IN MEMORIAM
W. GLENN CAMPBELL

W. Glenn Campbell, who was director of the Hoover Institution, Stanford University, for 30 years, died November 24 at the age of 77. In addition to his responsibilities as director, he advised U.S. presidents and was a member of the University of California Regents for 28 years.

Campbell was appointed as the Hoover Institution’s director in 1960 at the recommendation of Herbert Hoover on the advice of Ray Moley, an adviser to Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Under Campbell, who worked with founder Herbert Hoover until Hoover’s death in 1964, the Institution realized significant accomplishments, evolving from a well-known library and archives to an internationally renowned public policy research center that focused on American principles of individual, economic, and political freedom, private enterprise, and representative government.

Under Campbell’s leadership, a component of public policy scholars joined archival researchers at the Institution, the Institution’s collections and library grew, and the endowment flourished. Also continued on page 11


WILLIAM F. BUCKLEY JR. HIGHLIGHTS FALL RETREAT

Hoover Institution welcomed its largest retreat audience ever for the 2001 Fall Retreat, October 28–30. Among the retreat’s many highlights was an appearance by William F. Buckley Jr., who spoke on the occasion of Hoover Institution’s acquisition of the broadcast archives of Firing Line.

Firing Line was built on the proposition that “people, in and of themselves, could be interesting for an entire hour,” said Buckley. “Certain people deserved an explication of themselves and their views. Firing Line, as a postulate, allowed people to say what they wanted to say.”

Founded in the mid-1960s, when the fortunes of conservative ideas and politics were at an ebb in America, Firing Line, hosted by Buckley, played a key role in establishing conservatism as a legitimate and serious intellectual movement. President Ronald Reagan called Buckley “the most influential journalist and intellectual in our era.” Hoover fellow Peter Robinson, host of the Hoover Institution’s public affairs television program Uncommon Knowledge, said of Buckley’s long career: “He has given us right reason and human liberty.”

At the retreat dinner October 28, Ken Jowitt, the Pres and Maurine Hotchkis Senior Fellow, drew a standing ovation as he called for embracing a new national, patriotic identity to unify America in the war on terrorism.

“This is clearly an extraordinary point in our history,” Jowitt said. “[This crisis] will test our identity as a society and our identity as a nation.”

America’s response to the threat of Osama bin Laden and other terrorists must go beyond military action, said Jowitt. “What is needed immediately today is a practical, substantial, sober sense of national identity.”

Jowitt characterized the terrorism of the post–cold war era as “movements of rage,” continued on page 8

Goodson explained the dramatic challenges facing post-Taliban Afghanistan and the need for the United States, in his estimation, “to play a leading role in that future.”

“Afghanistan today is once again a country defined by localism,” Goodson said. “Whatever nation building is undertaken must peel away these [divisive] identities so that the core identity underneath can be found.”

Before the September 11 attacks on New York City and Washington, D.C., the situation in Afghanistan was “one of the great tragedies of our day, made all the more poignant by the world’s pronounced indifference, [and] is profoundly threatening to the continued stability of many other countries,” he said.

There are substantive reasons for the United States to take the lead in rebuilding Afghanistan after the Taliban is overthrown, Goodson declared.

Although United Nations forces can help stabilize and rebuild Afghanistan, only the United States has the ability to keep it stable as it recovers from Taliban rule and begins a long reconstruction phase.

“This is a great opportunity for the United States to lead the rebuilding of Afghanistan in a way that convinces open-minded people in the Islamic countries that America is a force for good in the world,” he said.

Larry Goodson is an associate professor in the department of international studies at Bentley College. Goodson’s special area of scholarship is the modern politics of Afghanistan and Pakistan, and he has lived and traveled there extensively since 1986, most recently in 1997.

Other speakers who participated in the fall 2001 sessions of Hoover Institution’s U.S. & World Affairs Seminars included

- United States Foreign Service officer Sheila Gwalteny, a national security affairs fellow at the Hoover Institution and former deputy chief of mission at the U.S. Embassy in Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan, who spoke on the “Challenges in Central Asia” on December 12.
- Tang Fei, former premier of the Republic of China on Taiwan, who spoke on December 5 (see sidebar).
- Hoover visiting fellow Gideon Rahat, a research fellow at the Israel Democracy Institute and assistant professor of political science at Hebrew University in Jerusalem, who commented on “The Future of Israeli Politics” on November 14.
- Hoover fellow and coorganizer of the U.S. & World Affairs Seminars Larry Diamond, who presented “A Political Strategy for Winning the War on Terrorism” on November 7. Diamond has written extensively on the international diffusion of democracy and is the coeditor of the *Journal of Democracy*.

• Daniel Brumburg, associate professor of government at Georgetown University and author of *Reinventing Khomeini: The Struggle for Reform in Iran* (University of Chicago Press, 2001), who spoke on “The Struggle for Reform in Iran” on October 10.


On January 16, 2002, former secretary of state George P. Shultz, the Thomas W. and Susan B. Ford Distinguished Fellow, opened the winter 2002 sessions of the U.S. & World Affairs Seminars with a talk entitled “A More Accountable World?”

“This is a special occasion for us,” noted Diamond in introducing Shultz “because it marks twenty-five years of his association with Hoover Institution and Stanford University. It is an association that we deeply treasure and one that has helped us to reestablish the Hoover Institution’s leadership role in addressing the international challenges of war, revolution, peace, and freedom.”

Dan Meridor, right, Israel’s minister of defense, speaks with Tad Taube, Hoover overseer, left, and Abraham Sofaer, center, during a December 12 visit to Hoover.

It is a documentary account of the Nobel Prize winners based on holdings from the Hoover Institution Library and Archives, the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center Archives and History Office, and the Stanford University Archives.

“This new exhibit is an elaboration of a smaller exhibit that was installed in the Hoover Tower lobby to coincide with the naming of the Nobel laureates in October and celebrating the 100th anniversary of the Nobel Prize,” said Exhibits Coordinator Cissie Hill. “In the process of researching in the Hoover Institution Archives, I found such a wealth of material that I requested a larger exhibit.”

As the exhibit grew, Hill also used collections from the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center Archives and History Office and the Stanford University Archives.

