

- Techniques in Political Risk Analysis." In *Theory and Practice in Political Risk Analysis 2* (May). Proceedings of a conference sponsored by the Association of Political Risk Analysts, pp. 11-14.
- Kovanda, Karel. 1984. "Characteristics of the Ideal Political Risk Analyst." In *Theory and Practice in Political Risk Analysis 2* (May). Proceedings of a conference sponsored by the Association of Political Risk Analysts, pp. 33-39.
- Lasswell, Harold D. 1963. *The Future of Political Science*. New York: Atherton Press.
- Majone, Giandomenico. 1989. *Evidence, Argument and Persuasion in the Policy Process*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- McClelland, Charles A. 1978. "D-Files for Monitoring and Forecasting Threats and Problems Abroad." Los Angeles: International Relations Research Institute, University of Southern California, January.
- Nehrt, Lee C. 1987. "The Internationalization of the Curriculum." *Journal of International Business Studies* 18(1) (Spring): 83-90.
- Ricks, David A. and Michael R. Czinkota. 1979. "International Business: An Examination of the Corporate Viewpoint." *Journal of International Business Studies* 10(2) (Fall): 97-100.
- Rummel, R. J. and David A. Heenan. 1978. "How Multinationals Analyze Political Risk." *Harvard Business Review* (January-February): 67-76.
- Simon, Jeffrey C. 1982. "Political Risk Assessment: Past Trends and Future Prospects." *Columbia Journal of World Business* 17(3) (Fall): 62-71.
- UMI Dissertation Abstracts Ondisc*, 35/07-49/07-51/06 (January 1985-December 1990), Ann Arbor, MI.
- University of Pennsylvania. The Wharton School MBA Catalog, 1990-91.
- Vogel, David. 1987. "The New Political Science of Corporate Power." *Public Interest* 87 (Spring): 63-79.

Interviews

- Bruce, David, Director, International Business Council, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA, June 17, 1991.
- Coplin, William D., Director, Public Affairs Program at the Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University, Syracuse, NY, June 7, 1991.
- Hegburg, Alan, Director, International Affairs, Phillips Petroleum Company, Bartlesville, OK, June 8, 1991.
- Samuels, Barbara, Deputy Director for Country Risk Policy, Chase Manhattan Bank, New York, June 7, 1991.
- West, Gerald, Senior Advisor, Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency, The World Bank, Washington, DC, May 8, 1991.

About the Author

Michele Zebich-Knos

Michele Zebich-Knos is assistant professor of political science at Kennesaw State College in the University System of Georgia. Her teaching and research interests are in the area of third world studies, international relations, and public policy with special emphasis on Latin America.



Academics to Ideologues: A Brief History of the Public Policy Research Industry

James G. McGann, *Temple University*

Public policy research institutes are a twentieth-century phenomenon and in many ways unique to the United States. Rooted in the social sciences and supported by private individuals and foundations, think tanks began to appear around 1900 as a part of a larger effort to bring the expertise of scholars and managers to bear on the economic and social problems of this period (Smith 1991).¹ According to Patricia Linden, "The early versions [of think tanks], set up by private capital long before the proliferation of tax-funded social agencies, were organized to alleviate problems of the poor. Two survivors of that era are the National Conference on Social Welfare, formed in 1873, and the Russell Sage Foundation, established in 1907 to help provide housing and better conditions for the

elderly, orphaned and indigent" (Linden 1987). Linden does not state what the connection is between these institutions and the evolution of think tanks, but one can surmise that it has to do with the fact that they were independent institutions that were engaged in developing policies and programs to alleviate human suffering.

I prefer to trace the origins of these institutions to the Brookings Institution, which was established in 1916, because Brookings was the first independent organization dedicated exclusively to conducting public policy research. Using this as a starting point, one can divide the history of the public policy research industry into four time periods that spawned many of the think tanks that exist today: 1900-29, 1930-59, 1960-75,

and 1976-90. Table 1 summarizes the number of institutes that were established during these periods and that have remained in operation.

Each one of the four periods was marked by a major domestic or international upheaval that sparked the creation of a new generation of public policy research institutes. These major events were wars of one kind or another: World War I,

TABLE 1
Public Policy Research Institutes
(by Period Founded)

Period	Number Founded
1900-1929	10
1930-1959	17
1960-1975	30
1976-1990	55

World War II, the War on Poverty, and the War of Ideas.

