

2011 Policymaker Survey

Paul C. Avey and Michael C. Desch

Notre Dame International Security Program
University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, IN

July 2013

This survey was made possible through the generous financial support of the Carnegie Corporation of New York. LTG Brent Scowcroft graciously agreed to sign the survey solicitation, which we believe was indispensable in achieving the high response rate to the survey. We are grateful to the Teaching and Research in International Politics (TRIP) project at the College of William and Mary, especially Susan Peterson and Michael Tierney, both for their assistance with the survey design and also for their help with implementing the survey itself.

Table of Contents

I. Introduction	3
II. Respondent Demographics.....	8
III. Arguments made by international relations scholars and the importance these arguments may or may not have to your work in the US Government.	9
IV. Utility of academic knowledge to the policy making community	15
V. The impact that social science research has on the work that you do for U.S. government?	16
VI. Next, we would like to ask you about learning and teaching in the social sciences.....	31
VII: Questions regarding U.S. Policy.	38

I. Introduction

In his April 14, 2008 speech to the Association of American Universities, then-Secretary of Defense Robert M. Gates argued that “we must again embrace eggheads and ideas.” The key assumptions undergirding what he has dubbed the Minerva Initiative were that “throughout the Cold War, universities had been vital centers of new research” and that at one time U.S. national security policymakers were successful in tapping intellectual “resources outside of government” to guide them in formulating policy. In that same spirit, then-Democratic Presidential hopeful Barack Obama promised while campaigning in Virginia in August 2008 to assemble a policy team consisting of “the best and the brightest” with the objective of tapping universities to bring important expertise on to his Administration’s foreign and security policy teams.

Obama’s and Gates’ efforts to bridge the Belt-way and the Ivory Tower gap came at a time, however, at which it never seemed wider. Harvard Professor (and former high-level State Department, Defense Department, and Intelligence Community appointee) Joseph Nye penned a widely discussed article in *The Washington Post*, in which he opined that “the walls surrounding the ivory tower never seemed so high.” There is a broad consensus that this gap has widened in recent years and widespread concerns that it was a bad thing for both policymakers and scholars. According to the 2011 Teaching, Research and International Policy (TRIP) survey, nearly 85 percent of scholars recognized that a theory/policy gap persisted or was growing in size. The TRIP academic surveys also clearly demonstrate that “there is a disjuncture between what American scholars of IR think about the value of producing policy-relevant work and the actual research they generate.”

How widespread is this disjuncture? In addition, what is the source of this disjuncture? The TRIP survey of scholars points to several possibilities. To date, however, there is a lack of systematic evidence from the other side. Specifically, how do policymakers view academic social science?

Working with the TRIP project at the College of William and Mary, we have taken a first step to get a better sense of the theory/policy divide by administering a survey to current and former policymakers. This will help to gauge when and how they use academic social science to inform national security decision-making. In addition, we asked policymakers their views on the most pressing national security challenges facing the United States today and in the medium-term future. We focused the survey upon current and former senior national security decision-makers in the Departments of State, Defense, and Homeland Security, the Intelligence Community, and the National Security Council.

We administered this survey on-line and asked questions from the TRIP project survey – the largest and most extensive data-collection effort to date on the field of international relations – that shed light on the questions of when and how, from the senior national security decision-maker’s perspective, academic social science research has been useful to them. The online nature of the survey created a convenient method for survey completion and facilitated data collection and management once the surveys were completed.

Because William and Mary conducted the three previous TRIP surveys of academics, we believe that the partnership with them provided an ideal opportunity to take this research further than the earlier TRIP survey's which focused exclusively on the academic side of the ivory tower/beltway gap. Our policymaker survey coincided with the fourth TRIP survey of international relations scholars. These two surveys – scholars and policymakers – share some common policy questions. In addition, the policy makers were asked their views on the usefulness of academic ideas and studies, while academic respondents were asked a number of questions about when and how academic social science research has been useful to senior national security decision-makers.

In the rest of this introduction we briefly describe the methodology used to generate the survey pool. In Section II we show the basic descriptive statistics for our respondents. In Sections III-VII we present the results for the substantive questions.

The Survey Pool

To construct our survey pool, we tried to identify all of the senior government officials involved in national security decision-making. We limited our pool to officials who served during the George H.W. Bush, Bill Clinton, and George W. Bush administrations. We therefore included officials from both Democratic and Republican administrations. Our pool included both civilian and military officials at or above the civilian GS/GG 13/Band 4 grade and the equivalent O-5 military grade (Lt. Colonel / Commander). We specifically sought to identify positions tasked with making, analyzing, and implementing policy. As such, we excluded positions whose primary responsibilities included management, coordination, and/or legal counsel.

We focused on seven departments and agencies. These included the Departments of Defense, Homeland Security, and State, the Central Intelligence Agency, the National Security Council, the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, and the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. Obviously not every department or agency existed for the entire period. We relied primarily on the U.S. Government Manual and the Federal Yellow Book to identify “policy-relevant positions” within each department and agency. We examined each year individually because administrations created, merged, and eliminated various positions from year to year. We included the top officials for each department and agency and then identified positions within lower-level policy-relevant offices. For instance, for the Defense Department we included officials down to the Deputy Assistant and Director level in the Office of the Under Secretary for Policy. In the State Department we included the members of the Policy Planning Staff. Table 1 provides an outline of the positions we selected.

To generate contact information for each individual we utilized Marquis' *Who's Who* on-line and systematic web searches. We were able to generate contact information for 915 national security officials. In order to increase the likelihood that current and former policymakers would respond to the survey, we asked LTG Brent Scowcroft, former National Security Adviser to two Presidents and one of the leading senior figures in the American national security community, to sign the solicitation email for the survey. We contacted respondents by mail and/or email depending on the information we possessed. We also sent a follow-up postcard to those who did not initially respond. Of the 915 officials we tried to contact, 234

responded to and completed the survey, either through the mail or online.¹ Our reported response rate of approximately 25% is probably a conservatively low estimate because we undoubtedly had inaccurate contact information for some of the policymakers who did not respond.