Three of Hoover’s current Nobel laureate economists, who continue to contribute to the Institution and its work on public policy issues, are featured in the exhibit. Gary S. Becker, the Rose-Marie and Jack R. Anderson Senior Fellow at Hoover, was awarded the Nobel Memorial Prize for economic sciences in 1992; Milton Friedman, widely regarded as the leader of the Chicago School of Economics, was recipient of the Nobel Memorial Prize for economic sciences in 1976; and Douglass C. North, the Bartlett Burnap Senior Fellow at Hoover, received the Nobel Memorial Prize for economic sciences in 1993.

Also featured in the exhibit are documents and photographs from Russian author and Hoover honorary fellow Alexander Solzhenitsyn, who received the Nobel Memorial Prize for literature in 1970.

Documents and memorabilia from these laureates and others associated with Hoover, Stanford, and the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center will be on display in the Herbert Hoover Memorial Exhibit Pavilion through July 28. The pavilion, located adjacent to Hoover Tower, is open Tuesday through Saturday from 11 a.m. to 4 p.m. For additional information about *To Benefit Mankind: Celebrating the Centennial of the Nobel Prize, 1901–2001,* please contact the Hoover Institution Archives at 650-723-3563.

**NEW ARCHIVE EXHIBIT CELEBRATES CENTENNIAL OF THE NOBEL PRIZE**

**SECRETARY OF ENERGY JOINS HOOVER/SIEPR CONFERENCE ON CALIFORNIA ELECTRICITY PROBLEM**

Leading authorities on energy issues from the public and private sectors met in October when the Hoover Institution and the Stanford Institute for Economic Policy Research (SIEPR) cosponsored a conference on the California electricity problem at the Hoover Institution.

During the October 18–19 conference, participants discussed the causes of and possible solutions to California’s current electricity crisis. Spencer Abraham, the U.S. secretary of energy, addressed the issue of energy security.

“The need for us to think very seriously—and in concrete and practical terms—about domestic and international energy policy could not be more pressing. As with so many other matters, September 11 has clarified and intensified what needs to be done,” Abraham said.

“Energy security is perhaps the principal factor in sustaining a robust economy—an economy that’s global and growing. But recognizing that complete energy independence is unlikely does not mean we should ignore the consequences of growing more and more dependent on imported oil and natural gas. Determination on our part to meet the full range of our energy challenges—from improvements in the electricity grid to more nuclear energy—will show the world that we will not allow ourselves to be at the mercy of others.”

The first conference panel on October 18, moderated by Hoover Institution director John Raisian, featured Hoover fellow James Sweeney, a professor of management and engineering science at Stanford University and SIEPR fellow who has worked extensively on energy related issues, and Severin Borenstein, a professor of business administration and public policy at the University of California, Berkeley, and director of the University of California Energy Institute. The two experts analyzed the economic and political roots of the crisis and discussed viable long-term solutions to the problem.

“Understanding the failure in California is key to keeping deregulation on track,” said Borenstein. “For markets to work, players must have the infrastructure and information to participate.”

Edward Leamer, a professor of management from the University of California, Los Angeles, presented a talk on the impact of the electricity problem on California’s economy, taking a macroeconomic view of the problem that has plagued the state.

“Energy issues are not on today’s radar, but they will come back in two or three years,” warned Leamer, adding, “The terrible consequence of the electricity continued on page 12
Charles G. Palm, who joined the Hoover Institution in 1971 and served as deputy director since 1990, retired as of December 31. His duties as chief of the Institution’s library and archives were assumed on January 1 by Elena Danielson.

Palm’s long and distinguished career at Hoover included a 1992 negotiated agreement between the Institution and the Russian State Archival Service, which led to the world-wide distribution on microfilm of more than 12 million pages from the Soviet Communist Party and State Archives. Palm directed an acquisition program that brought to Hoover many other major collections, including 2.5 tons of materials on the collapse of communism and the transition to democracy in Eastern Europe, and the voluminous archives of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty.

In 1988, he was appointed to the California Heritage Preservation Commission, which promotes preservation of the state’s history. Palm was elected chairman of the commission in 1997.

Palm was cocompiler of Herbert Hoover: A Register of His Papers in the Hoover Institution Archives (Hoover Institution Press, 1983) and Guide to the Hoover Institution Archives (Hoover Institution Press, 1980).

Palm was associate director for the library and archives, 1987-90; head librarian, 1986-87; and archivist, 1984-87.

Palm is a fellow of the Society of American Archivists. He was president of the Society of California Archivists from 1983 to 1984.

He earned his A.B. in history from Stanford University in 1966, and graduate degrees from the University of Wyoming and the University of Oregon.
On November 9, 2001, President George W. Bush issued a proclamation declaring that day—which marked the anniversary of the fall of the Berlin Wall—World Freedom Day:

“Since the fall of the Berlin Wall, many countries have achieved freedom via the ballot box, through political pressure rising from their citizens, or as a result of the settlement of internal or regional conflicts,” Bush said. “We celebrate the new freedom in which much of the world lives today.”

The president’s proclamation had its roots in the work of Hoover fellow Arnold Beichman, who had called for such recognition a decade earlier. In a column for the Washington Times on November 9, 1991, Beichman wrote:

“On November 9, 1989 a hated symbol of 70 years of communist tyranny came to a squalid end. The fear of nuclear war between the two superpowers was over. World peace seemed more assured than ever before in modern history.

“November 9 from this day forward should be a day for world observance. In years to come we will realize that the man whose policies made that victory possible was Ronald Reagan.

“Let us remember that this victory came without bloodshed, without marching armies, without loss of life, without nuclear fallout. Unprecedented in modern times, victor and vanquished together have acclaimed the end of the Cold War. Everybody won. November 9 each year would be a warning to future tyrants that tyranny, whether military as in Burma or ideological as in China and Cuba, has no future.

“November 9—World Freedom Day.”

Beichman’s inspired idea remained unrealized until it was resurrected by President Bush this year. Beichman credits the renewed interest in a World Freedom Day to the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001.

Reflecting back, he found one event during the final years of the cold war particularly inspired him.

“In 1987, President Reagan made a speech at the Berlin Wall. [Hoover fellow] Peter Robinson wrote that speech. In his speech, Reagan issued an apostrophe: ‘General Secretary Gorbachev, if you seek peace, if you seek prosperity for the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, if you seek liberalization: Come here to this gate. Mr. Gorbachev, open this gate. Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall.’ That stayed with me a long time. Then in 1989, the wall came down and all of Europe was transformed. My son, John, sent me a fantastic photograph, taken at night under very garish spotlights; it shows people dancing on the wall. It suddenly became a symbol of freedom for me.”