For each of these periods, I have selected an institution that reflects the economic and political environment of that time. In the 1920s, it was the Brookings Institution; in the 1940s, the Rand Corporation; in the 1960s, the Urban Institute; and in the 1970s, the Heritage Foundation (see Table 2). The organizations that came into being during these four periods were influenced by the innovations introduced by these four institutions. For instance, the majority of the firms that came into being from 1900 to 1948 had a strong academic orientation like the Brookings Institution.

TABLE 2
Public Policy Research Institutes at Time of Structural Innovation

Institution	Date Founded
The Brookings Institution	1927 ^a
The Rand Corporation	1948
The Urban Institute	1968
The Heritage Foundation	1973

^aThe Institute for Government Research was founded in 1916 and is often given as the date Brookings was founded.

Brookings and the Rise of the Public Policy Research Institute

At the conclusion of World War I, a series of domestic and foreign policy challenges led to the creation of a number of public policy research institutes in the mid- to late-1920s. Institutes with a foreign policy emphasis were formed—Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (1910), Foreign Policy Association (1918), Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace (1919), and Council on Foreign Relations (1921). All of these institutions came into prominence as a result of the United States' emergence as a global power just before and just after World War I. Because of the American tendency toward isolationism, some groups wanted to convince the political elites and the American public at large that it was in America's interest to play a greater role in international politics.

The ambivalence that helped shape

the nature and character of these early think tanks is captured by George Fauriol (1984, 11), when he observes that the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and the Hoover Institution “were clearly the outgrowth of America’s domestic economic and overseas diplomatic expansion.” According to Fauriol, “The apparent strength of the American economic system and the potential application of its ideals on a global basis generated a certain sense of mission reinforced by frustration with traditional international behavior [exemplified by the catastrophe of World War I]. But these same frustrations also underlined a national feeling of hesitation regarding any deep involvement in world affairs” (1984, 12). There appeared to be a clear mandate internationally for greater U.S. involvement in global affairs; but the American public was not prepared to accept it, and a small but influential elite set out to change this by establishing a series of foreign policy education and foreign policy research organizations.

On the domestic front, a number of public policy research organizations came into being as a result of the social science and scientific management movements popular in the later part of the nineteenth century. The operating premise was that scientific methods, if properly applied, could solve social problems and improve the efficiency of government. It was these forces that helped shape the direction of institutions such as the Russell Sage Foundation (1907), Brookings Institution (1916), and National Bureau of Economic Research (1920). James Smith, in his article, “Think Tanks and the Politics of Ideas,” concludes that each one of these institutions “owed its origins to different business and professional groups” that were a part of the social reform movements of this period (Smith 1989). Individuals like Robert S. Brookings, a successful businessman, and Wesley C. Mitchell, an economist, believed that business and the social sciences would improve governmental operations and enlighten public policy. Mitchell’s convictions led him to establish the National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER), while Brookings was instrumental in establishing the

institution that bears his name. The importance and stature of these institutions, however, was greatly enhanced by the social, political, and economic upheaval caused by the Great Depression. In addition, the New Deal created a host of new programs and government agencies that led to a demand for expert advice that public policy research institutions such as Brookings and NBER were able to provide.

The Brookings Institution, for example, was established in the late 1920s, at a time when, as Calvin Coolidge explained, the business of America was business, and the principles of science were beginning to be applied to government. Robert S. Brookings, a St. Louis industrialist motivated by a desire to bring “economy and efficiency” to government, established three institutions (Institute for Government Research, Institute of Economics, and the Robert Brookings Graduate School of Economics and Government) which merged to create the Brookings Institution in 1927 (Critchlow 1985). Brookings’ interest in applying scientific principles to the management of government is reflected in the charter of the institution which states that it will conduct “scientific research” in “the broad fields of economics, government administration and the political and social sciences generally”; in an effort to interpret relevant “economic and political and social facts . . . without regard to and independent of the special interests of any group in the body politic, either political, social or economic.”² According to Bruce MacLaury, Brookings’ current president, Robert Brookings set out to establish a center that would bring social scientists and policy makers together so that a “scientific approach” might be applied to government management, budgeting, and spending (Brookings 1991).