¹ 244 individuals responded, but 10 of those did not answer any substantive questions (Q9 thru Q31).

Table 1. Guide to policymaker positions selected.

- 1) Central Intelligence Agency (1989-2008)
 - a) Director, Central Intelligence
 - b) Deputy Director, Central Intelligence
 - c) Deputy Director, Intelligence
 - d) Deputy Director, Operations
 - e) Deputy Director, Science and Technology
- 2) Department of Defense (1989-2008)
 - a) Secretary of and Deputy Secretary of Defense
 - b) Defense Agency – Director Defense Intelligence Agency
 - c) Office of the Secretary of the Army, Navy, and Air Force
 - i) Secretary and Undersecretary
 - ii) Uniformed Chiefs (also listed under Joint Chiefs),
 - iii) Directors (or equivalent) of Intelligence Divisions
 - d) Joint Chiefs of Staff
 - i) Chairman and Vice-Chairman
 - ii) Service Chiefs
 - e) Combatant Commanders (e.g., AFRICOM, CENTCOM, etc.)
 - f) Joint Staff
 - i) Director and Vice Director
 - ii) Directors J2, J3, J5, J7
 - g) Office of the Undersecretary of Policy
 - i) Undersecretary, Deputy Undersecretary, Principal Deputy Undersecretary
 - ii) Director and Deputy Director Net Assessment
 - iii) Chairman, Defense Policy Board
 - iv) Assistant Secretaries for Security Policy, Security Affairs, Special Operations / Low-Intensity Conflict, Strategy and Requirements
 - (1) Regional Offices Deputy Assistants and Deputy Undersecretaries (e.g. African Affairs, Near Eastern Affairs, etc.)
 - (2) Issue / policy Offices Deputy Assistants and Deputy Undersecretaries (e.g. Counterproliferation Policy, Humanitarian Affairs, etc.)
- 3) Department of Homeland Security (2003-2009)
 - a) Secretary and Deputy Secretary
 - b) Assistant and Undersecretaries for Policy / Issue Offices (e.g., Assistant Secretary for Policy, etc.)

Table 1. Guide to policymaker positions selected (continued).

- 4) Department of State (1989-2008)
 - a) Secretary and Deputy Secretary of State
 - b) Permanent Representative to the United Nations (Ambassador to the UN)
 - c) Counselor
 - d) Ambassador-at-Large, Counterterrorism
 - e) Assistant Secretary, Intelligence and Research
 - f) Director, Policy Planning Staff
 - i) Staff Members, PPS
 - g) Undersecretaries for Political Affairs / Business, Economic, Agricultural Affairs / Global Affairs / Arms Control (after 1998) / Int'l Sec. Affairs
 - i) Assistant secretaries for regional and policy / issue offices (e.g. African affairs, refugee programs, political-military affairs, etc.)
- 5) National Security Council (1989-2008)
 - a) Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs (National Security Advisor)
 - b) Deputy Assistant(s) to the President for National Security Affairs
 - c) Regional offices (e.g. African Affairs, European Affairs, etc.)
 - i) Special Assistant to the President
 - ii) Senior Directors and Directors
 - d) Issue / policy offices (e.g. Global Issues and Multinational Affairs, Nonproliferation and Export Controls, etc.)
 - i) Special Assistant to the President
 - ii) Directors
- 6) Office of the Director for National Intelligence (2005-2009)
 - a) Director / Principal Deputy Director
 - b) Deputy Directors, Analysis / Acquisition / Collections
 - c) Mission Managers
 - d) Center Directors (e.g. Counterterrorism, Counterintelligence, Counterproliferation)
 - e) Center Principal Deputy Directors
 - f) Associate Director Science and Technology (see also CIA listing)
- 7) United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (1989-1998)
 - a) Director, Deputy Director
 - b) Assistant Directors, Policy / Issue / Region Bureaus (e.g. Nonproliferation and Regional Affairs, Strategic and Eurasian Affairs, etc.)
 - c) Principal Deputy Director, On-Site Inspection
 - d) U.S. Negotiators / Representatives to Multinational Forums (e.g. U.S. Representative to Conference on Disarmament)
 - e) Senior Advisors, Military, Policy

II. Respondent Demographics

Table 2. Respondent Demographics			
1. Age		6. Years in Government	
Mean Age	59	Mean Service	24
2. Sex		7. Highest Education	
% Male	85	% College Degree	15
Female	15	MA	37
3. Race		Professional Degree	14
% Non-White	10	ABD	9
White	90	PhD	26
4. Government Rank		8. Primary Disciplinary Training	
% GS 14 / O-5	1	% Area Studies	3
GS 15 / O-6	11	Economics	6
SES / O-7+	26	Business	4
Appoint, No Confirm	18	Foreign Language	1
Appoint, Confirm	44	History	11
5. Primary Responsibilities		International Affairs	30
% Analysis	4	Law	9
Management	15	Nat., Phy., Bio., Comp.	3
Policy Implementation	13	Political Science	15
Policy Making	59	Public Policy	10
Other	9	Psychology	< 1
		Other	12

III. Social Science Theories and Impact

9: Are you familiar with Samuel Huntington’s “clash of civilizations” thesis?

10: Are you familiar with the “democratic peace” thesis?

11: Are you familiar with the theory of “mutual assured destruction”?

12: Are you familiar with “population-centric counter-insurgency” theory?

13: Are you familiar with Kenneth Waltz’s “realist” thesis about state behavior?

14: Are you familiar with Bruce Bueno de Mesquita’s “expected utility” approach to international relations and foreign policy?

	% Yes	% No	Respondents
9. Clash of Civilizations	90	10	234
10. Democratic Peace Theory	56	44	224
11. Mutual Assured Destruction	99	1	224
12. Population Centric COIN	70	30	222
13. Structural Realism	69	31	222
14. Expected Utility Theory	21	79	220

9a: How did you learn about it? (Check all that apply.)