Today’s World Freedom Day holds the same significance for Beichman that it did ten years ago.

“We’re still fighting for the same ideals. The values are still the same as I saw in 1991.”
**Q & A**

**TIME TO STOP PLAYING GAMES WITH TERRORISTS**

**FELLOW**  Abraham D. Sofaer  
**TITLE**  George P. Shultz Distinguished Scholar and Senior Fellow  
**RESEARCH**  Separation of powers issues in the American system of government, including the power over war, issues related to international law, terrorism, diplomacy, national security.  
**DEGREES**  LLB, New York University School of Law, 1965; B.A., history, Yeshiva College, 1962.

**Q:** You have spoken strongly for years about what the United States should do to fight terrorism. What are your thoughts after September 11?  
**A:** The scale and savagery of the attacks on September 11 should prompt our leaders to fight terrorism with force. Presidents for years have deceived us with empty promises denouncing terrorist assaults and vows to pursue perpetrators until they are “brought to justice.”

**Q:** This is what has been promised by our leaders. Is this not a good idea?  
**A:** Yes. The current administration thus far is seriously pursuing a policy of using necessary and appropriate force. Until recently, however, this country played games with terrorists, trying to stop them through slow and cumbersome criminal-law procedures rather than hitting them hard and destroying their capacity to attack Americans. The sad results of this failed policy—the disintegration of the World Trade Center towers and the Pentagon inferno—are now engrained in the minds of millions.

**Q:** Who is responsible?  
**A:** U.S. presidents are responsible. Instead of using the military to eliminate terrorist groups, they have relied on the FBI and federal prosecutors to investigate and try only those few low-level operatives we are fortunate enough to arrest.

This misguided policy has allowed the suspected mastermind of September’s carnage, Osama bin Laden, unlimited time to plan and implement new attacks of increasing seriousness. An antiterrorism policy based on criminal prosecution created the misleading impression that the U.S. government was providing the American people with meaningful protection. It was not.

**Q:** Why do you say the prior policy was like playing games?  
**A:** Our policy of fighting terrorism with criminal-law procedures was uncomfortably like playing “Where in the World Is Carmen San Diego?”

In the computer game, player-investigators are assigned cases involving spectacular crimes—for example, stealing the Golden Gate Bridge—committed by members of Carmen’s extensive gang. Investigators then dash off to collect evidence, flying from place to place, based on clues received from witnesses and documents. If successful, an investigator gradually puts together enough evidence to establish probable cause. The investigator must secure a warrant and then is allowed to arrest the correct person when he or she appears on the screen. Every successful arrest is a win, even though the boss—the daring and elusive Carmen San Diego—remains at large, arranging for other gang members to commit new crimes. Successful investigators are congratulated and promoted. Even when at long last Carmen San Diego is sometimes caught, she is reincarnated and the game goes on.

The way we go after terrorists in many ways mirrors the game. Each prosecution is aimed at specific individuals known to have perpetrated specific crimes. Some are convicted and imprisoned. But bin Laden—the boss—remains at large.
Q: Are prosecutions worth anything at all?
A: Of course. Prosecutors were deservedly proud when, on May 31, 2001, a jury in New York found four defendants guilty of conspiring with bin Laden to bomb American embassies in Nairobi, Kenya, and Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, three years earlier. The bombings killed 224 people, including 12 Americans.

Convicting terrorist henchmen establishes that they are subject to the rule of law, brings a sense of justice to survivors and relatives, and lends credibility to the pledge that terrorists who kill Americans will be punished. It can also expose some of the methods of terrorist groups.

But there are limits to the efficacy of prosecutions that must be acknowledged. While bin Laden and some of his top associates were indicted along with the four actually tried, they cannot be reached by the criminal process so long as they stay in Afghanistan, which refuses to extradite or prosecute them.

Prosecution doesn't solve the underlying problem. It doesn't get rid of those responsible for acts of terrorism. That's something to worry about because we may not have seen the worst. The CIA and FBI confirmed that bin Laden was attempting to obtain weapons of mass destruction, including nuclear, chemical, and biological killing agents.

Q: What steps should be taken?
A: A real effort to stop bin Laden and his group as enemies of this country would focus on bin Laden himself and every other member of his organization, Al Qaeda, regardless of their susceptibility to prosecution for particular crimes. The objective would not be convictions of particular Al Qaeda members, but ending the threat they pose. That, at last, is what the United States is doing now. Antiterrorism efforts must be judged by whether they prevent attacks.

Q: So prevention is the key. What else can be done?
A: The U.S. government must continue to treat bin Laden and all his supporters as enemies of the United States. That requires more than the prosecution of underlings or a freeze on Al Qaeda's assets or economic sanctions against Afghanistan. It requires a shift from responding to terrorist attacks as ordinary crimes to using military force wherever and whenever necessary to prevent attacks. The president has ordered the Department of Defense and his staff to end the threat—they must implement his order.

We must also insist on the implementation of required security standards and on holding accountable those who do not comply. Terrorist attacks have succeeded because of a reckless indifference to security standards. The U.S. military housing complex, Khobar Towers, near Dhahran, Saudi Arabia, and the U.S. Embassy in Nairobi, Kenya, lacked essential perimeter protection.

Seventeen sailors were killed on the destroyer USS Cole while it was docked in Aden, Yemen, on October 12, 2000, when slipshod security allowed an unknown vessel to come close enough to blow a hole in its hull.

The World Trade Center bombing in 1993 might have been prevented if Arabic-language documents seized earlier from terrorists had been translated.

Q: And more recently?
A: Terrorists who destroyed the World Trade Center and part of the Pentagon in September were able to elude security at three East Coast airports and seize four planes.

These lapses would not be tolerated if we truly regarded ourselves as being in a battle with an enemy.

Q: You take a very hard line on this.
A: Force is the essential method of protection when all else fails.

Resorting to force requires great care. Mistakes or collateral damage can undermine its effectiveness. While the United States is free to act unilaterally in self-defense, it must be prepared to admit its mistakes. President George H. W. Bush apologized for the 1988 destruction by a U.S. Navy warship of an Iranian passenger airliner, and the United States negotiated a settlement with Iran.

I also recognize that the use of force can lead to reprisals against the United States. It can create a cycle of violence. It may make terrorists like bin Laden heroes to other Muslim militants.

But criminal prosecutions can also lead to reprisals and make heroes of terrorists. Anyway, criminal prosecution will never stop committed militants. An effective use of force stands at least a chance of wiping out, or deterring, terrorist acts.