The Brookings model, which attempts to bring the knowledge and expertise of academics to bear on public policy, has influenced the nature and design of public policy institutes for over 50 years. Brookings has become known for its reliance on recognized scholars who engage in empirical, scholarly, and objective analysis of public policy

issues in the social sciences. Originally focused on economic analysis, the Brookings Institution has since broadened its agenda to include a range of domestic and international concerns. Because its roots are firmly planted in the social sciences and academia, Brookings is without a doubt the best example of the academic-oriented public policy research institute. In fact, the Brookings model still, in many ways, dominates the public policy landscape as the preferred model for how think tanks should be organized. It remains unchallenged, in a large measure, because of the powerful mystique of the “disinterested social scientist” who conducts “value free” public policy research.

Rand and the Rise of the Military Intellectual Complex

The next generation of think tanks owes its origins almost entirely to the increased international commitments that the United States entered into after World War II. Many of these institutions were also established to help sustain the momentum of the defense efforts generated during the war years. It is during this period that institutions such as The Rand Corporation (1948), Foreign Policy Research Institute (1955), The Center for Strategic and International Studies (1962), and The Hudson Institute (1962) came into being. George Fauriol attributes the surge in the number of foreign policy think tanks during this period “to the resurgence of conservatism and also a greater concern for a coherent global vision of U.S. defense and foreign policy” (Fauriol 1984, 13). Harold Orlans contends that Rand grew out of “a need to develop a new and more permanent arrangement whereby civilian engineers and scientists could continue the critical technical work begun during the war” (Orlans 1972, 18-23). Each of these four institutes focused on a different dimension of our national security and how we as a nation should strive to maintain it. While the focus and structure of each is different, the political forces that shaped them are similar.

The only other major public policy

institute to appear on the scene at this time is the American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, which grew out of the same conservative movements that shaped its foreign policy counterparts. According to historian Kim McQuade, business leaders “had cause for worry by the end of the first full year of the war (1942). The conflict was being won, but there were signs that the liberals were seeking to follow through upon military victories abroad with political victories at home. . . . Once peace returned, liberal forces would await only favorable opportunities to try to expand the scope of their power. The question, then, was . . . what type of economic

The operating premise was that scientific methods, if properly applied, could solve social problems and improve the efficiency of government.

and political order would result from the reconversion from a war time to a peace time economy” (McQuade 1982, 107). These forces provided the impetus for the creation of conservative think tanks in both the domestic and foreign policy arena.

The Foreign Policy Research Institute, Center for Strategic and International Studies, and American Enterprise Institute were similar in structure to the first generation of academic-oriented think tanks. They, however, owe their origins to a more conservative political and philosophical segment of American society and were organized in direct response to the perceived liberal threat created by institutions such as the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and the Council on Foreign Relations.

The Rand Corporation, however, proved to be a major departure from the academic model pursued by most of the institutions developed up to this point. It is Rand’s unique approach to public policy research that led Roger E. Levien to describe

Rand as a “major social invention” (Levien 1971, 1). The Rand Corporation model was based on the research and development center (R and D) model and was guided by a systems approach to problem solving. Rand adapted the techniques perfected by the research and development industry to the analysis of public policy problems. A clear illustration of this connection is the fact that Rand is an acronym for “research and development.” This organization got its start as Project Rand, which was set up by the Air Force at Douglas Aircraft in Santa Monica, California. Because of the obvious conflict of interest, Rand soon became an independent entity, but to this day, it still gets close to two-thirds of its funding from defense contracts. According to Patricia Linden, Rand has distinguished itself through its “superb technical competence, originality, depth, breadth, and knowledge built up through 40 years of work for the Pentagon agencies.” She goes on to say that “its thorough, objective methods of analysis and multi-disciplinary approach have been copied by problem solvers in every field, and are paradigms for the Urban and Hudson Institutes” (Linden 1987, 105-06). Rand’s most distinguishing characteristic, however, has been its extensive use of systems and operations research to examine both military and social problems. The Rand Model set the standard for many of the think tanks established during this period.

The Urban Institute and the Rise of the Domestic Think Tank

The nature and design of public policy think tanks took another turn as a result of increased federal involvement in what came to be called the War on Poverty. During this period, defense contracts dried up as a result of a backlash from the Vietnam War, while domestic, specifically urban, social policy think tanks flourished. Paul Dickson, commenting in 1972 on the tremendous impact these changes had on the nature and orientation of these organizations, observed that, “There was a trend of ‘phenomenal’ growth.

