversely, if the media are committed to advance their own political and institutional agenda, they may consciously select those experts who will faithfully support their views. In other words, the political positions of policy experts, rather than their ability to provide an informative and quotable ten second bite, may ultimately determine which experts appear regularly on network newscast.\textsuperscript{158}

Although network producers and journalist can limit the access of think tanks scholars to various media outlets, it is doubtful that when faced with the constant pressure of deadlines, they will have the ability and willingness to expand their golden Rolodex. As a result, it is unlikely that the

\textsuperscript{156} Donald E Abelson, \textit{Id}, p 82
\textsuperscript{157} \textit{Id}, p 83
\textsuperscript{158} \textit{Id}, pp 89-90
small group of policy experts upon which the American media has come to rely will quickly disappear.\textsuperscript{159}

The increasing reliance of the media on policy experts will not change in the near future. Nor will the political motivations of think tanks. On the contrary, as policy research institutions continue to proliferate and compete for influence and funding in the United States, their desire to gain access to the news media will become even more pronounced. However, in the final analysis, only the media can determine how much exposure these organisations will be granted.\textsuperscript{160}

By relying on various governmental and non-governmental channels, think tanks, either acting alone or in concert with other actors in the political process, have attempted to influence the contents and outcome of major policy initiative. The effort of think tanks to become actively involved in the foreign policy making process has become a characteristic feature of contemporary policy research institutions. Whether on their own or as part of a network of organisations sharing similar concerns, think tanks are committed to influence the political agenda. By assuming the role lobbyist, many think tanks have revealed their primary functions. While some institutions continue to assign the highest priority to the advancement of knowledge, other has redefined their role in American politics. Rather than remaining disinterested observers of the political process, some think tanks have made a concerted effort to become part of it. Many think tanks have become more committed to influencing policy than to improving it. They are run like businesses whose performances are measured on how successful they are in mass marketing their ideas. But think tanks that promote a particular ideology, without having the expertise to substantiate their views, will not survive in the increasingly competitive marketplace of ideas; nor will think tanks that sacrifice scholarship for short-term public notoriety. Only those think tanks that maintain a healthy balance
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between scholarship and aggressive salesmanship will remain well entrenched in the policy-making process.\textsuperscript{161}

The notion that think tanks exercise political influence is easily criticised. Through both formal and informal avenues, think tanks become linked to centre of power. However, this potential is limited to policy innovation and the dissemination of ideas. There are number of reasons why the policy impact of institute is limited. First, outside the formal arenas of politics and without large constituencies, think tanks have little political power other than the intrinsic persuasiveness of their policy analysis. Most politicians and bureaucrats do not have the time or inclinations to read books-length studies or even executive summaries. Furthermore, bureaucrats act as gatekeepers sifting the information that lands on a minister’s desk. They may also present it as their own material. On the other hand, they criticise institutes for their lack of appreciations of the complexities of policy initiation and drafting legislations. Independent research and analysis competes with many other sources of advice which often have more direct routes of access to decision makers. Indeed, it may be that the end result of the interaction among academics, politicians, bureaucrats and other practitioners and experts that think tanks so enthusiastically pursue represents no more than the opportunity to interact.\textsuperscript{162}

While there are occurrences of think tanks being consulted by government, this \textit{ad-hoc}. Furthermore, political influence may be the result of luck or a host of other factors at work. The window of opportunity for think tanks may be greatest just before an election and early in the term of a new government when political executives are still establishing their priorities and think tanks are busy producing transitions documents. While staff of policy institutes can be shown to have a strong desire to influence policy, and while some are in positions of authority and have scope for influence, it is not
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unequivocal evidence that that influence is exerted. The counter factual argument can be employed to limited degree. If think tanks are of negligible relevance, than they do.163

Second, the commitment of most institutes to be educational, analytical organisation, that adhere to standards of dispassionate and rigorous research limits their political activity and erects professional or scholarly standards that restricts complete identification with the state, political parties or their sectional interests. 164

Third, independent policy research institutes are dependent organisation. The interest of funders places limits on the autonomy of institutes and constrains research agendas. Most of the American institutes are sustained in large proportion by foundations. In some, degree institutes are beholden to the funding priorities of foundations. Foundations executives and other sponsors have the ability to define what are emerging policy agendas and to legitimisation particular kinds of professional expertise.165 in the interests of continued existence and financial viability, institutes need to accommodate some of the expectations of funders. Institutes are also reliant on the academic world for theoretical advances, for scholars to undertake policy analysis with these new theoretical insights, and for scholarly regeneration. Furthermore, it is the formally defined power holders- legislators, bureaucrats, party officials and the judiciary – who are responsible for the selection and the persistence of ideas in policy and indeed, their incorporation into policy into policy networks. In the last, instance, think tanks are dependent on them for recognition and to see their policy recommendations implemented.166

Perhaps the most demanding indictment of contemporary think tanks is that they are becoming more like interest groups or are being drawn into
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interest group circles. This is particularly the case with the “think tanks and do tanks”. The majority new institutes do not make pretence of scientific, dispassionate and objective research and are open about their ideological disposition. But they draw a line at declaring an alliance with sectional interests in society. Yet, as think tanks become more penalised in conjunction with the requirement to be adversarial in advocating policy advice and analysis, they appear to be in cahoots with clearly identifiable groups. The Washington Institute for Near East Policy had good reputation for solid analysis on Middle East issues. It also has a clear affinity with the Jewish lobbying Washington D.C and substantial financial support from the Jewish community.\(^{167}\)