Q: So you stand for strong force?
A: Yes; the key is not merely to use force symbolically but to use enough force to knock out the capability of terrorists to commit acts of terror. We are entitled to use the force necessary to defend our nation and its people.

In no war would a combatant expect an enemy to cease its attacks merely because of a single, largely symbolic use of force, such as President Clinton's strike against bin Laden in Afghanistan.

Only in the world of computer games such as "Carmen San Diego" can we expect to avoid the real risks involved in failing to confront and destroy the enemy's "boss." It is time to stop playing games and give terrorists like bin Laden and Al Qaeda the attention they deserve. Let us stop talking about "bringing them to justice" and start doing what justice requires.

This Q&A is based on an op-ed column first published on September 16, 2001, in the San Francisco Chronicle.
violently opposed to Western civilization and Western culture and intent on destroying all traces of it, including “anyone who has had contact with, or been contaminated by, Western culture.”

However, noted Jowitt, while movements of rage like Al Qaeda are always violent, they are often also weak.

“Al Qaeda cannot defeat or seriously challenge a great nation like the United States unless it can control a nation like Pakistan with its nuclear weapons or Saudi Arabia with its oil reserves,” said Jowitt.

The real danger of these movements, Jowitt pointed out, is that they act as “malignant incubators for other movements of rage with stronger bases.”

Jowitt said America will triumph over this new threat: “America has faced unique threats to our existence [before] and we have prevailed.”

On the first full day of the retreat, Hoover fellow James Sweeney, a professor of management and engineering science at Stanford University, analyzed the economic and political roots of the California electricity crisis and discussed viable long-term solutions to the problem. Much of the blame for the crisis lay with the failure of the governor to manage the situation, Sweeney said.

“The governor knew absolutely that the system was going out of control. The situation demanded action,” he said. “Because of the failure in leadership, the California electricity problem became a crisis.”

Richard Epstein, a Hoover fellow and a professor of law at the University of Chicago, gave a talk on privacy and disclosure issues that he called “Walking the Fine Line between Two Imperatives.”

Yale history professor and Hoover fellow John Lewis Gaddis provided an inside view on the attitudes of students at Yale toward the war on terrorism.

“I’m struck by the urgency with which the students are trying to define patriotism,” said Gaddis. “The students have been quicker than the faculty to put the university back in touch with the country. There is a sense of national unity that has been created by these events.”

During the afternoon, retreat guests selected from an offering of breakout sessions with Hoover fellows.

Hoover fellows David Davenport, Terry Moe, and Eric Hanushek, the Paul and Jean Hanna Senior Fellow, discussed education issues. Davenport talked about political and cultural issues undermining college campuses, Moe spoke on teachers unions and education reform, and Hanushek detailed the hurdles that have impeded education reform nationally.

Richard Epstein, the Peter and Kirsten Bedford Senior Fellow

Hoover fellow Morris Fiorina reviewed the circumstances behind Al Gore’s failed bid for the presidency, while Hoover fellow David Brady and Hoover overseer Buzz McCoy held an open discussion on business ethics.

Hoover fellow George P. Shultz, the Thomas W. and Susan B. Ford Distinguished Fellow, provided guests with his insights into foreign policy issues facing the current administration in the war on terrorism; Hoover fellow and associate director Thomas Henriksen gave an overview of the roots of the present conflict in Afghanistan and insight into policies the United States will use to
combat terrorism internationally; and Peter and Helen Bing Research Fellow Michael McFaul analyzed recent changes in the relationship between the United States and Russia.

Epstein, Gaddis, and Sweeney carried their topics to smaller conversation settings.

A special presentation by Archivist Elena Danielson and Exhibits Coordinator Cissie Hill invited guests to a look at some of Hoover's hidden art treasures in a private viewing of uncataloged paintings and art books from the archives.

At the Fall Retreat's evening dinner October 29, Lisa Graham Keegan, chief executive officer of the Education Leaders Council in Washington, D.C., spoke on the challenges to education leadership.

Keegan, the former Arizona superintendent of public instruction and a former member of Arizona’s House of Representatives, is known for her focus on education reform.

“In the wake of September 11, I am concerned about curriculum and student proficiency,” said Keegan. “The Rudman Report on Homeland Security showed that foreign students consistently outscore American students in math and science. We need to change that. Our students need that knowledge and we need to compete.”

On October 30, Kate O’Beirne, Washington editor for National Review, presented a view of “wartime Washington, D.C.” Warning that “in time of war, the size and reach of government expands,” O’Beirne said, “the apparent remedy for government failure, I’m sorry to tell you, is more government.”

Kate O’Beirne, Washington editor for National Review, center

Jeffrey Hart, distinguished professor of English emeritus at Dartmouth College and senior editor of National Review, spoke of the need for a revival of Western civilization studies in higher education. His talk, drawing from his new book Smiling through the Cultural Catastrophe: Toward the Revival of Higher Education (Yale University Press, 2001), called on academia to embrace Western civilization studies, especially in light of the terrorist attacks.

David Friedman, professor of law at Santa Clara University, spoke on “What Economics Has to Do with Law and Why It Matters.”

Hoover fellow Peter Schweizer presented an account of former President Ronald Reagan’s lifelong battle against communism. Based on newly released documents from the KGB archives, Schweizer detailed Reagan’s fight first as an actor in Hollywood and later as president.

In breakout sessions Hoover fellow Bruce Bueno de Mesquita presented “The Logic of Political Survival: Who Should and Who Shouldn’t Get ‘Bailed Out,’” Hoover fellow Shelby Steele spoke on the issue of reparations for slavery, Peter and Helen Bing Senior Fellow Stephen Haber discussed the challenge of political and economic reform in Mexico, and Hoover fellow Milton Friedman held an open conversation with retreat guests.

The final panel discussion of the retreat featured Hoover fellows responding directly to the terrorist attack on the United States. Hoover fellows Sidney Drell, Joseph McNamara, Henry J. Miller, and Abraham Sofaer, the George P. Shultz Senior Fellow and chair of the panel, joined Hoover distinguished visiting fellow Edwin Meese to discuss the challenges facing the United States both domestically and internationally in the war against terrorism.
DIRECTOR’S SEMINAR ADDRESSES TERRORISM

The Hoover Institution has recently unveiled a new cyberjournal focused on tracking the latest developments in China’s political leadership. Edited by Hoover fellow H. Lyman Miller, the China Leadership Monitor offers authoritative assessments of trends in Chinese leadership politics and policy to American policymakers and the general public.