In the 1950s there were only two dozen university-based urban research centers, by 1967 there were about eighty of them—and by late 1969 the total had jumped to nearly two hundred” (Dickson 1972, 219). Dickson points out that the reason for this dramatic explosion was that older institutions began redirecting their resources and staff to “new internal, civil, urban, and environmental matters as quickly as new institutions [were] being created for problem solving in these areas” (1972, 220). The shift in research emphasis was especially dramatic “at institutions with a strong military heritage” (1972, 219). Defense-related think tanks like Rand saw their defense contracts dry up while the federal domestic policy research portfolio was growing by leaps and bounds. In order to take advantage of this opportunity, Rand and other research organizations developed domestic policy programs. According to Dickson, “Defense contractors, think tanks, and R and D firms [began] creating new divisions applying their skills [and problem-solving techniques] to domestic matters” (1972, 219). The impact of this shift in research efforts is still being felt today. All of the major think tanks organized prior to and after this period now have a significant domestic or social policy component.

Two of the major institutions to emerge during this period are the University of Wisconsin’s Institute for Research on Poverty (1966) and the Urban Institute (1968). Both were established to examine the social and economic problems that captured the American consciousness during the 1960s and early part of the 1970s. These institutions, and others like them, became known as urban think tanks because all of their research efforts were devoted exclusively to urban/social issues.

The Urban Institute, for example, was formed in 1968 to examine a whole range of domestic issues, but most particularly, Johnson’s Great Society programs. Once again, this institution was a sign of the times. The Johnson administration, faced with an array of urban problems, encouraged the development of the Institute. According to Dickson, once it was agreed that the Institute

should be established, its incorporators vowed that it should avoid Rand’s problem of being too identified with one agency of government. “rather, their plan called for an independent nonprofit think tank supported on a contract basis by a variety of civilian agencies and, to whatever extent, by private foundations” (1972, 223). Ninety percent of the initial funding for the institute came from governmental sources, primarily Housing and Urban Development (although they now account for less than half of the institute’s total budget).

The Urban Institute provided a model for a whole host of institutions that were focused primarily on social and urban issues. During this period, the number of think tanks mushroomed and coincided with the growth of government agencies. This period also saw private foundations and corporations significantly increase their funding of public policy research.

Foreign policy and defense-related think tanks declined during this period. The one exception to this trend, however, was the Overseas Development Council (1969), which was established to conduct research on developing countries and U.S. aid programs to those countries. Once again, this institution was created to fill a gap in the U.S. government and was in direct response to the substantial foreign aid programs launched during the Truman, Kennedy, and Johnson administrations.

The Heritage Foundation and the Rise of the Specialty Tank

In the last 25 years, six interrelated trends have emerged that have influenced the development of subgroups within this universe of institutions. First and foremost, the number of institutions conducting public policy research has dramatically proliferated. Not since the 1940s, when the number of R&D centers and defense-related think tanks rapidly increased, has there been such growth in the number of research institutes. The increase of policy-related institutes has intensified the competition for dollars, scholars, and influence, and

brought about some fundamental changes in how these institutions operate. The second major trend has been the tilt toward Washington, D.C., as the center of influence. Many of the West Coast and New York-based think tanks were forced to relocate to Washington or open branch offices in order to remain competitive. The third major trend involved the emergence of specialized think tanks. In an effort to distinguish themselves from the vast array of think tanks already in existence, the newer public policy organizations chose to focus on a narrow audience or to adopt a single-issue orientation. This trend was also in direct response to the increased influence of special interest groups on Congress and the executive branch and to the move by foundations to target their grant funds for highly specialized programs. The fourth major trend to emerge during this period was the politicization of think tanks, which has its roots in the breakup of the liberal consensus that first appeared in the late 1950s and became manifest in the 1970s and 1980s. The fifth trend to surface during this period was the increase in the number of professional staffers in the executive and legislative branches of government and the creation of the Congressional Research Service and other governmental think tanks that rely on independent think tanks for research, data, and analysis. The sixth and final trend to emerge was the increasing influence of the media on the public policy process.