10a: How did you learn about the "democratic peace" thesis? (Please check all that apply.)

11a: How did you learn about the theory of "mutual assured destruction"? (Please check all that apply.)

12a: How did you learn about "population-centric counter-insurgency" theory? (Check all that apply)

13a: How did you learn about Kenneth Waltz's "realist" thesis? (Check all that apply)

14a: How did you learn about Bueno de Mesquita's "expected utility" approach? (Check all that apply)

	% Option 1	% Option 2	% Option 3	% Option 4	% Option 5	Respondents
9a. Clash of Civilizations	39	64	32	51	N/A	202
10a. Democratic Peace Theory	42	37	67	44	N/A	123
11a. Mutual Assured Destruction	59	69	65	56	N/A	221
12a. Population Centric COIN	40	45	82	72	N/A	156
13a. Structural Realism	47	37	32	49	54	152
14a. Expected Utility Theory	33	51	38	51	N/A	45

See next page for Option Codes:

Option Codes for questions 9a, 10a, 11a, 12a, 13a, 14a

9a:

Option 1: I have read Huntington's book, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*.

Option 2: I have read his *Foreign Affairs* article.

Option 3: I have read his *New York Times* opinion piece.

Option 4: I have heard about his argument from colleagues.

10a:

Option 1: I have read scholarly works like Immanuel Kant's *Perpetual Peace* and/or the work of contemporary academic social scientists such as Michael Doyle and Bruce Russett.

Option 2: I have read about the thesis in the 1994 and 2002 *National Security Strategies*.

Option 3: I have read about the thesis in opinion pieces.

Option 4: I have heard about the thesis from colleagues.

11a:

Option 1: I have read about it in scholarly works such as Bernard Brodie's *The Absolute Weapon*, Thomas Shelling's *Arms and Influence*, or Robert Jervis' *The Meaning of the Nuclear Revolution*.

Option 2: I have read articles about the theory in journals such as *Foreign Affairs* by analysts such as Albert Wohlstetter.

Option 3: I have read about the theory in opinion pieces.

Option 4: I have heard about the theory from colleagues.

12a:

Option 1: I have read about it in books like Douglass Blaufarb's *The Counterinsurgency Era*, David Galula's *Counterinsurgency Warfare: Theory and Practice*, or John Nagl's *Eating Soup With a Knife*.

Option 2: I have read the joint Army-Marine Counterinsurgency Field Manual, FM 3-2.

Option 3: I have read about the theory in opinion pieces.

Option 4: I have heard about the theory from colleagues.

13a:

Option 1: I have read Waltz's *Theory of International Politics*.

Option 2: I have read one or more of Waltz's scholarly articles in *The American Political Science Review* or *International Security*.

Option 3: I have read one or more of Waltz's articles in *The National Interest*.

Option 4: I have read one or more of Waltz's opinion pieces.

Option 5: I have heard about the thesis from colleagues.

14a:

Option 1: I have read one or more of Bueno de Mesquita's books (*The War Trap*, *War and Reason*, *The Logic of Political Survival*, or *The Strategy of Campaigns*) or one or more of his scholarly articles in *The American Political Science Review* or *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*.

Option 2: I have read one or more of Bueno de Mesquita's articles in *Foreign Affairs*.

Option 3: I have read one or more of Bueno de Mesquita's opinion pieces.

Option 4: I have heard about the approach from colleagues.

9b: How confident are you in the accuracy of Huntington’s “clash of civilizations” thesis that civilizations, not states, are likely to be the most important actors in the future of world politics?

10b: How confident are you in the accuracy of the “democratic peace” thesis -- that because two countries are democracies, they are not likely to wage war against each other? Are you...

11b: How confident are you that the theory of “mutual assured destruction” is correct -- that when two countries have an assured second strike capability the likelihood of conflict between them decreases? Are

12b: How confident are you in the theory of “population-centric counterinsurgency” -- that the core of successful counterinsurgency operations entails securing the civilian population and that in these operations the role of traditional military force is less important than the other instruments of statecraft?

13b: How confident are you in the accuracy of the “realist” thesis that states’ behavior is influenced primarily by international factors like the distribution of power rather than the nature of their domestic politics?

14b: How confident are you in the accuracy of Bueno de Mesquita’s “expected utility” approach -- that states or political leaders make cost/benefit calculations of their interests and act rationally upon them in their foreign policy behavior?

	% Very Confident	% Somewhat Confident	% Not Very Confident	% Not Confident At All	Respondents
9b. Clash of Civilizations	5	32	44	19	198
10b. Democratic Peace Theory	12	51	27	10	124
11b. Mutual Assured Destruction	27	59	12	2	220
12b. Population Centric COIN	28	57	10	5	154
13b. Structural Realism	9	43	39	9	151
14b. Expected Utility Theory	9	47	33	11	45

- 9c: In your opinion, how useful is the “clash of civilizations” thesis for policymakers?
 10c: In your opinion, how useful is the “democratic peace” thesis for policymakers?
 11c: In your opinion, how useful is the theory of “mutual assured destruction” for policymakers?
 12c: In your opinion, how useful is the theory of “population-centric counter-insurgency” for policymakers?
 13c: In your opinion, how useful is the “realist” thesis for policymakers?
 14c: In your opinion, how useful is the “expected utility” approach for policy makers?

	% Very Useful	% Somewhat Useful	% Not Very Useful	% Not Useful At All	Respondents
9c. Clash of Civilizations	12	57	24	8	200
10c. Democratic Peace Theory	12	53	25	10	123
11c. Mutual Assured Destruction	33	53	12	2	218
12c. Population Centric COIN	39	51	7	3	155
13c. Structural Realism	13	57	24	6	150
14c. Expected Utility Theory	11	49	31	9	45

9d: Does Huntington’s thesis about the clash of civilizations influence the work you do for the U.S. government?