“As China becomes more powerful economically and militarily and becomes integrated into the international system, it becomes even more important to know what’s going on in the top levels of the Chinese political system,” Miller said.

The on-line journal format of the China Leadership Monitor (www.chinaleadershipmonitor.org) provides analysis that is timely and instantly accessible. It joins Education Next, the Hoover Digest, and Policy Review as part of the Hoover Institution’s growing collection of journals and periodicals. The Monitor differs from the others in that it is released first on-line and continually updated throughout the quarter before the print version is released. Education Next, the Hoover Digest, and Policy Review are released simultaneously on-line and in print.

Although using the traditional China-watching methods of interpreting information in China’s state-controlled media, the Monitor also brings to bear some of the new avenues of information and insight that have opened up since the normalization of U.S.-China relations in the late 1970s. Experts contributing to the Monitor’s inaugural issue constitute a team that will continue to offer analysis on China’s leadership from quarter to quarter. “All are recognized specialists in the particular areas that they treat,” Miller said. “The idea is to use the same team of specialists to build some continuity of perspective.”

The inaugural issue of the cyberjournal is aimed at what is anticipated to be “a major transition in leadership in China later this year” at the Sixteenth Party Congress, explained Miller. “All of the contributors to the issue are focused in some way on how the arena that they specialize in will be affected by this coming leadership transition.”

In addition to being the Monitor’s general editor, Miller himself is also a contributor, penning “The Road to the Sixteenth Party Congress” for the current issue. A visiting associate professor of history at Stanford University and associate professor of Chinese affairs at the U.S. Naval Postgraduate School in Monterey, California, Miller has written extensively on contemporary Chinese politics, foreign affairs, and history.

HOOVER UNVEILS THE CHINA LEADERSHIP MONITOR

The Hoover Institution Director’s Seminar opened on Sunday night, November 11, with an address by Dinesh D’Souza, the Robert and Karen Rishwain Research Fellow, on “What Is Great about America,” offering reflections on the very achievements of American society and culture that have come under attack in recent months.

“We see that the United States has been portrayed as the Great Satan,” said D’Souza. “This is not Satan as conqueror, but as tempter. And you must admit that American ideas and the American way of life are tempting.”

D’Souza’s talk set the tone for the opening day of the Director’s Seminar, which focused on terrorism issues confronting the nation.

“Critics have said that the West advanced because it was the oppressor and it gained its lead by defeating and beating up everyone else. [But] the West brought science, democracy, and capitalism to peoples all over the world,” said D’Souza. “America’s way of life is both appealing and threatening. You can come to America and become rich. A very ordinary guy can come here and have a very high quality of life. In America, you have your own destiny. And this is very, very threatening.”

On Monday, guests attending the seminar were treated to a choice of conversations with resident Hoover fellows on a variety of issues dealing with the terrorist attacks against the United States.

In early sessions, Norman Naimark offered some historical reflections on fighting terrorism around the world; Jennifer Roback Morse and David Davenport looked at the domestic challenges that face the American public in uniting behind the war effort; Toshio Nishi gave a perspective on Japan’s role in the international coalition against terrorism that has been organized by President Bush; and Peter Duignan spoke on Islamic fundamentalism, discussing its roots and its present-day manifestations.

In later sessions, Bruce Bueno de Mesquita discussed the causes and cures of terrorism, Henry S. Rowen discussed a long-term strategy for combating terrorism, and David Brady reviewed congressional politics since September 11.

Other conversations featured Peter and Helen Bing Research Fellow Michael McFaul discussing current U.S.-Russian relations and Gerald Dorfman addressing Britain’s role in the war on terrorism, focusing on the stirring support of Prime Minister Tony Blair. Larry Diamond, Keith Eiler, Arnold Beichman, Shelby Steele, and Visiting Fellow Donald Abenheim gave additional insight into the motives behind and responses to terrorism.

The seminar concluded with a panel discussion on responding to terrorism. Chaired by Abraham Sowaer, the George P. Shultz Senior Fellow, the panel offered the insights of Thomas Henriksen, Joseph Namara, and Henry I. Miller.

The Director’s Seminar is a one-day event for Hoover donors that features Hoover fellows informing the donors of the fellows’ latest research. It is also an opportunity for the director to update donors on the state of the Institution.
during his tenure as director, two buildings at the Institution were built and dedicated: the Lou Henry Hoover Building (1967) and the Herbert Hoover Memorial Building (1978).

On his retirement in 1989, Campbell was appointed counselor to the director; in 1994, he was named director emeritus.

Before joining the Hoover Institution, Campbell had been research director at the American Enterprise Association and before that an economist at the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

He received his Ph.D. in economics from Harvard University, where he was a teaching fellow and, later, instructor.

During the Richard Nixon and Gerald Ford presidencies, Campbell was a member of the President's Commission on White House Fellows. In 1972, he was appointed to be a member of the National Science Board; he served a second term from 1990 to 1994.

When President Ronald Reagan was elected in 1980, Campbell was appointed chairman of the President's Intelligence Oversight Board and a member of the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board. He served on both boards until 1990.

He was a senior adviser in Barry Goldwater's 1964 presidential campaign.

In 1968, Campbell was appointed to a 16-year term as a regent of the University of California and was appointed to a second term in 1984. He served as chairman of the Board of Regents in 1982–83.

From 1983 to 1989, he was chairman of the Japan-U.S. Friendship Commission.

In 1997, the Institution's National, Public Affairs, and Peace Fellows Program was named after W. Glenn Campbell and Rita Ricardo-Campbell. The Campbells established the Uncommon Book Award to recognize outstanding authors with ties to the Hoover Institution.

His memoir, The Competition of Ideas: How My Colleagues and I Built the Hoover Institution, was published in 2000.

Campbell was born April 29, 1924, in Komoka, Lobo Township, Middlesex County, Ontario, Canada. He graduated from the University of Western Ontario in London in 1944 with honors in economics and political science and went on to Harvard.

He is survived by his wife of 57 years, Rita Ricardo-Campbell, and three daughters, Barbara Gray, Diane Campbell, and Nancy Yager, three grandsons, and one granddaughter.

The funeral service was held November 29 in Los Altos; a memorial service was conducted December 11 at Stanford University's Memorial Church.

The family requested that contributions be made to the MS Awareness Foundation, Attention: Phyllis Stewart, P.O. Box 1193, Venice, FL 34284 (888-336-6723) or to the charity of the donor's choice.