Each of these major trends is directly related to the fragmentation of our political process, the increasing complexity of the policy-making apparatus, and the intense competition of the think tanks located in and around Washington, D.C. And while it would seem that increasing the professional staffs of Congress and the executive branch and establishing think tanks within government would reduce the demand for independent public policy research, just the opposite has occurred.³

An interest in influencing decision makers at the state level through state-based public policy research institutes has led to the creation of 25 or so think tanks in just the last decade. A number of multi-purpose

(diversified) and single issue (specialized) think tanks can now be found working on every domestic and international concern. The intense rivalry among these institutions has been characterized as a "war of ideas." According to Kent A. Weaver, the competition has forced think tanks to become more image conscious, to improve the quality and diversity of their product lines, and to consider alternative means of staffing and financing (Weaver 1989, 571). The two institutions that best exemplify the fundamental changes that have taken place in the field are the Heritage Foundation and the Institute for International Economics.

The trend by think tanks to specialize in one field or another has gone relatively unnoticed in the literature and, to a large extent, has been overshadowed by what some scholars see as the politicization of think tanks. It is my contention, however, that the politicization of think tanks is just another form of specialization. Public policy think tanks not only specialize by policy issue or programs; they now specialize by ideology and political orientation (conservative, liberal, libertarian, Democratic, Republican, etc.). Commenting on the general trend toward specialization, R. Kent Weaver concludes that "another set of organizations—mostly newer, smaller, and Washington based—which focus on a narrow range of issues, but with the same stress on rigorous research and (in most cases) reliance on academic research," have grown up alongside the more diversified research institutions in Washington (1989, 565). The establishment of the Institute for International Economics (IIE) to conduct research on international economic concerns and the Center for Budget Priorities to examine the U.S. federal budget, along with Resources for the Future and the Worldwatch Institute to examine environmental issues, are clear examples of this trend toward specialization.

The Institute for International Economics, for instance, is focused almost entirely on international economic issues and staffed by economists. It was created by the German Marshall Fund and "devoted solely to analyzing important international

issues and developing and communicating potential new approaches for dealing with them" (Institute 1990). The above quote, taken from IIE's mission statement, clearly indicates the highly specialized nature of this organization and the specific niche that it has carved out for itself.

The politicization of public policy research created a new breed of institution that challenged the conventional wisdom about how think tanks should be organized and operated. Commenting on this phenomenon, Patricia Linden writes that:

. . . while it would seem that increasing the professional staffs of Congress and the executive branch and establishing think tanks within government would reduce the demand for independent public policy research, just the opposite has occurred.

As the new, well-funded political movement embodied by the Reagan administration became entrenched in the mid-seventies, two things happened. First, a new breed of think tank sprang up: politically purposeful bodies whose mission is to back the new conservative movement or fight it. At the same time, the established tanks broadened the scope of their studies and joined the swelling debate over government's national and foreign policies. Increasingly, amid the roar of contention and cries of dissent, public policy research centers became centers for the politics of public policy research (Linden 1987, 100).

The organization that best exemplifies this new brand of think tank is the Heritage Foundation. Established in 1973, this institute, as Linden describes it, is "less a think tank than an a priori ideology factory, avowedly a marketing agency for the neoconservative movement" (1987, 103). This point is confirmed

by Burton Yale Pines, senior vice president at Heritage, when he states: "The goal is a conservative nation. Our role is to provide . . . public policy-makers with arguments to bolster our side" (Pines 1982). This is a far cry from Robert Brookings' call for objective analysis of public policy problems. The Heritage Foundation's objectives and design remain at odds with Brookings, Rand, and the Urban Institute, whose studies remain more or less objective assessments of critical policy concerns. These institutions have been forced to become more market oriented and ideological in their approach to policy analysis in order to keep pace with the conservative onslaught.

The newest trend in the industry is the creation of state-based think tanks, which are located in state capitals throughout the United States and are focused on state and local issues. The devolution of federal programs and increased power to the states has sparked this latest movement in the industry. Since the early 1980s, over 25 institutions have come into being, most of them with the backing of conservative foundations and corporations.

The Public Policy Industry and the Population Ecology Model

The nature and rate of growth in the public policy research industry is not unique. In fact, the industry has followed a pattern of growth that resembles the population ecology model established by the organizational theorists R. L. Daft and H. E. Aldrich.⁴ Daft's work in this area is particularly illuminating, for he divides the evolution of a population of institutions into three phases: variation, selection, and retention (Daft 1963, 76). In the first phase, a large number of variations appear, and the population of organizations begins to compete for scarce resources. A natural selection process takes place in the second phase, where the weak organizations wither away and the strong organizations that have found a niche in the market survive. In the retention phase, a few of the surviving organizations grow large and become insti-

tutionalized in the environment.

