

To: "Dr. John Mark Hansen, Chair - NES Board of Overseers" <jhansen@uchicago.edu>.

Subject: **Rescuing NSF political science; ANES; testing hierarchical psychodrama models & a Nobel prize in economics; Senator Mikulski's concerns and APSA's long-term strategic plan.**

Date: 10/28/2009

Dear John Mark Hansen and Members of the American National Election Studies Board

Two further suggestions about APSA /ANES strategy in response to Senator Coburn's amendment to zero-out NSF political science (including ANES) as civically useless & non-innovative.

1.) ANES and political scientists can advance evidence-based public policy and win a Nobel Prize in economics if you test hierarchical psychodrama models.

. If there are observed motivational effects (either Reagan Republican/suppressive or Democratic/activist leadership), these are discoveries (i.e., to economists) for which Nobel Prizes are awarded. And a Nobel Prize to ANES and participating political scientists, especially given the reigning macroeconomic assumption that motivation is fixed and exogenous, would be justified: textbooks would need to be rewritten.<1> And there are further benefits if political scientists transform our understanding of resistant social problems by clarifying the unrecognized brain mechanisms activated in lower-status/lower-power populations.<2>

2.) Responding to Senator Mikulski's Concerns

In her bold speech, Senator Mikulski expressed strong support for policy-relevant political science that can prevent serious policy errors by government officials. Two very good examples of useful predictions, on the www.policyscience.net Website, come to mind. They could be used by President Brady in discussions with Republicans.

- Will the Bush Administration Unravel? There is an homage to James David Barber (June, 2001) - "Will the Bush Administration Unravel?" It used his character model to predict a repetition of Warren Harding's unraveling by the end of the George W. Bush Administration. We still do not know the full extent to which Bush's Republican businessmen "friends" took advantage of him via lax regulation and other means - the revelations of exploited trust that stunned Harding at the end of his Administration. But Republicans could be reminded that NSF-supported political science *has* a developing ability to make insightful and important predictions [e.g., about policy mistakes by government], beyond what one will hear on Fox News.

- Hubris: Predictions of US policy in Iraq, esp. Cheney's influence. There also have been important predictions/scientific achievements - again, bolstering Senator Mikulski's argument - in foreign policy, The theory of a *hubris*/hardball syndrome correctly predicted key features of Bush/Cheney foreign policy in Iraq, post 9/11. The predictions included both the extraordinary over-confidence and the stark sense of fear,

characteristic policy mistakes and overlays/misperceptions of local realities, the disregard of ethics, manipulations of the policy process, etc. The scientific work grew from original work supported by NSF (to study government learning rates) and it was informed by three case studies of CIA Central American interventions across three decades, of Vietnam, studies of personality & foreign policy (dominant decision makers similar to Cheney), etc.

[Just to make a scientific point. This political science theory of *hubris*, building on Lasswell, is not an adjective/accusation used in anti-war debate. It predicts syndromes, a package of behaviors & predictions (e.g., of characteristic mistakes) that makes possible a comparative testing with Realpolitik and rational-utility-maximization, Jervis (etc.) models. There's a 2006 "Memorandum Concerning Two Developments in IR Theory" on the www.policyscience.net Website at II. D that discusses this case that can be cited to Republicans to strengthen Senator Mikulski's arguments. Again, you don't hear this on Fox News.]

Looking ahead: I think some of the most useful political science predictions come via an admixture of psychology. My own early work (the predictions, above) was partly supported by NSF political science, plus a far-sighted NIMH investment in early interdisciplinary programs to begin political psychology. [There are additional, visionary ideas in William Ascher & Barbara Hirschfelder-Ascher's [Revitalizing Political Psychology](#) (2004) on Lasswell's vision/agenda.]

\$19 Million/Year is Pathetic

\$19 million/year for all of NSF political science & our 15,000 members is pathetic! The earlier decision of our national science Establishment to back down, [discussed in the following message to President Brady], faced with a Republican attack, was outrageous. We should not make the same mistake again.

Lloyd E.

<1> Baseline Data. If ANES wants to review the possibilities, there were national probability samples in the mid-1950's and mid-1970's with N-Ach (achievement motivation) measures that might be useful. In 1990, the estimable Daniel Druckman on the National Academy of Sciences/National Research Council staff, proposed a fresh look at the Luce Commission restrictions on social science. He arranged for an invitation to me, for a draft outline of what a research program might look like, and I believe the early N-Ach references are included there: A copy (from 1990) is on the www.policyscience.net Website under II. C: "A Proposal to Study Leadership, Motivation, and Economic Growth." There probably are many newer measures, from neuropsychology, that can be used today, after nineteen years.

<2> Pioneering work across thirty years, for which he was knighted in Great Britain, is reviewed in Sir Michael Marmot's, [The Status Syndrome: How Social Standing Affects our Health and Longevity](#) (2005). Given the British national health system Marmot can rule-out differential access to affordable health care.

Date: Sun, 25 Oct 2009 23:03:10 -0400
To: "Dr. Henry Brady - APSA President" <hbrady@berkeley.edu>
From: Lloyd Etheredge <lloyd.etheredge@policyscience.net>
Subject: APSA strategic plans & the Coburn/Republican challenge
[CC: Council . . . }

Dear Henry:

I am enclosing a letter re the Coburn amendment, with a strategy suggestion that will depend upon informed support from the Council.

As you know, there is a degree of dishonesty at the core of the American politics field (re Republican ideas). Until this is resolved, I don't think APSA has a good future of bipartisan political support, especially with \$1 trillion+ deficits. And, for scientific breakthroughs, without integrity nothing is going to work

As you will recall: In the earlier Luce Commission case President Reagan's OMB Director, David Stockman, threatened to zero-out all behavioral science in the federal budget unless the social sciences agreed to shut-up and become civically innocuous. Now, having become innocuous via the *en masse* restructuring quietly orchestrated via the seignors at the National Academy of Sciences, the same fate is ahead (although this time the charge is being useless and innocuous). As you know I've thought, all along, that the best strategy is courage and honesty, I still do.

best regards,
Lloyd

Dr. Lloyd S. Etheredge - Director, Government Learning Project
Fellow - World Academy of Art & Science
Policy Sciences Center Inc.
127 Wall St., Room 322 - Box 208215
New Haven, CT 06520-8215
URL: www.policyscience.net
301-365-5241 (v); lloyd.etheredge@policyscience.net (email)