Eight Hoover Institution fellows have been appointed to the U.S. Defense Policy Board Advisory Committee, which advises national leaders on major matters of defense policy.

The committee addresses long-term, enduring issues central to Department of Defense strategic planning and responds to specific requests from the secretary of defense and other defense officials. Members will review and assess the long-term strategic implications of defense policies in various regions of the world, the policy implications of current and prospective weapons and weapons classes, and the impact of U.S. defense policies on alliance military issues.

The Hoover fellows selected to serve are
—Richard Allen, former national security adviser
—Martin Anderson, the Keith and Jan Hurlbut Senior Fellow, longtime policy adviser to presidents and governors
—Gary S. Becker, the Rose-Marie and Jack R. Anderson Senior Fellow, Nobel laureate in economics
—Newt Gingrich, former Speaker of the House
—Henry Rowen, former assistant secretary of defense for international security affairs
—George P. Shultz, the Thomas W. and Susan B. Ford Distinguished Fellow, former U.S. secretary of state
—Kiron Skinner, the W. Glenn Campbell Research Fellow, assistant professor of history, political science, and public policy, Carnegie Mellon University
—Pete Wilson, former California governor

They are among 29 newly appointed members.

Richard Perle, former assistant secretary of defense, chairs the committee.

The committee will advise the secretary of defense, the deputy secretary, and the undersecretary of defense for policy.

Members, who are selected because of their distinguished backgrounds in national military affairs, are from the private sector.

The committee meets quarterly, although panels drawn from the board meet at other times to address specific topics presented by the secretary.
deregulation fiasco in California is that it has given deregulation in every other market a bad name.”

The second panel on October 18, moderated by SIEPR director John Shoven, the Buzz and Barbara McCoy Senior Fellow at Hoover, featured SIEPR fellow Frank Wolak, an economics professor at Stanford University and a leading expert on energy issues, and Vernon Smith, lead economist at the Interdisciplinary Center for Economic Science and a professor in the department of economics and law at George Mason University. Wolak and Smith discussed increasing competition in the electricity market by introducing real-time pricing.

“Price volatility in electricity is here to stay,” proclaimed Wolak. And Smith pointed out that “all utility systems are vulnerable to what happened in California.”

October 19 featured a panel discussion, moderated by Shoven, with Hoover fellow and former California governor Pete Wilson and the CEOs of two major power companies in California—Edison International and Calpine Corporation. John Bryson, president and CEO of Edison International and former president of the California Public Utilities Commission, and Peter Cartwright, president and CEO of Calpine Corporation, joined Wilson in presenting perspectives from political and business players involved in the unfolding crisis.

“Terrible design, terrible implementation, and several other factors contributed to create a kind of perfect storm in this crisis,” said Bryson. Of the role of the state legislature played in the crisis, he said, “You can’t find in the California legislature now any person that is deeply knowledgeable about energy in the state of California.”

Cartwright offered a sobering perspective: “We’re not out of the crisis yet. The perfect storm has been replaced by a perfect calm. But it may well be the eye of the storm. [Electricity] reserves are not adequate.”

Wilson, who as governor signed into law the California electricity deregulation plan, commented on the politics that fueled the crisis, saying, “The flaws [in the original deregulation plan] were correctable [early on]. The fact of the matter is the governor did not want to be associated with an increase in rates.”

Wilson also warned of other impending crises that will affect California. “We are growing, but we have not kept pace [in developing] our infrastructure.

The next crisis is going to be water,” he said. “We had better beware the water crisis, which will probably dwarf the energy crisis.”

The final panel of the conference addressed the “Dos and Don’ts of Deregulation” with Hoover fellow Milton Friedman, Thomas W. and Susan B. Ford Distinguished Fellow George Shultz, and Sweeney. Moderated by Raisian, the panel reviewed the important lessons California’s electricity crisis presents for future deregulation policies.

“We need a system in which the private sector is dominant,” said Shultz. “We’ve got to stop taking steps to discourage the private sector. We need to find a way of reducing the dependency on political decision making in the process.”

“There were all kinds of signals early on that the system was headed for trouble,” said Shultz, adding, “There is a tendency for people to say that deregulation failed. That isn’t true. What failed was a system to manage the deregulation process. If government acquires the management of this problem, we’ll be in real trouble.”

Friedman summed up the feelings many have felt throughout the crisis: “What is most frustrating is how often the obvious becomes the politically impossible.”

New Season of Uncommon Knowledge™ on PBS

Uncommon Knowledge, the weekly public affairs series coproduced by the Hoover Institution and KTEH in San Jose, presents another season of informed public policy discussion on PBS.

Emmy-nominated host and Hoover fellow Peter Robinson has brought together leading experts for the 2001–02 season to discuss the most captivating issues on the national agenda.

This season’s high-profile topics include the war on terrorism, the ethics of stem cell research, the debate over slavery reparations, bioterrorism, reform in Russia and China, and the future of Europe.

Among the well-known guests joining Robinson at the Uncommon Knowledge roundtable are former supreme allied commander of NATO Wesley K. Clark; Nobel laureate and Hoover fellow Milton Friedman; Hoover fellow Timothy Garton Ash; former Speaker of the House of Representatives and Hoover distinguished visiting fellow Newt Gingrich; author Christopher Hitchens; Michael McFaul, the Peter and Helen Bing Research Fellow at the Hoover Institution; former secretary of defense Robert S. McNamara; syndicated radio host Michael Medved; journalist P. J. O’Rourke; former secretary of state George P. Shultz, the Thomas W. and Susan B. Ford Distinguished Fellow at the Hoover Institution; and Abraham Soffer, the George P. Shultz Senior Fellow at the Hoover Institution.

Uncommon Knowledge is broadcast on public television stations throughout the country and can also be heard on NPR Worldwide. Now in its seventh season, the show’s reputation for excellence has earned praise from academics as well as the media. As Paul Gigot of the Wall Street Journal points out: “Peter Robinson talks to intelligent people who tell him and the rest of us something we didn’t, but ought to, know. Isn’t this what television was invented to do?”

Episodes of the 2001–02 season of Uncommon Knowledge, as well as episodes from past seasons, can be viewed on the Hoover Institution web site at www.Hoover.org.
The lesson for the Bush administration is that the U.S. ought not to plan for a postwar Afghanistan that has functioning democratic institutions. A more realistic plan would focus on finding, or at least accepting, an efficient authoritarian regime that would provide political stability and improve economic conditions.