During the last 75 years, the growth and development of the public policy industry has closely paralleled the model presented by the population ecologists. In each of the four periods, the industry has seen a surge in the number of new organizations that then pass through the three stages outlined above. From these periods of increased growth have emerged a select group of institutions that have been able to grow and prosper while other institutions have gone out of business. In the last eight decades, the number, composition, and relationship among the firms in the industry have undergone dramatic change.

While estimates of the total number of institutes that exist today vary according to how they are defined and who does the counting, current estimates put the number somewhere between 1,200 and 1,400. If we limit the universe of institutions to those that are independent of government, colleges, and universities, the total number of institutions in business today is approximately 115. The chronological list of public policy research institutes presented at the end of this paper, dramatically illustrates how this industry has changed over the last 75 years. During the first 30 years of this century, for instance, only 10 institutions came into being which remain with us today. Since that time, the industry has grown by ten-fold, doubling in each of the four periods discussed. If we look closely at the chronological list of institutions, we see that the most dramatic shifts in the industry have occurred in the last 30 years. Over two-thirds of the institutions in business today came into being between 1961 and 1986, and over one-half were established between 1970 and 1988. This information clearly suggests a pattern of sustained growth over time in the number and types of research institutes that are competing for many of the same dollars, scholars, and influence.

During the last 75 years, new entrants to the industry have attempted to vary the strategy (goals, technologies, and product lines) and structure (organizational design) in response to the increased competition and changes in the environment. Existing

firms in the industry have altered their strategies in order to meet the challenges posed by the new entrants and in response to changes in the environment. These factors have influenced both the rate of growth and survival of businesses in the industry.

In the early part of this century, the challenges of managing an advanced industrial economy and increased commitments abroad created a demand for policy experts that far exceeded the existing capacity of the U.S. government. In order to meet this demand, institutions like Brookings and the National Bureau of Economic Research were established to bring science and reason to government. In the period following World War II, when there was a need for defense experts and technocrats to help manage the defense establishment and its new security arrangements around the world, the federal government once again turned to the public policy research community for help. The Rand Corporation, along with a host of other research organizations, provided a ready supply of what have become known as "defense intellectuals" to help develop the defense hardware and systems that were put in place after World War II.

The social turmoil of the 1960s and its attendant political pressures provided the impetus for the creation of the Urban Institute and a host of other organizations that were the architects of the social programs instituted during this period. More recently, the rise of the conservative movement, the fractious nature of the Democratic and Republican parties and the hyperpluralistic nature of American society have contributed to the rapid expansion of a host of specialized think tanks. Specialty tanks such as the Heritage Foundation, Cato Institute, and the Institute for International Economics are now highly differentiated operations, serving a special constituency or philosophy or focusing on a single issue or area of specialization.

Public policy research, or "paper alchemy" as it is sometimes called, is truly a growth industry, and the new entrants to the field have shaken the monopoly once held by organizations such as the Brookings Institution and

the American Enterprise Institutes for Public Policy Research. This recent trend toward specialization and vigorous competition not only challenges existing institutions to alter the ways they do business but also presents a major opportunity for new or emerging institutions to develop innovative technologies and seize a major share of the market. Clearly, both opportunities and barriers to entry will grow as the market becomes more crowded and fragmented and institutions are forced to find a niche to survive.

To understand how these factors have affected the nature and composition of the industry over the last 75 years, one only has to look at the difference in the technologies employed and products produced by organizations like Brookings, Rand, and Heritage. The Brookings Institution employs an academic/scientific approach to its research that results in the production of book-length studies that are marketed to policy makers and academics. In contrast to this approach, Rand is more oriented toward policy analysis than scholarly research and produces technical reports for government agencies rather than book-length studies. The Heritage Foundation produces non-technical policy analysis and focuses on the production of policy digests and prescriptions for policy makers. The dramatic increase in the degree of differentiation in the industry is underscored by the fact that of the 58 institutes established between 1975 and 1989 over two-thirds of them are specialty research organizations.

The information provided above serves to illustrate how diverse the industry has become and how new firms have developed innovative technologies and products in order to seize a share of the market. The move away from the large multi-issue academic-oriented think tanks to the more policy-oriented specialty research organizations has served to fragment the industry. The increase in the size and diversification within the industry has in turn served to intensify competition. These competitive forces have challenged existing firms in the business and compelled them to alter their technologies and product lines. An excellent example of this phenomenon is the Rand Cor-

poration, which diversified in the area of domestic policy research in the 1960s when there was a downturn in defense-related research as a result of the backlash connected with the Vietnam War.

