The Annenberg Foundation has granted Stanford University $5 million to honor former U.S. secretary of state George P. Shultz.

The Hoover Institution will receive $4 million to endow the Walter and Leonore Annenberg Fund in honor of George P. Shultz, which will support the Annenberg Distinguished Visiting Fellow.

The Stanford Institute for Economic Policy Research (SIEPR) will receive $1 million for the George P. Shultz Dissertation Support Fund, which supports empirical research by graduate students working on dissertations oriented toward problems of economic policy.

“In all of his capacities, George has given unstintingly to this institution over

Secretary of State Colin Powell discussed the importance of human rights, democracy, and the rule of law when he addressed the Hoover Institution Board of Overseers and guests on February 23 in Washington, D.C.

Powell told the group of more than 200 who gathered to hear his postluncheon talk that worldwide political and economic conditions present not only problems but also great opportunities to share American values.

Other speakers during the day included Dinesh D'Souza, the Robert and Karen Rishwain Research Fellow, who discussed the future of American conservatism.

Reflecting on the legacy of Ronald Reagan's presidency, he pointed to enduring values and virtues that have sustained American society for more than 200 years.

continued on page 8

PRESIDENT BUSH NAMES HENRY S. ROWEN TO PANEL ON WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION

Hoover Institution senior fellow Henry S. Rowen was named by President Bush in February as a member of the Commission on Intelligence Capabilities of the United States Regarding Weapons of Mass Destruction.

His appointment, along with that of Charles M. Vest, president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology since 1990, completed the presidential appointments to the panel. The nine-member independent and bipartisan group includes co-chairs Charles S. Robb and Judge Lauren A. Farley.

continued on page 4

HOOVER, SIEPR SHARE $5 MILLION GIFT IN HONOR OF GEORGE P. SHULTZ

The Annenberg Foundation has granted Stanford University $5 million to honor former U.S. secretary of state George P. Shultz.

The Hoover Institution will receive $4 million to endow the Walter and Leonore Annenberg Fund in honor of George P. Shultz, which will support the Annenberg Distinguished Visiting Fellow.

The Stanford Institute for Economic Policy Research (SIEPR) will receive $1 million for the George P. Shultz Dissertation Support Fund, which supports empirical research by graduate students working on dissertations oriented toward problems of economic policy.

“In all of his capacities, George has given unstintingly to this institution over
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PAPERS OF T. V. SOONG TO BE OPENED FOR FIRST TIME

The family of one of the most influential figures in modern Chinese history has decided to open fully, for the first time, its historical papers for research in the Hoover Institution Archives.

T. V. Soong, foreign minister of China during World War II, worked closely with United States president Franklin D. Roosevelt to defeat Japan, negotiated with Moscow to reestablish Chinese sovereignty over Manchuria, and represented China at the founding of the United Nations. His papers consist of three parts.

The first part, 39 boxes, has been available for research in the Hoover Archives since its acquisition as a gift from the family in the 1970s. That landmark collection has been used extensively. According to Stanford professor of Chinese politics John Lewis, “For the research on my coauthored book Uncertain Partners, I was privileged to draw on the files of the Soong-Stalin meetings from June to August 1945 for our best understanding of Stalin’s postwar plans for Asia.”

The second part, 19 boxes, was restricted during the lifetime of Soong’s sister Madame Chiang Kai-shek out of respect for her privacy. But when Madame died on October 23, 2003, at age 105, the heirs decided, in the interest of fostering a more accurate understanding of their homeland, to open the closed 19 boxes.

There is a general lack of documentation on Chinese history. Jonathan Spence, who teaches modern Chinese history at Yale, wrote recently in the New York Times Book Review (February 29, 2004) that this gap in the archival record has left much history “in the hands of Chinese composers of the kind of unofficial histories that the Chinese call yeshi (literally wild or undocumented histories).”