Instead of foreboding, we should find strength in this initial Afghan victory and fresh opportunity in the different circumstances that confront us. Our all-volunteer forces, morale at home and support abroad are a far cry from what they were during the Vietnam War. In this first conflict of the new century, it is time to banish the Vietnam ghost, once and for all.


After September 11, the potential for a fundamentally new and improved relationship between Russia and the West has never been greater. However, the same was said about U.S.-Russia relations at the beginning of the last decade. Failure to define realistic expectations about the pace of partnership or failure to recognize the real criteria for full Russian membership in the West could lead to another round of disappointment in U.S.-Russia relations.

- **Michael McFaul**, Peter and Helen Bing Research Fellow, *San Francisco Chronicle*, Dec. 30

On the diplomatic side, [British prime minister Tony] Blair has demonstrated again how valuable Britain can be in reaching out both to allies and to uncertain or wavering states. Britain often has access to and influence in places where the United States does not or is unwelcome.

- **Gerald Dorfman**, senior fellow, *York (PA) Sunday News*, Dec. 4

If military tribunals have been used effectively in the past, what is all the hue and cry about? To some degree it is about short memory and a generation of leaders that has not experienced the exigencies of war. It is also about the shadowy nature of a war on terrorism and how you bring it to a close. And, yes, the shouting is also about politics, with many in Congress peevd that the president did not consult them prior to issuing his executive order.


War has another major cost, as economist Robert Higgs has noted in his book *Crisis and Leviathan*: it hurts economies by giving governments the opportunity and the excuse to take on new powers—powers they don’t fully relinquish when the war is over. During World War II, for example, the income tax, which prevaiously had applied only to high-income people, was imposed even on low-income people. The federal government also introduced withholding to make it easier to collect tax money. After the war, income taxes remained a “normal” part of everyone’s life, as did income-tax withholding.

- **David Henderson**, research fellow, *San Francisco Chronicle*, Dec. 28

Schools that succeed with low-income pupils don’t generally surround them with electronics. They engage knowledgeable and committed teachers to deliver a powerful, coherent curriculum built on high standards of skills and knowledge. They are orderly, well-led places, focused on academic learning. Many of them are schools of choice—charter schools, magnet schools, private schools—that must compete for students and resources. They may deploy technology, but only as an instructional tool akin to textbooks and well-stocked library shelves.

- **Chester E. Finn Jr.**, distinguished visiting fellow, *Wall Street Journal*, Nov. 28

The problems related to the accession of new European Union member states serve as a reminder at this time of accomplishment and celebration that for the European Central Bank to have continued success, big countries must not be allowed to crowd out the influence of small ones. The currency that comes into being physically tomorrow deserves better than to be marooned on the shoals of national interest.


I often see the glass as half empty, but not today. I believe 2002 will bring renewed economic growth not only in the U.S. but also in Europe, Asia, and elsewhere. The main risk is not any inherent weakness of advance economies or even future terrorist attacks, although these must be guarded against. The risk lies in misplaced public spending and tax actions that do more harm than good.


**Research conducted by Hoover distinguished visiting fellow and Harvard economist Caroline Hoxby has answered critics who claim that school choice bleeds traditional public schools of their best students.**

In a recent study published in the new issue of *Education Next: A Journal of Opinion and Research*, Hoxby found that competition from school choice improved public schools’ academic performance.

Hoxby’s study shows that all schools perform better in areas where there is vigorous competition among public and private schools. She found that areas with many low-cost private school choices scored near 3 national percentile points higher in eighth-grade reading and math and nearly 4 national percentile points higher in twelfth-grade reading and math.

Hoxby’s findings are part of the winter 2001 issue of *Education Next*, published by the Hoover Institution. The editors of *Education Next* include Hoover fellow Paul E. Peterson, editor in chief, Hoover distinguished visiting fellow Chester E. Finn Jr., Jay Greene, and Marci Kanstoroom.

Members of the Hoover Institution’s Koret Task Force make up the editorial board of the journal. In addition to Hoxby, Finn, and Peterson, task force members include Hoover fellows Williamson M. Evers, Eric Hanushek, and Terry Moe and Hoover distinguished visiting fellows John E. Chubb, Paul Hill, E. D. Hirsch Jr., Diane Ravitch, and Herbert J. Walberg.

The Koret Task Force is an elite team of scholars specializing in education reform who have been brought together by Hoover director John Raisian to address the national debate over public education. As part of Hoover’s American Public Education Initiative, members of the Koret Task Force have been charged with analyzing the current state of public education and finding possibilities for meaningful reform.
The Transnational Dimension of Cyber Crime and Terrorism, Edited by Abraham D. Sofaer and Seymour E. Goodman

The worldwide information infrastructure is today increasingly under attack by cyber criminals and terrorists—and the number, cost, and sophistication of the attacks are increasing at alarming rates. With annual damage around the world now measured in billions of U.S. dollars, these attacks threaten the substantial and ever-growing reliance of commerce, governments, and the public on the new technology to conduct business, carry messages, and process information.

At a Hoover Institution conference, more than forty members of government, industry, and academe assembled to discuss this problem and explore possible countermeasures. The Transnational Dimension of Cyber Crime and Terrorism (Hoover Press, 2001), edited by Hoover senior fellow Abraham D. Sofaer and Seymour E. Goodman, summarizes the conference papers and exchanges, addressing pertinent issues in chapters that include a review of the legal initiatives undertaken around the world to combat cyber crime, an exploration of the threat to civil aviation, an analysis of the constitutional, legal, economic, and ethical constraints on the use of technology to control cyber crime, and a discussion of the ways we can achieve security objectives through international cooperation.

Abraham D. Sofaer is the George P. Shultz Senior Fellow at the Hoover Institution and professor of law, by courtesy, Stanford Law School. He served as legal adviser to the U.S. Department of State from 1985 to 1990. Seymour E. Goodman is a professor of international affairs and computing, Georgia Institute of Technology.

Currency Unions, Edited by Alberto Alesina and Robert J. Barro

Spurred by the adoption of the euro, countries have become more willing to consider the idea of a currency union, in which more than one economy shares a common money, note Currency Unions coeditor and Hoover fellow Robert J. Barro and coeditor Alberto Alesina in their introduction to the book. As the editors explain, the concept of “one country, one currency” has been called into question. The discussion has shifted toward one of desirable forms and sizes of currency unions.