Over the years, the industry has experienced considerable diversification in response to the variable market for its products. In addition, firms have created a demand for new enterprises by creating new areas of policy analysis or defining a problem in a new way.⁵ Paul Dickson's observations in 1973 about the growth of the research industry have even greater relevance in the 1990s.

"Today, think tanks represent a wide variety of institutionalized thought. The phenomenon has grown quickly and in all directions. It seems that almost every conceivable interest group in the nation has or has had at least one think tank working for it" (Dickson 1972, 31). In the short span of 75 years, the industry has undergone a dramatic transformation that has seen growth in both size and influence. In fact, I would contend that if the press is the fourth arm of government, think tanks are certainly the fifth.

Notes

1. Smith contends that the history of the policy expert is comprised of three intertwined threads. The strongest of these is the attempt in the mid-nineteenth century to create a "social" science that would be both a method of scholarly investigation and tool for social improvement. The second strand is the ongoing attempt in the United States and elsewhere to incorporate the experts' knowledge and analytic techniques into public service through a series of formal and informal mechanisms. The final strand is comprised of think tanks.

2. Data developed from information provided by the Brookings Institution's Charter, Mission and Statement of Purpose and other historical data.

3. In a conversation with James Thurber, professor of government at American University, he described the increase in Congress and the White House as "staffflation." Many observers of the U.S. government are alarmed at how fast congressional staffs have expanded and are concerned about the impact it is having on the policy making process. The Heritage Foundation and the Claremont Institute produced a scathing attack on Congress in *The Imperial Congress: Crisis in the Separation of Powers* (Jones and Marini 1988).

Chronological Listing of Existing Policy Research Institutions

1907	The Russell Sage Foundation
1910	Carnegie Endowment for International Peace
1916	Institute for Government Research
1916	Conference Board
1919	Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace
1919	The Twentieth Century Fund
1920	National Bureau of Economic Research
1921	Council on Foreign Relations
1925	Battelle Memorial Institute
1927	Brookings Institution
1936	Urban Land Institute
1937	Tax Foundation
1941	Institute of Gas Technology
1942	Center for Naval Analyses
1942	Committee for Economic Development
1943	American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research
1946	Middle East Institute
1946	SRI International
1948	RAND Corporation-Washington
1950	Bureau of Social Science Research
1951	Human Resources Research Organization
1952	Resources for the Future
1954	Conference on Economic Progress
1955	Foreign Policy Research Institute
1955	International Law Institute
1956	Institute for Defense Analysis
1958	ANSER (Analytic Services, Inc.)
1961	Atlantic Council of the U.S.
1961	Hudson Institute-Washington
1961	Logistic Management Institute
1961	Potomac Institute
1962	Center for Strategic and International Studies
1962	National Institute of Public Affairs
1963	Institute for Policy Studies
1963	Ripon Society
1965	Center for Applied Research in the Apostolate
1965	Washington Journalism Center
1968	Urban Institute
1970	Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies
1970	Tax Analysts
1971	Center for Science in the Public Interest
1971	Center for the Study of Welfare Policy
1971	Public Technology
1972	Center for Defense Information
1972	Center for Women Policy Studies
1972	Investor Responsibility Research Center
1973	American Council for Capital Formation
1973	American Legislative Exchange Council
1973	Children's Defense Fund
1973	Mankind Research Foundation
1974	Heritage Foundation
1974	Institute for Contemporary Studies
1974	Institute for Energy Analysis
1974	Worldwatch Institute
1975	Center for International Policy
1975	Council for Social and Economic Studies
1975	National Center for Policy Alternatives
1976	Committee for the Study of the American Electorate
1976	Ethics and Public Policy Center
1976	International Center for Research on Women
1976	Institute for Foreign Policy Analysis
1976	Media Institute
1976	National Center for Appropriate Technology
1976	Northeast-Midwest Institute
1976	The Rockford Institute
1977	Alan Gutmacher Institute-Washington
1977	CATO Institute
1977	Ethics Resource Center
1977	Free Congress Research and Education Foundation
1977	Manhattan Institute for Policy
1977	Women's Research and Education Institute