To counter such unofficial histories, the family has since augmented the existing official files at Hoover with a third part: more than 2,000 documents from their private family archives. Michael Feng, grandson of T. V. Soong, hand-carried these newly available materials from New York to the Hoover Institution at Stanford on March 12, 2004.

In these papers T.V. Soong, as an eyewitness to history, describes such turning points as the abduction of Chiang Kai-shek in 1936 (called the Sian incident), the dismissal of General Joseph Stilwell, and the framing of the Sino-Soviet Treaty of 1945.

The newly available papers include rare personal correspondence among the Soong family, including the famed sisters, Madame Chiang Kai-shek, Madame Sun Yat-sen, and Madame H. H. K’ung. In an effort to correct pervasive yeshi-style rumors about the family’s personal finances, the decision was made to open private financial papers as well. Although private individuals rarely include personal financial data in archival donations, T. V. Soong’s heirs chose transparency to counter unwarranted speculation.

“All future historians of China will mine these marvelous additions to the archives and in their citations will recall the great contributions of T.V. Soong to the modern history of China,” commented Professor Lewis. Hoover Institution senior fellow Ramon Myers explained that these papers cover the “debates with Winston Churchill, John Davis and many others” and that the files “show Soong to be a loyal and brilliant official representing his country while advancing its national interests and strategic thinking.”

Once they have been cataloged, these previously unknown documents will be made available, on April 26, 2004, for research in the reading room of the Hoover Institution Archives, which is open to the public free of charge. Information can be found on the web site: www.hoover.org/hila or by contacting the head of reference, Carol Leadenham at leadenham@hoover.stanford.edu.

EVALUATION BOOT CAMP FOR DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION GIVEN BY CENTER FOR RESEARCH ON EDUCATION OUTCOMES

The Center for Research on Education Outcomes (CREDO) hosted an Evaluation Boot Camp for the United States Department of Education to teach a select number of staff about program evaluation February 25–27 in Washington, D.C.

The program offered participants an efficient way to become better advocates, planners, and consumers of program evaluations. The workshop emphasized both skill building and the strategic use of evaluation evidence in policy decisions.

CREDO director Margaret Raymond, a Hoover research fellow, noted that the workshop combined practical knowledge and big-picture perspectives.

CREDO, whose mission is to improve research and evaluation practice in the area of educational policy, was established at the Hoover Institution to improve the body of empirical evidence about education reform and student performance at the primary and secondary levels. For more information on CREDO, see http://credo.stanford.edu/.
GEORGE P. SHULTZ PRESENTS THIRD ANNUAL KISSINGER LECTURE AT LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

“I particularly welcome this opportunity to speak under the mantle of Henry Kissinger, at the venerable Library of Congress, and in Washington, D.C. Beyond the honor, the reason is my conviction that we are at one of those special moments in history: the topic of the day is Iraq and weapons not accounted for; but the implications of actions in Iraq for the world and for our future go far beyond this immediate case.”

So began Hoover fellow George P. Shultz as he delivered the third annual Kissinger Lecture, titled “A Changed World,” on February 11 in the Coolidge Auditorium of the Library of Congress’s Thomas Jefferson Building.

Shultz was speaking in his capacity as the Kissinger Lecturer. (See http://www.loc.gov/loc/kluge/kluge-shultz.html for broadcast of speech.)

The establishment of the Henry Alfred Kissinger Chair in Foreign Policy and International Relations at the Library of Congress in 1999 created an endowment to provide for a Kissinger Scholar and a Kissinger Lecturer. The Kissinger Lecturer, chosen annually by Librarian of Congress James H. Billington, may be of any nationality and is an individual who has achieved distinction in the field of foreign affairs.

The inaugural Kissinger Lecture was delivered in October 2001 by Henry Kissinger himself.

The Kissinger Chair establishes an important focus at the Library of Congress for research and discussion of foreign policy and international affairs.