10d: Does the democratic peace thesis influence the work you do for the U.S. Government?

11d: Does the theory of “mutual assured destruction” influence the work you do for the U.S. government?

12d: Does the theory of “population-centric counter-insurgency” influence the work you do for the U.S. Government?

13d: Does the “realist” thesis influence the work you do for the U.S. government?

14d: Does the “expected utility” approach influence the work you do for the U.S. government?

	% Yes	% No	Respondents
9d. Clash of Civilizations	32	68	201
10d. Democratic Peace Theory	47	53	123
11d. Mutual Assured Destruction	56	44	217
12d. Population Centric COIN	65	35	153
13d. Structural Realism	54	46	150
14d. Expected Utility Theory	45	55	44

IV. Utility of Academic Knowledge to the Policy Making Community

15: How useful to policy makers are the arguments and evidence used in the following disciplines?

	% Very Useful	% Somewhat Useful	% Not Very Useful	% Not Useful At All	Respondents
Economics	64	35	2	0	217
Political Science	33	49	17	1	220
Sociology	15	61	22	2	213
Anthropology	13	52	31	5	213
Psychology	17	56	24	3	214
Public Policy	43	49	8	0	215
International Affairs	57	39	4	0	218
Foreign Language	53	30	13	5	215
Area Studies	69	29	2	0	218
History	70	28	3	0	217
Law	27	61	12	0	215
Business	26	58	15	0	214
Natural, Physical, Biological, or Computational Sciences	15	48	33	3	213

V. Social Science Impact on Policy Work

16: How often do you relate the arguments made in social science research to the work that you do for the U.S. Government? Is it...

% Daily	% A Few Times A Week	% A Few Times A Month	% A Few Times A Year	% Never	Respondents
19	26	27	21	7	218

16a: Which of the following best describes how you relate the arguments made in social science research to the work that you do for the U.S. Government? Please check only one box.

% Directly applies	% Provides intellectual background	% Helps to provide a common language	Respondents
13	69	19	199

17: How often do you make use of the evidence used in social science research to the work that you do for the U.S. Government. Is it...

% Daily	% A Few Times A Week	% A Few Times A Month	% A Few Times A Year	% Never	Respondents
8	19	32	33	7	215

17a: Which of the following best describes how you make use of the evidence used in social science research to the work that you do for the U.S. Government? Please check only one box.

% Directly Applies	% Provides Intellectual Background	% Helps to Provide A Common Language	Respondents
12	71	17	192

18. How useful to policy makers are the following ways of conducting social science research?

	% Very Useful	% Somewhat Useful	% Not Very Useful	% Not Useful at All	Respondents
Theoretical Analysis	5	50	38	7	208
Quantitative Analysis	18	53	23	7	209
Policy Analysis	53	40	6	0	210
Area Studies	66	31	3	0	209
Historical Case Studies	54	42	4	0	210
Contemporary Case Studies	60	37	3	0	210
Formal Models	4	36	46	13	209
Operations Research	16	48	29	7	207

19. How should international relations scholars contribute to the policy-making process? (Please select all that apply.)

	% Selected	Respondents
Formal Participants	36	212
Informal Advisors	87	212
Creators of new information/knowledge	72	212
Trainers of Policymakers	54	212
Should not be involved in policy-making	5	212

20: Please list an example of social science research that you believe has been, is, or will be useful to policy makers in the formulation and/or implementation of foreign policy. (Please provide as much information as possible about author's name and title.) Ex:

Frank Fukuyama, "The End of History." Edward Gibbon, "The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire."
Analysis of economic and demographic trends broadly.
Most of the useful writing is done by practitioners or journalists. Some area studies work is useful as background material/content
historical analysis such as Niall Ferguson's War of the Worlds
The Global War Game series at the U.S. Naval War College, Newport, RI
Work of Ezra Vogel, Gerald Curtis, Robert Scalapino, Joseph Nye, Harry Harding has been especially useful in US Asia policy.
arms control agreements as a means to improve security. Schelling, Hedley Bull, Brennan
Alvin Tofler's Power Shift and Third Wave are useful, as are all State Dept. area studies programs, Defense Language Inst. and DOD College courses
Sociological research on the evolution of terrorism by Professor Robert Jackall at Williams College.
Research on questions of state fragility and failure are increasingly relevant in a globalized age.
PEW Global Attitudes Project has been very important to framing America's position in the world and changing dynamics of globalization and modernity
Tony Judt, "Europe"; Timothy Snyder, "Bloodlands"; any good history book is better than a highly technical social science article that no one reads.
Pick any modern work from the arms control and deterrence theory community (Schelling, Smoke, Alexander, etc.)
Pape's work on the strategic logic of suicide terror is quite interesting, and alarming.
public opinion research/analysis of foreign audiences by whomever
Henry Kissinger's - Diplomacy, China / Roberta Wohlstetter - Pearl Harbor / Schelling /
Sam Huntington and both Albert and Roberta Wohlstetter's work as well as Colin Gray's, Alvin Bernstein's and Donald Kagan's work on policy, strategy,
The work of scholars such as Howard Raiffa and Thomas Schelling in the area of game theory and systems analysis has been of great utility.
Institutional Economics/Douglas North / Public Choice theories/Mancur Olson & James Buchanan / Anthropol research conflict/war/culture / Opinion Polls
Rogoff/Reinhart work on why recovery is slower after a debt-induced economic downturn.
1. Soft Power helped policymakers encapsulate/conceptualize a set of facts and worldviews / 2. Public opinion research as a social science discipline.
Historical analysis, case studies, theoretical writings that illustrate theory with case studies and concrete examples.
wohlstetter on pearl harbor; kissinger on limited nuclear war; Kahn on deterrence, any number of economists on trade, sanctions; any number on Mid / East
"Ghost Wars" by Steve Coll, winner of the 2005 Pulitzer Prize for this book, he is a former journalist and Managing Editor for the Washington Post.
Many examples from development economics (The Bottom Billion); research on gender issues has focused policy attention.
policy implementation is too complex for outside analysis to be relevant. the challenges are real time, in the moment, and situational.
German Marshall Fund's Transatlantic Trends Surveys - annual publication