1978	Employee Benefit Research Institute
1978	Reason Foundation
1979	Pacific Research Institute for Public Policy
1979	Lincoln Institute
1979	Center for the Study of Social Policy
1979	Indochina Project
1979	Pacific Research Institute for Public Policy
1980	Foreign Policy Institute (Johns Hopkins University)
1980	Renewable Energy Institute
1981	Center on Budget and Policy Priorities
1981	Center for International Business and Trade (Georgetown University)
1981	Center for National Policy (Republican Party)
1981	Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget
1981	Democracy Project
1981	Institute for Educational Leadership
1981	Institute for International Economics
1981	Political Economy Research Center
1981	Roosevelt Center for American Policy Studies (closed 6/89)
1981	Washington Center for Public Policy Research (Duke University—closed 7/30/89)
1982	Hispanic Policy Development Project
1982	Washington Institute
1982	World Resources Institute
1983	Democratic Institute for International Affairs (Democratic Party)
1983	Institute for Health Policy Analysis
1983	Institute for Security and Cooperation in Outer Space
1983	Jefferson Foundation
1983	National Center for Policy Analysis
1983	National Institute for Public Policy
1984	Capital Research Center
1984	Citizens for a Sound Economy
1984	Committee for Economic Development
1984	Economic Policy Institute
1985	Center for Democracy
1985	The Citizens Network for Foreign Affairs
1986	Economic Policy Institute
1986	Independence Policy Institute
1986	Sunbelt Institute
1986	The Independent Institute
1986	United States Institute of Peace
1989	Progressive Policy Institute
1989	Washington Institute of Foreign Affairs

4. Daft and Aldrich provide good insights into the population ecology model. This school of thought focuses on the characteristics of organizational populations rather than on characteristics of management strategies and individual organizations. This model assumes that the environment is always in a state of flux and new organizational forms are continuously being established and dying.

5. *Wealth and Poverty* by George Gilder and *On Understanding Poverty* by Daniel Patrick Moynihan are books that helped set the stage for the Reagan tax cuts, created a demand for new organizations to advance these causes.

References

- Aldrich, H. E. 1979. *Organizations and Environment*. New York: Prentice-Hall.
- Brookings Institution. 1991. *Seventy-fifth Anniversary Pamphlet, 1916-1991*. Washington, DC.
- Critchlow, Donald T. 1985. *The Brookings Institution, 1916-1952*.
- Daft, R. L. 1963. *Organization Theory and Design*. New York: West Publishing.
- Dickson, Paul. 1972. *Think Tanks*. New York: Atheneum.
- Fauriol, George A. 1984. "Think Tanks and

- U.S. Foreign Policy." A paper presented at the fourth Tamkang American Studies Conference, Tamkang University, Taipei, Taiwan, November 25-28, 1984. Washington, DC: Georgetown University, Center for Strategic and International Studies.
- Institute for International Economics. 1990. "Mission Statement." Washington, DC.
- Jones, Gordon S., and John A. Marini, eds. 1988. *The Imperial Congress: Crisis in the Separation of Powers*. New York: Pharos Books.
- Levien, Roger. 1971. "Independent Public Policy, Analysis Organization: A Major Social Invention." In *The Rand Papers Series*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.
- Linden, Patricia. 1987. "Powerhouses of Policy." *Town and Country*, January.
- McQuade, Kim. 1982. *Big Business and Presidential Power: From FDR to Reagan*. New York: Morrow.
- Orlans, Harold. 1972. *The Nonprofit Research Institute: Its Origins, Operation, Problems and Prospects*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Pines, Burton Yale. 1982. *Back to Basics. The Traditionalist Movement That Is Sweeping Grass-Roots America*. New York: William Morrow.
- Smith, James A. 1991. *The Idea Brokers: Think Tanks and the Rise of the New Policy Elite*. New York: The Free Press.
- Smith, James A. 1989. "Think Tanks and the Politics of Ideas." In *The Spread of Economic Ideas*, ed. David Colander and A. W. Coats. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Weaver, R. Kent. 1989. "The Changing World of Think Tanks." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 22: 563-78.

About the Author

James G. McGann teaches political science at Temple University and consults for domestic and international policy organizations. He serves as a senior consultant to McGann/McCarthy Management Company, an international trade and investment firm. He has been senior vice-president of the Executive Council on Foreign Diplomats and directed the public policy program for The Pew Charitable Trusts from 1983-1989.