Shultz is the Thomas W. and Susan B. Ford Distinguished Fellow at the Hoover Institution. He has held four cabinet-level posts: U.S. secretary of state, U.S. secretary of the Treasury, U.S. secretary of labor, and director of the Office of Management and Budget. He also held the Jack Steele Parker Professorship in International Economics at Stanford University’s Graduate School of Business and was president of Bechtel Corporation from 1974 to 1982.

An adapted version of the Kissinger Lecture was published on March 29 in the Wall Street Journal.

THE BIG SHOW IN BOLONLAND WINS HOVER INSTITUTION’S 2003 UNCOMMON BOOK AWARD

The Big Show in Bololand: The American Relief Expedition to Soviet Russia in the Famine of 1921, written by Hoover research fellow Bertrand Patenaude, was named by the Hoover Institution the winner of its 2003 Uncommon Book Award.

The award was announced by Hoover Institution director John Raisian on February 23 during the Hoover Institution’s Board of Overseers Meeting in Washington, D.C.

The Big Show in Bololand is based on materials in the Hoover Institution Archives and was published in 2002 by Stanford University Press. It portrays a crucial American relief expedition to Soviet Russia in 1921 to mitigate the impact of the famine that killed millions.


In November 2003, the book was co-winner of the prestigious 2003 Marshall Shulman Book Prize from the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies (AAASS), in conjunction with the Harriman Institute at Columbia University.

continued on page 10

GENERAL KEVIN BYRNEs, MEMBERS OF U.S. NAVAL STAFF COLLEGE VISIT

U.S. Army general Kevin Byrnes met with Hoover Institution representatives and the staff of Stanford University’s Institute for International Studies during a visit to campus on March 12.

General Byrnes was briefed by Lt. Col. Jeff Fargo, a Hoover national fellow for 2003–4, and Hoover staff about the operation of the Institution. He met with army officers currently at Stanford and then visited the Institute for International Studies, where he presented a seminar on military and international affairs.

General Byrnes assumed the duties of commander, United States Army Training and Doctrine Command, in 2002 after serving as the director, Army Staff.

On February 23, Hoover hosted an informational visit by international students of the U.S. Naval Staff College.

The 36 representatives from 35 countries were selected by their countries to spend six months in the United States studying international affairs, according to Hoover national fellow and U.S. Navy commander Matthew A. Weingart, who organized the visit. A goal of the program is to expose the participants, during their time in the United States, to important institutions in American society and government.

While at Hoover they met with Hoover senior fellow Michael McFaul in a roundtable discussion of U.S. foreign policy and toured the library and archives.

The Naval Staff College is a graduate-level resident program of the Naval War College in Newport, Rhode Island, for midgrade military officers of various invited nations.
continued from page 1

decades,” said Stanford president John L. Hennessy. “Stanford is delighted that the Annenberg Foundation has chosen to honor him by supporting those key aspects of the university that mean so much to him. We are also pleased the foundation is continuing its long-standing generous relationship with Stanford in this way.”

Shultz was the honorary chairman of SIEPR’s first annual economic summit on February 27 of this year. He served as U.S. secretary of state from 1982 to 1989, secretary of the Treasury from 1972 to 1974, director of the Office of Management and Budget from 1970 to 1972, and secretary of labor from 1969 to 1970.

The Jack Steele Parker Professor of International Economics at the Graduate School of Business, Shultz is also the Thomas W. and Susan B. Ford Distinguished Fellow at the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace and a founding member of SIEPR’s advisory board.

“The Annenberg Foundation’s support will allow Hoover to recruit individuals of high standing and superior expertise to engage, for a limited term, in research of contemporary importance,” said Hoover director John Raisian. “The Annenberg Distinguished Fellow will be a visiting fellow who will join with Hoover’s resident scholars to produce scholarly writings and analysis for distribution to broad audiences, including the Stanford community.”

Raisian said the fellow will focus on the fields of national security and foreign policy. The Hoover Institution is a public policy research center devoted to advanced study of politics, economics, and political economy—both domestic and foreign—as well as international affairs.