Getting to Yes in the negotiations to end the civil war in El Salvador.
I take the occasional idea or fact from social science research, but find most of it divorced from reality and so lagging events as to be unhelpful.
Studies of the Afghan Narcotics economy by David Mansfield.
"Political Order in Changing Societies" by Huntington; "Power Kills" by RJ Rummel; "Left Behind" on Latin America by S. Edwards are examples.
There is no time for academic theories in getting policy decided and implemented. It is nearly irrelevant except as a general influence over time.
That Used to Be Us: How America Fell Behind in the World It Invented and How We Can Come Back [Hardcover] / Thomas L. Friedman (Author)
Joe Nye and Soft Power, a host of scholars on Strategic Development,(e.g., Paul Kennedy, etc.). Historians such as Michael Beschloss, Niall Ferguson,
Deep Capture website on Economic Warfare
History and analysis of tribes in Pakistan and Afghanistan
Any analysis (eg, in area studies) that gets at the UNDERLYING causes, rather than current symptoms, of problems has deep policy value.
MARO (mass atrocity response operations) / COIN analysis / Nye on interdependence and power
When I headed [redacted], awareness of social science research was important for our analysts, for their work and to understand others.
Research on the various relationships among and between tribal elements in Iraq and Afghanistan, some of it derived from embedded anthropologists.
Depends on the area and the specific policy issues involved. Research that is specifically tailored to issues relating to specific policy questions.
Economic research on national debt levels and scope for economic policy: Reinhardt and Rogoff
Policy analysis by John Parker of the National Defense University's Institute for National Security Studies related to Russia and US policy.
Steve Walt - The Origins of Alliances /
Decision-making theories and models -- organizational and bureaucratic politics models like Allison. / /
I do not recall any recent example of social science research that I thought was particularly useful to policy-makers.
recent RAND study on success and failure in coin
My all time favorite remains Morris Janowitz's work on military sociology which provides insight and a veritable template for standing up militaries
Irving Janis's Groupthink hypothesis, and Frank Fukuyama's understanding of the origins of political institutions
Stephen Stedman's work at Stanford on contemporary conflict.
research on how public support for military operations is affected by casualties and other costs of war has had a direct impact on policymakers
Aspen Institute Berlin Study of Balkan Cultures 1995
Group think Irving Janus
example is a collection of essays called "breaking the cycle" in the late 90's by Rod Von Lipsey that outlined a theory of conflict intervention
The bottom Billion, by Collier, I believe, helped reshape global goals for international development assistance - also book on Bird Flu raised pandemic
Robert Jervis' "Why Intelligence Fails," Cornell 2010 -- examines the policy/intelligence nexus from an academic perspective, but in a PM's voice.

John Lewis Gaddis, Surprise, Security, and the American Experience /
Thomas Schelling's work on deterrence is fundamental. Ernest May and Dick Neustadt's work on using historical analysis is also exemplary.
I am [redacted]
Amaury de Souza's study of the Brazilian middle class and its impact on Brazil's economy and its politics.
research into one-child policy in China; reports on impact on U.S. economy of international trade; surveys of foreign opinion by Pew Research
T S Kuhn on paradigm shifts, Fernand Braudel on cultural change over time, Bernard Lewis on history and Islam
The ongoing work of Bob Axelrod and Scott Atran on the importance of sacred values to understanding international political disputes and negotiations.
Research on conflict and conflict resolution in area studies
Robert Pape, Dying to Win.
David Kilcullen's work on COIN theory and practice will continue to have relevance. Eliot Cohen's studies of decision-making by commanders as well.
Frugal Superpower, Michael Mandelbaum
Husain Haqqani's book on contemporary Pakistan, "Pakistan: Between Mosque and Military."
Schelling, Arrow on strategic games. Kahneman/Tversky on Behavioral econ.
Frank Fukuyama's "End of History" & John Lewis Gaddis's "Surprise, Security, and the American Experience," and Robert Kagan's books had impact.
Stephen Lyon's social anthropology doctoral thesis, "Power and Patronage in Pakistan," University of Kent helps make sense of Pakistani politics.
Found Daniel Drezner's work on the international politics of zombies to be a refreshing dash of the whimsical with the real.
Public opinion polling conducted by the Eurasia Partnership Foundation on trends in Azerbaijan in December 2010.
I need a broader context for my work, that incorporates military, regional, political, economic factors, to help me devise policy solutions
Stanley Hoffman's State of War as a framework underpinning peace studies.
Behavioral Economics - Kahneman and Tversky, Ariely, Sunstein / Decision Theory/Analysis/Value Focused Thinking - Keeney / Game Theory - Brandenburger
Blaufarb, et al, collective work on population-centric counterinsurgency has had an enormous influence on the U.S. government.
Case studies - Kennedy School, Maxwell School, Georgetown-Pew
Alexander George's Coercive Diplomacy; Steve Krasner on international regimes & on sovereignty; Condoleezza Rice on civil-mil. relations & alliances
Kilcullen, Gallula on COIN. Eliot Cohen and Richard Betts on civ-mil relations. But an excellent book like Cohen's can be misused, as GW Bush did.
bureaucratic politics eg Graham Allison et al.; bureaucratic politics analyses of other nations [where are they?]
Mansfield and Snyder, Electing to Fight: Why Emerging Democracies Go to War
Polling data and its analysis is perhaps the most basic and certainly among the most useful such products.
Opinion polling can be very useful in trying to determine what populations think, especially in countries where freedom of expression is limited.
research on ethnic roots of conflict in complex, mixed societies.

