

Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2011 14:59:44 -0500

To: "Dr. Baruch Fischhoff - Chair, National Academy Committee on Improving Intelligence" <baruch@cmu.edu>, "Dr. Theda Skocpol - National Academy of Sciences and Past President, APSA" <ts@wjh.harvard.edu>, "Bill Nordhaus - National Academy of Sciences" <william.nordhaus@yale.edu>, "Dr. David Shaw - PCAST" <dshaw@blackpointgroup.com>, "Dr. Karen Cook - Chair, AAAS Section K" <kcook@stanford.edu>, "Dr. Carole Pateman - President, APSA" <pateman@ucla.edu>, "Dr. Robert Keohane - National Academy of Sciences" <rkeohane@princeton.edu>, "Dr. Robert Axelrod - National Academy of Sciences" <axe@umich.edu>, "Dr. Jonathan Cole - CASBS" <jrc5@columbia.edu>, "Dr. Richard Atkinson - Chair - NRC/DBASSE" <rcatkinson@ucsd.edu>, "Dr. G. Bingham Powell, Jr. - APSA Vice President" <gb.powell@rochester.edu>, "Dr. Aletha Huston - COSSA" <achuston@mail.utexas.edu>, "Dr. David Lake - ISA" <dlake@ucsd.edu>, "Dr. Kwame Anthony Appiah - Chair, Exec. Committee, American Council of Learned Societies" <kappiah@Princeton.EDU>, Joseph Nye <joseph_nye@harvard.edu>, "Dr. Anne-Marie Slaughter - Director, Policy Planning Staff via Ms. Marisa S. McAuliffe" <mcauliffems@state.gov>
From: Lloyd Etheredge <lloyd.etheredge@policyscience.net>

Subject: 239. Red Team: The "Who Listens to American Leaders?" Inquiry - Three Possible Policy Lessons

Dear Dr. Fischhoff, Dr. Atkinson, Dr. Keohane, Dr. Pateman, and Colleagues:

I write to add a comment to paper #238, and to discuss three levels of policy implications for this "Who listens to American leaders?" Red Team re-evaluation of the changing nature of power in world politics.

Do Davos People Listen to American Leaders?

A colleague, reading paper # 238, suggested extending the question to non-government global actors: "Do you think anybody at *Davos* listens to American leaders?" Billionaire

CEO's of globalized enterprises, with cosmopolitan lifestyles, may have annual salaries 50 to 100+ times greater than an American President (or members of Congress). An American President would be listened to (i.e., in the diplomatic sense) as he is the CEO of a major player, but how much influence does he really have today, in what areas, on what basis, at this (post Cold War) point in the 21st century?

- The National Academy should make a strong recommendation for a Red Team project to develop these new (behavioral) measures of power: We already have had one catastrophic failure of the American government's conventional wisdom: The 60+ mainstream econometric models, backed by the public data systems of the federal government, with the cumulative wisdom of decades of NSF support for academic economics, failed to warn American government leaders that they would wake up to discover the worst global economic crisis since the Depression. A new Red Team could, using behavioral science to make an independent assessment of reality, challenge another area of conventional wisdom, and it might prevent Secretary of State Clinton from waking up one morning with the sudden realization "They are not listening to me . . . "

It is too early to know what a Red Team R&D project will discover. However, I think that it could have historical implications at three levels:

An Urgent Red Team and Three Possible Policy Lessons

1. Relationship-building.

President Clinton was the first modern President to believe that the nature of power was changing. The International Relations textbooks of the early Cold War agreed that "summit" meetings of major leaders were rare and somewhat awesome events. But President Clinton decided that the building of personal relationships was essential and, when he left office, frequent and regular group meetings of the heads of major nations (complete with group photos, with all leaders wearing the national dress specified by the host country) had become *de rigueur*.

We also have seen the benefits, for international cooperation in global health, of the many

decades of foreign fellowships offered by the Center for Disease Control in Atlanta. These have supported the development of today's personal and professional networks in a key policy area.

There may be many further implications along these personal relationship lines.

2. G-20 System Design & Building.

President Clinton worked the international political process, as he did as Governor of Arkansas, by an extraordinary intellect, sociability and a commitment to knowing everybody. But he was never as good, as President, at the institution- and system-building work. Almost no American leader is going to be able to do this personal networking, as he did it. And paradoxically, an international system in which only the American President [+ Tony Blair] takes this political approach beyond their own water's edge, is still too unilateral. For example, there is a system-building agenda in which the G-20 leaders begin to think of themselves as a kind of Board of Trustees, that may need to be pursued before a new basis for power is achieved.

Designing new, workable and accountable systems for the global future is a leading-edge question for everyone. The Obama Administration's vision for a G-20 governance system will need to work for a world of complex adaptive systems. It will need many dimensions: the links of universities; the development of professional diplomacy; bilateral meetings of government professionals across many agencies; scientific cooperation; the growth of policy and social and NGO networks and news media to support them; the investments in transnational linkups via common nomenclature systems and translatable software codes for new global electronic health record (EHR)/rapid learning systems, etc.

3.) Fresh Thinking along Dozens of Lines of Investigation

Beyond system-building, several hundred ideas and lines of investigation were identified in my earlier suggestions for the Fischhoff process (archived at www.policyscience.net at II.D). However, this investment needs a Red Team! The ideas and lines of investigation are unlikely to come to life unless people recognize that a paradigm has shifted and that,

in a changing world - in which American power also is changing - we need the help, and the analytic + combinatorial tools, of social science to take a fresh look at almost everything. Yes, in a changing reality, conventional assumptions can unravel suddenly and catastrophically - as they did in the global economic crisis and as autocrats in Egypt and elsewhere in the Islamic world are discovering. But, especially, we need to take a fresh look because we will, through this process, recognize that there also is far more opportunity [i.e., post hegemonic psychodrama] for power and rapid progress than we currently imagine.

Lloyd Etheredge

Dr. Lloyd S. Etheredge - Fellow,
World Academy of Art & Science
Director, Government Learning Project
Policy Sciences Center

URL: www.policyscience.net

301-365-5241 (v); lloyd.etheredge@policyscience.net (email)

[The Policy Sciences Center, Inc. is a public foundation that develops and integrates knowledge and practice to advance human dignity. Its headquarters are 127 Wall St., Room 322 PO Box 208215 in New Haven, CT 06520-8215. It may be contacted at the office of its Chair, Michael Reisman (michael.reisman@yale.edu), 203-432-1993. Further information about the Policy Sciences Center and its projects, Society, and journal is available at www.policysciences.org.]