There are systematic difficulties faced by think tanks in their interaction with government that limit their potential for influence. As they operate as ‘ginger groups’ they can be politically and bureaucratically dysfunctional. By elaborating on policy options, increasing the number of alternatives and outlining possible problems, these policy research bodies potentially overload collective decision making process, disrupt established programmes, undermine consensus and question the legitimacy of a government’s chosen policy. They provide the rhetorical weapons for opposition groups. Identifying flaws in policies or promoting superior policy design does not endear these organisations to politicians or bureaucrats. Consequently, ‘think tanks are not easy to integrate in to policy making system’. They question the accepted and debunk the habitual in contradiction to the inbuilt conservatism of bureaucracies. Traditional machineries of government are likely to dismiss their contributions to policy. Admitting this salience of independent policy research tacitly recognizes the flaws in the expertise and authority of bureaucracies. Finally, the desire to maintain their independence and distance from government
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may result in a self imposed restrain on the impact that independent policy units can have on policy.\textsuperscript{168}

There is multiple source of policy advice competing for the attention of policy makers. Departmental policy advice, from ministers’ office, party political advice, political advice from policy units, the recommendation of Congressional committees and outside advice are all sources of potentially conflicting forms of advice. The favored source of advice is subject to a variety of factors such as a leader’s personal preference to the avenues of access to that leader. Governments can also be characterised by closed advice circuits or group think where advisers and decision makers share values and policy approaches effectively excluding alternatives from consideration. Decision makers do not necessarily have time for think tanks research. As Alice Rivlin notes of Brooklyn scholars, none of us draft legislation, sit in committee markups, or even talk more than sporadically to those who do. President does not call to ask what we should do in Middle East? Or how can we balance the budget? Government officials do not call—at least not very often. Nor is it the case that the decision makers are even aware of think tanks, least of all their current research programmes. Further more, the vast growth of think tanks has not been replicated with super human abilities in decision makers to read and process the information churned out by think tanks and other groups. So, it quite different thing to say that think tanks policy recommendation thereby percolated into actual policy.\textsuperscript{169}

It can not be denied that the impact of even the best known think tanks on policy is modest. Policy making is mainly driven by interest, not by ideas. Despite the absence of proof and criticism, the impact of many institutions in helping to forge a consensus on foreign policy has been and remains pervasive. Knowledge and ideas are a source of power. The modern state depends on
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experts whose views on issues can provide the theories and rationale for policy legislation. State structures are the dominant but not the only source of policy innovations as there is a need to consult other interests for information. Think tanks seek to provide this kind of information and occasionally play a dynamic role in identifying problems. Policy research institutes are most likely to inform policy when they are part of an epistemic community, a wider policy community or discourse coalition. These analytical frameworks are concerned with agenda-setting, networking, research brokerage and the ways in which policy actors operate to establish a discourse that frames understanding of problems and policy. In particular, institutes help forge common identities and shared values among experts and opinion leaders through their conferences, workshops and study groups, and thereby help determine the ubiquitous climate of opinion. Ideas about networks allow an assessment of think tanks influence or effectiveness that gets beyond providing or measuring the input of these organisations into a given policy or legislative act. In other words, power is not narrowly, conceived as behavioral and observable, but that power is structural and operates through exclusion and non-decision making. Through both informal and formal avenues, think tanks become linked to centres of power such as the state or corporate sector.

Policy institutes are on the margins of government but not in the government. There is enormous scope for the investigations of the mechanism that connect organisations on the margin of government with the conventional structures of government. While the approval of public policy remains with elected representatives and appointed officials, governments draw upon outside sources of advice and information. Think tanks are shown to be a contemporary mode of interaction between the world of scholarship and inquiry and the domain of policy-making. In a world where knowledge,
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information and expertise are burgeonising, think tanks are an increasingly important mechanism for filtering and refining such resources in a relevant and usable manner.

The scholars and executive of think tanks act as policy entrepreneurs. Think tanks serve three functions: i, they promote ideas by pushing them higher on the public agenda. ii. they ‘soften up’ the system so that when a policy winded opens, an epistemic community’s ideas meet a receptive audience; and iii, they make the critical coupling of problem, policy and politics when a window of opportunity open.

Research brokerage and networking are the primary means by which think tanks make ideas matters. Research brokerage is a process of conveying social scientific knowledge from universities and research organization to the world of politics and decision making. In this process think tanks are often conceived as a bridge between academia and decision makers. They ‘occupy a space in the intellectual life, a society between universities, with their preoccupation on teaching and research, and the Civil Service with its preoccupation with day to day management of public policy’. They run by ‘research brokerage’- people of initiative who build institutions where intellectual can work on policy issues- and who could also be called; discourse managers. Brokerage also occurs through the training and development of staffs. Staffs are required from universities, political parties, law firms, interest groups and government. Staffs experience and professional interaction is an important facet of communication.173

Another form of brokerage occurs when policy institutes act as a forum for discussion and interaction through conferences, workshops, seminars, breakfast and luncheon meetings, television debates, working groups and annual dinners- functions that may be ‘ invite only’ or ‘members only’, closed to the media or open to the interested public. Both

173 Ibid, pp.122-123
social functions and the more intensive working environment of seminars and meetings serve an intangible purpose of promoting interaction among people from diverse backgrounds who would not ordinarily meet but who have common interests. Importantly, think tanks provide neutral territory where people feel more comfortable and have an opportunity to mingle. Academics can meet practitioners, business people can discuss regularly policy with bureaucrats, and activists can confront politicians.\textsuperscript{174}