Aaron Friedberg's work on China "A Contest for Supremacy," and similar sorts of policy/history/area studies books.
Joseph Nye, Smart Power/Soft Power
Ken Waltz's Man, the State and War is probably the most useful in providing a framework for understanding international politics.
Nye soft and hard power
Securing the Bomb, by Matthew Bunn
None comes to mind.
Impact of an emerging middle class on expectations of how government should function; OR / Role of expectations on the economy (ie, Soros' theory)
Social science research is useful as a backdrop to the daily policy decisionmaking. It helps us frame our thinking, but does not have direct influence
Ted Robert Gurr, "Why Men Rebel" -- the key element being the importance of relative deprivation in inciting rebellion.
Pape's work on suicide bombers.
Michael Barnett and Marty Finnemore, "International Organizations and Global Politics" and other writings on the behavior of international agencies.
Work on 21st century change in the overall international system, including by Anne-Marie Slaughter, Bruce Jentleson and Steven Weber
/ Designing and implementing non military coercive measures such as sanctions
Cheng Li's book on China's Emerging Middle Class. Paul Kennedy on The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers.

21: Please list an example of social science research that you believe has NOT been, is NOT, or will NOT be useful to policy makers in the formulation and/or implementation of foreign policy. (Please provide as much information as possible about authors name and title.) Ex:

Orientalism, Edward Said.
The time spent on computer modeling of international systems or conflict resolution is a complete waste. Much of the theory work is as well.
highly theoretical and quantitative analysis that seems to be more concerned about the elegance of the model than the policy utility
Apologia, such as that perpetrated by Don Rumsfelt and Richard Cheney, for the disastrous war on Iraq and the overreaction to 9/11.
Many micro-economic models and fitting of history into larger theories is not very useful. Many professors do not want to influence contemporary policy
democratic peace
The neo conservative ideas of the Chicago school
Complex econometric models
Most of it. Cannot think of an exceptionally useless example at this moment (which is itself perhaps a useful insight).
I find the whole "responsibility to protect" debate a sideshow that diverts attention from a pragmatic, cost-efficient approach to policy-making.
Whoever the idiot was who came up with the "nuclear winter" thesis in the 1980s as a way to defeat Reagan Admin national security policy.
My work has been mostly technical/military/economic so other than history I don't follow the literature.
Charles Lipson's theories about democracies' honoring of contractual obligations (Reliable Partners: etc. etc.) overlooks the importance of the milit
Work by the like of Lois Lorentzen and Jennifer Turpin that seeks to use gender studies as an instrument of political and social change.
Ideologically driven research, where results are determined up front and evidence is found to support them, can be very unhelpful.
Not research per se, but The World is Flat (Friedman) and The Post American World (Zakaria) are not only useless they are positively harmful.
Clash of Civilizations
Highly theoretical writings Complex statistical analysis of social science topics (except economics). Writings that use arcane academic jargon.
"The Psychology of Non-Proliferation by Jacques Hymen (title may not be exact)
Any research based on the "rational choice" school of political science tends to be irrelevant if not nonsensical.
all of it!
American Negotiating Behavior -- good but too wordy
The "world systems" theory is one example of research that is of no value to policy-makers. Most of the work by Deconstructionists is another one.
It is merely a general background influence in decision making.
Jacqueline Kennedy / Caroline Kennedy (Author), Michael Beschloss (Author)
International Theory and much of the modeling theories
Theories of state formation and political involvement
Any analysis looking only at current manifestations of problems is of much less utility -- eg, documenting popular opposition to a regime vice causes.

most any quantitative study; virtually every article in APSR
I think it is all useful--can't think of a negative example.
Have not seen an applicable model applied to the motivation of Al Qaeda and its relationship(s) among the various affiliated organizations worldwide.
Any research papers that exceed 10-15 pages.
I do not have the time to read much so cannot cite.
None
I don't recall any recent examples of social science research (that I've read).
theoretical dissertations on the economic factors leading to terrorism
All formulaic academic, as opposed to historically based temperamental, realist projects.
Most social science research from acadamia is of little value to policy makers, as it is more focused on theory rather than practice.
clash of paradigms (is offensive realism better than defensive realism better than state-based realism better than etc.). Balance of threat vs. BoP
End of History Francis Fukuyama
example is a gripping, but ultimately inapplicable study called "end of the american era" by charlie kupchan
Richard Betts' "Enemies of Intelligence," Columbia 2007 -- heavy on opinion, light on evidence. Already have enough of the former, short on evidence.
The New Pearl Harbor: Disturbing Questions About the Bush Administration and 9/11
Most of the offense, defense, realist debates are sterile. Large amounts of rat choice or J. of Conflict Res. are useless
tendentious, agenda-driven "studies" such as often produced by Heritage Foundation
Huntington's most recent work emphasizing the importance of civilizations over states. The work has a very ethnocentric based approach.
Any perspective can have explanatory power, even if they it is demonstrably false or outdated, if someone with power believes it is true
Lexus and the Olive Tree, or anything solely authored by Tom Friedman
Francis Fukuyama's, "The End of History."
Waltz and Mearsheimer on the role of domestic lobbies in Middle East Policy
Anything that attempts to predict the behavior of governmental and foreign policy actors in the aggregate.
Michael Reynolds' theoretical arguments about the role of nationalism in determining late Ottoman foreign policy.
Ken Waltz's Theory of International Relations is as abstract now as it was when I read it as an undergraduate.
Political Theory
lots of game theory is of questionable relevance
Not an option in the survey, but much of the influence has been negative, creating misleading generalizations to be offset or countered.
Quantatative work is not helpful in internatinal affairs. Other political science writing would benefit from analysis of any policy implications.
psychological profiles of foreign leaders done from afar [e.g. Saddam Hussein, Aristide, Soviet leaders]
Highly theoretical work about the nature of the international system.
Formal/game theoretical work and quant in political science - most of what passes as "methodologically sophisticated" international relations work.