In May 2000, about two dozen economists assembled at the Hoover Institution to consider basic conceptual issues about currency unions. Currency Unions (Hoover Press, 2001) summarizes the conference papers. The contributors—all experts on international monetary policy—provide theoretical analyses of currency unions and other monetary regimes, including flexible and fixed exchange rates. The papers also assess the available empirical evidence on the performance of these alternative monetary systems. The authors then draw some policy conclusions on the desirability of currency unions for countries in various circumstances.

Robert J. Barro is a senior fellow at the Hoover Institution and the Robert C. Waggoner Professor of Economics at Harvard University. Alberto Alesina is a professor of economics and government at Harvard University, with a specialty in political economy.

Behind the Façade of Stalin’s Command Economy: Evidence from the Soviet State and Party Archives, Edited by Paul R. Gregory

“The opening of the once secret Soviet state and party archives in the early 1990s was an event of profound significance,” writes Hoover visiting fellow Paul R. Gregory in his preface to Behind the Façade of Stalin’s Command Economy: Evidence from the Soviet State and Party Archives (Hoover Press, 2001). “Western scholars, who previously used Kremlinology to penetrate the official wall of secrecy, could now use the same documents as had Soviet leaders in earlier periods.”

Behind the Façade of Stalin’s Command Economy brings together prominent scholars from Russia, the United States, and the United Kingdom—most of whom have worked with these archives since they were opened—who examine in detail such topics as the economics of the gulag, the management of military innovation, the specifics of defense budgets, the rule of law, Stalin’s hand-written margin comments on planning documents, and internal Politburo discussions, as well as other areas whose coverage could not have been imagined twenty years ago. This collection of writings is an important addition to the scholarship on the Soviet past as well as a crucial key to Russia’s evolving future.

Paul R. Gregory is a distinguished visiting fellow at the Hoover Institution and is the Cullen Chair of Economics at the University of Houston.
Winning Florida: How the Bush Team Fought the Battle, By Robert Zelnick

Award-winning journalist Robert Zelnick provides an insider’s look at the controversial 2000 presidential election in *Winning Florida: How the Bush Team Fought the Battle* (Hoover Press, 2001). Detailing both the hard facts and the roller coaster of human emotions experienced on both sides, Zelnick carefully reconstructs the political chess match that ensued in Florida in the days following the 2000 election. He paints a vivid picture of the strategies employed by both sides in their contentious fight for the presidency, from the early efforts of the Gore campaign “to delegitimize the narrow Bush victory in Florida and overturn the results of the contest” to the scrappy defensive measures of the Bush team.

Robert Zelnick is a research fellow at the Hoover Institution and a professor of journalism and acting director of the Department of Journalism at Boston University. During his twenty-one years with ABC News, he covered political and congressional affairs primarily for *ABC Morning News*, *World News Tonight/Saturday/Sunday*, and *This Week*. He has won two Gavel Awards for his work.

Slovakia: From Samo to Dzurinda

By Peter A. Toma and Dušan Kováč

From medieval times to the current day, historical accounts of Slovakia and the Slovak people have often been either sketchy, romanticized versions of a pastoral society or nationalistic, exaggerated exaltations of the past. Now *Slovakia: From Samo to Dzurinda* (Studies of Nationalities series, Hoover Press, 2001), by Peter A. Toma and Dušan Kováč, at last offers a true history of the Slovak people without prejudice: their struggle for national identity, their aspirations for independence and economic development, and their ambition to become a democratic state.

The product of painstaking research by the authors—Toma, a naturalized American from Slovakia, and Kováč, a Slovak historian—this book is the definitive volume for English language readers who wish to acquire a more sophisticated understanding about past and present Slovakia.

Peter A. Toma is a professor emeritus of political science and international relations at the University of Arizona. Dušan Kováč is a historian and research specialist who since 1968 has worked at the Slovak Academy of Sciences in Bratislava, where he now functions as a scientific secretary.

The Joy of Freedom

By David R. Henderson

In *The Joy of Freedom: An Economist’s Odyssey* (Prentice Hall, 2001), Hoover fellow David R. Henderson shows how freeing the economy from government intervention would actually result in higher quality and lower costs for everything from health care to education.

If he had his way, Henderson would eliminate Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, the military draft, compulsory unionism, the minimum wage, professional licensing for everyone from doctors to manicurists, mandatory school attendance, and taxes for public education—and both individuals and the economy would be better for it.

In chapters covering such important issues of the day as racism, the environment, education, and health care, Henderson marshals solid economic theory and history, as well as real-life examples of his own and others, to prove that government intervention—in the United States and around the globe—makes matters worse.
Fellow Robert Conquest receives 2001 Campbell Book Award


“The prize was given to my most uncommon book. This book delivers a great deal of truth,” said Conquest, adding, “Hoover is still fighting a big academic battle [for truth]. It’s not over yet.”

In *Reflections on a Ravaged Century*, Conquest examines the nature, strengths, and weaknesses of the open society and the long struggle waged against it by such rogue ideologies as Marxism and national socialism. He looks at the Soviet record, Western misunderstanding of it, and the long confrontation of the cold war. Conquest warns that “the power of fanaticism and of misunderstanding is by no means extinct” and that the twentieth century will be a prelude to even greater evils unless intellectuals engage in “a careful consideration of what needs to be learned, and unlearned.”

Conquest is a senior research fellow at the Hoover Institution and curator of the Russian/CIS Collection of the Hoover Institution Library and Archives. One of Conquest’s earlier books, *The Great Terror: A Reassessment*, is considered the definitive study of Stalin’s purges. He also wrote the acclaimed *Harvest of Sorrow*.

The W. Glenn Campbell and Rita Ricardo-Campbell Uncommon Book Award is presented annually to an author affiliated with the Hoover Institution whose work is selected by a panel of Hoover fellows. The award is given for a published book or other significant work on a public policy issue that, in the panel’s determination, meets the highest standards of scholarship at the Hoover Institution.

The award was established with a gift from Hoover director emeritus W. Glenn Campbell, who died on November 24, and Hoover senior fellow Rita Ricardo-Campbell. Campbell directed the Hoover Institution from 1960 to September 1989.

“During our period at the Hoover Institution, many uncommonly good scholars were appointed,” the Campbells said upon establishing the award. “It seemed to us that it was appropriate that we set up an ‘uncommon book’ award with the judges being some of the most distinguished scholars appointed during our tenure.”