Huntington, Clash of Civilizations
Most formal modeling, "Large-N studies", "rational choice", quantitative theories bear absolutely no relation to the decisions policymakers face
Atomic Obsession by John Mueller.
None comes to mind.
Textual analysis of foreign policy speeches as an indication of a country's priorities (theoretical political science debates)
John G. Stoessinger, "Why nations go to war" -- which presents an unprovable thesis.
I've never seen a bit of quantitative, public choice analysis that has any worth.
formal models, rational choice theory, most large N aggregate data and regression analyses
I take a pragmatic approach to foreign relations issues and cannot prejudge what information or research might or might not prove to be relevant.
Samuel Huntington's The Clash of Civilizations

22: Where did you acquire the most important intellectual skills that you use in your job in the U.S. Government? Please check only one box.

% Formal education (high school, college, grad school)	% Professional education / job training	% Field or work experience	% Mentoring	% Independent research / reading	% Other	Respondents
27	11	50	3	6	3	210

23: How important are the following sources of information in giving you information to do your job at U.S. Government?

	% Very Important	% Somewhat Important	% Not Very Important	% Not Important At All	Respondents
Academic books and/or articles	18	56	20	6	208
Trade press books and/or articles in popular magazines	14	55	27	4	201
Professional journals	24	54	19	3	207
Newspapers	64	31	4	0	207
Internet blogs, news sites, and/or streaming internet	22	49	26	3	203
Television and/or radio	10	49	32	8	205
Classified U.S. Government reports (either oral or written)	66	27	4	3	206

VI. Learning and Teaching in the Social Sciences

25: In your opinion, which universities have faculty who produce the most policy-relevant research in the social sciences? Please list up to five.

Rank	School	# Select	% Select
1	Harvard	104	79
2	Stanford	64	48
3	Princeton	58	44
4	Johns Hopkins	53	40
5	Georgetown	45	34
6	Columbia	29	22
7	MIT	19	14
8	Chicago	18	14
9	Yale	14	11
10	George Washington	11	8
10	University of California - Berkeley	11	8
12	Tufts University	10	8
13	Duke	9	7
14	University of Maryland - College Park	5	4
15	University of Pennsylvania	5	4
15	University of Virginia	5	4
17	George Mason	4	3
17	Michigan	4	3
17	Oxford	4	3
17	Syracuse	4	3
21	National Defense University	3	2
22	Dartmouth	2	2
22	London School of Economics	2	2
22	Naval Postgraduate School	2	2
22	New York University	2	2
22	U.S. Military Academy	2	2
22	University of Texas at Austin	2	2
22	William and Mary	2	2
29	American University	1	1
29	Arizona State	1	1
29	Cambridge	1	1
29	Carnegie Mellon	1	1
29	Cornell	1	1
29	Hillsdale College	1	1

29	Indiana University/SPEA	1	1
29	Joint Special Operations University	1	1
29	Mercyhurst College	1	1
29	Missouri State	1	1
29	Monterey	1	1
29	Naval War College	1	1
29	Penn State	1	1
29	Texas A&M University	1	1
29	U. of Pittsburgh	1	1
29	U. Washington	1	1
29	UCLA	1	1
29	University of Denver	1	1
29	University of North Carolina	1	1
29	University of Wisconsin	1	1
29	Williams College	1	1
29	N/A AEI, Heritage, Center for Naval Analyses	1	1
29	N/A IDA,CNAS etc.	1	1
29	N/A War Colleges	1	1

26. In your opinion, which universities train the best candidates for jobs with the U.S. Government?
Please list up to five.

Rank	School	# Selected	% Select
1	Harvard University	82	64
2	Georgetown University	64	50
3	Johns Hopkins University	60	47
4	Princeton University	50	39
5	Stanford University	33	26
6	Tufts University	29	23
7	Columbia University	18	14
8	Yale University	16	13
9	George Washington University	13	10
10	United States Naval Academy	10	8
11	U.S. Military Academy - West Point	9	7
11	University of Chicago	9	7
13	American University	8	6
14	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	7	5
15	University of Michigan	6	5
16	Duke University	5	4
16	Syracuse University	5	4
18	College of William and Mary	4	3
18	University of California - Berkeley	4	3
18	University of Virginia	4	3
21	Brigham Young University	3	2
21	Dartmouth College	3	2
21	George Mason University	3	2
21	Oxford University	3	2
21	University of Maryland - College Park	3	2
21	University of Wisconsin	3	2
27	Brown University	2	2
27	Cornell University	2	2
27	National Defense University	2	2
27	Pennsylvania State University	2	2
27	Thunderbird	2	2
27	U.S. Air Force Academy	2	2
27	University of Pennsylvania	2	2
27	University of Southern California	2	2

27	University of Washington	2	2
27	Williams College	2	2
37	Arizona State University	1	1
37	Cal Tech	1	1
37	Cambridge	1	1
37	Carnegie Mellon University	1	1
37	Fordham	1	1
37	Georgia Tech	1	1
37	Indiana University	1	1
37	Luther College	1	1
37	Mercyhurst College	1	1
37	Missouri State	1	1
37	National War College	1	1
37	Ohio State University	1	1
37	Ohio University	1	1
37	Smith College	1	1
37	Texas A&M University	1	1
37	University of California - Los Angeles	1	1
37	University of Denver	1	1
37	University of Florida	1	1
37	University of Pittsburgh	1	1
37	University of Rochester	1	1
37	University of Texas at Austin	1	1
37	Vanderbilt University	1	1
37	Virginia Tech	1	1
37	Wellesley	1	1

27: Please list up to four international relations scholars whose work has had the greatest influence on U.S. foreign policy in the past 20 years.

Rank	Scholar	# Select	% Select
1	Joseph Nye	55	45
2	Samuel Huntington	47	39
3	Henry Kissinger	41	34
4	Francis Fukayama	18	15
5	Zbigniew Brzezinski	15	12
6	Robert Jervis	10	8
6	Thomas Schelling	10	8
8	Fareed Zakaria	8	7
9	Kenneth Waltz	7	6
10	Albert Wohlstetter	5	4
10	Anne-Marie Slaughter	5	4
10	Bernard Lewis	5	4
10	George F. Kennan	5	4
10	Graham Allison	5	4
10	Hans Morgenthau	5	4
16	Eliot Cohen	4	3
16	Ernest May	4	3
16	John Mearsheimer	4	3
16	Stephen Walt	4	3
16	Thomas Friedman	4	3
21	Condoleeza Rice	3	2
21	G. John Ikenberry	3	2
21	Leo Strauss	3	2
21	Richard Haass	3	2
21	Robert Kagan	3	2
21	Robert Keohane	3	2
21	Stanley Hoffman	3	2
21	Walter Russel Meade	3	2
29	Alexander George	2	2
29	Brent Scowcroft	2	2
29	Daniel Pipes	2	2
29	David Petraeus	2	2
29	Fredrick Kagan	2	2
29	George Shultz	2	2
29	Joseph Stiglitz	2	2
29	Michael Doyle	2	2
29	Natan Sharansky	2	2
29	Richard Betts	2	2

29	William Perry	2	2
40	Aaron Friedberg	1	1
40	Ahmad Raschid	1	1
40	Ajami	1	1
40	Alan Greenspan	1	1
40	Amartya Sen	1	1
40	Arnold Toynbee	1	1
40	Ashraf Ghani	1	1
40	Barbara F. Walter	1	1
40	Benjamin Bernake	1	1
40	Bhagwati	1	1
40	Bill Taylor	1	1
40	Bruce Bueno de Mesquita	1	1
40	Bruce Reidel	1	1
40	Charles Tilly	1	1
40	Colin Gray	1	1
40	cominique Moisi	1	1
40	Crocker	1	1
40	Dan Yergin	1	1
40	David Lampton	1	1
40	Ezra Vogel	1	1
40	Fouad Ajami	1	1
40	Fred Ikle	1	1
40	George Will	1	1
40	Harry Harding	1	1
40	Herman Kahn	1	1
40	Hobbes	1	1
40	Timothy D. Sixk	1	1
40	Ian Bremer	1	1
40	Immanuel Wallerstein	1	1
40	Inis Claude	1	1
40	Jack Snyder	1	1
40	James Lewis	1	1
40	Jan Hallenberg	1	1
40	Janowitz	1	1
40	John Lewis Gaddis	1	1
40	Jonathan Spence	1	1
40	Kant	1	1
40	Lawrence Freedman	1	1
40	Lee Hamilton	1	1
40	Lowenthal	1	1

40	Machiavelli	1	1
40	Madeline Albright	1	1
40	Max Kampelman	1	1
40	Michael Howard	1	1
40	Michael Mandelbaum	1	1
40	Michael O'Hanlon	1	1
40	Michael Walzer	1	1
40	Norman Podhoretz	1	1
40	Paul Wolfowitz	1	1
40	Paul Kennedy	1	1
40	Paul Nitze	1	1
40	Peter Rodman	1	1
40	Raymon Aron	1	1
40	Reinhold Niebuhr	1	1
40	Richard Clarke	1	1
40	Richard Holbrooke	1	1
40	Richard Rhodes	1	1
40	Robert Art	1	1
40	Robert Jay Lifton	1	1
40	Robert Kaplan	1	1
40	Robert Pape	1	1
40	Samantha Powers	1	1
40	William Bennet	1	1
40	Steve Coll	1	1
40	Steve Krasner	1	1
40	Steve Stedman	1	1
40	Strobe Talbott	1	1
40	Thomas Christensen	1	1
40	Thomas Risse	1	1
40	Thucydides	1	1

VII: Questions Regarding U.S. Policy

28: Which area of the world do you consider to be of greatest strategic importance to the United States today? Please check only one box.

Option	% Frequency
East Asia (including China)	50
Former Soviet Union/Eastern Europe, including Central Asian states, except for Afghanistan	<1
Latin America (including Mexico and the Caribbean)	2
Middle East	33
North Africa	<1
North America (not including Mexico)	2
South Asia (including Afghanistan)	5
Western Europe	7

29: Which area of the world do you believe will be of greatest strategic importance to the United States in 20 years? Please check only one box.

Option	% Frequency
East Asia (including China)	85
Former Soviet Union/Eastern Europe, including Central Asian states, except for Afghanistan	<1
Latin America (including Mexico and the Caribbean)	2
Middle East	6
North Africa	0
North America (not including Mexico)	1
South Asia (including Afghanistan)	1
Southeast Asia	<1
Sub-Saharan Africa	1
Western Europe	1

30: What are the three most important foreign policy issues facing the United States today?

Option	% Frequency
Arab Spring	33
Collapse of the Doha Round of trade negotiations	1
Conflict in the Middle East	33
Cyber-security	17
Decline of the US dollar as a reserve currency	7
Ethnic conflict	3
Failed states	13
Global climate change	8
Global debt crisis	34
Global population growth	2
Global poverty	3
Global reliance on oil	4
International organized crime	3
International terrorism	28
Persistence of the U.S. trade deficit	6
Reform of the United Nations	<1
Resource scarcity	5
Rogue states	1
Russian resurgence	1
Rising power of China	42
War in Afghanistan	10
WMD proliferation	27
Other	8

31: What are the three most important foreign policy issues the United States will face over the next 10 years?

Option	% Frequency
Arab Spring	14
Collapse of the Doha Round of trade negotiations	2
Conflict in the Middle East	28
Cyber-security	20
Decline of the US dollar as a reserve currency	12
Epidemic disease	<1
Ethnic conflict	4
Failed states	16
Global climate change	19
Global debt crisis	19
Global financial regulation	3
Global population growth	8
Global poverty	7
Global reliance on oil	9
International organized crime	4
International terrorism	15
Persistence of the U.S. trade deficit	3
Regional integration	2
Resource scarcity	14
Rogue states	5
Russian resurgence	3
Rising power of China	54
War in Afghanistan	<1
WMD proliferation	23
Other	9