SIEPR director John Shoven said the idea for the dissertation support fund came from Shultz himself, who believes that scholars who develop and evaluate primary sources of data about the economy will gain deeper insights into their topics of study. Shoven said this fund supports SIEPR’s mission of training a new generation of economists to conduct research on relevant issues to develop effective economic and public policy.

“This gift will open up new opportunities for graduate students at Stanford University,” Shoven said. “It will enable them to become familiar with their research topics firsthand rather than rely on secondhand sources. It might allow some students to follow in the footsteps of George Shultz.”

Shultz will participate in the selection of Hoover’s Distinguished Annenberg Fellows. Recipients of SIEPR’s dissertation support fund will be chosen by the SIEPR director, the Hoover Institution director, and the chair of the Department of Economics, and all dissertation-level students in economics at Stanford will be eligible.

Shultz received his B.A. degree in economics from Princeton University in 1942. He then served in the U.S. Marine Corps through 1945 and returned to academia to earn his Ph.D. degree in industrial economics from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in 1949. During that time, he conducted firsthand research on the Tennessee Valley Authority and New England shoe factories, Shoven said.

Shultz taught at MIT from 1948 to 1957, and also served on the President’s Council of Economic Advisers during the administration of President Dwight Eisenhower. He was appointed professor of industrial relations at the University of Chicago Graduate School of Business in 1957 and named dean of the Graduate School of Business in 1962.

From 1968 to 1969 he was a fellow at Stanford’s Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, and he returned to Stanford in 1989. He was also president and director of Bechtel Group from 1974 to 1982, and he continues to serve on its board of directors, as well as the boards of Fremont Group, Gilead Sciences, and Charles Schwab & Co. He is chairman of the International Council of JPMorgan Chase and chairman of the Accenture Energy Advisory Board.

Shultz is the author of numerous publications and has received the Presidential Medal of Freedom, the nation’s highest civilian honor; the Seoul Peace Prize; the Eisenhower Medal for Leadership and Service; and the Reagan Distinguished American Award.

The Annenberg Foundation was founded by Ambassador Walter H. Annenberg in 1958 to advance the public well-being through improved communication. The Annenbergs began their close friendship with Shultz when Walter served as ambassador to Great Britain from 1969 to 1974. Annenberg’s widow Leonore, a Stanford alumna, now directs the foundation, which decided to recognize and honor Shultz’s many contributions and accomplishments at Stanford, across the nation, and throughout the world by supporting areas of academic importance to him.
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When a use of force is undertaken with proper preparation and full consideration by all the relevant agencies of government, it is far more likely to be both legally and politically sound than if it is undertaken as a secret operation for which responsibility will never be acknowledged. Accepting accountability for mistakes increases the cost of using force, but that is more likely than not to lead to more rational decisions, and in any event is the right thing to do. While targeted killing is and should be a legitimate option in the protection of our national security, its utility will depend on its principled, considered and responsible implementation.

- Abraham D. Sofaer, senior fellow, San Francisco Chronicle, March 26

The best way to stimulate the creation of better materials for our schools is to break the stranglehold of state [textbook] adoption. Let publishers compete to produce exciting and challenging classroom materials. Let teachers, who know the kids and the standards, choose what works in their classrooms. When it comes to choosing textbooks, competition and freedom will produce better results than the heavy hand of state regulation.

- Diane Ravitch, Koret Task Force member and distinguished visiting fellow, Austin American-Statesman (Austin, Texas), February 18

I’ve seen the impact of the National Endowment for Democracy, together with other semi and wholly non-government organizations, in Eastern Europe and the Balkans. Without their work, Milosevic might not have been toppled by a revolution in Serbia. Add the clear message that corrupt, oil-bloated Arab elites no longer enjoy Washington’s unconditional support and we could see some fireworks. Not laser-guided American military fireworks from the sky, but emancipatory Arab fireworks from the ground.

- Timothy Garton Ash, senior fellow, The Age (Sydney, Australia), January 27

In the end one can hope the answer is not to reduce material progress but to increase spiritual depth and meaning. If happiness is a fruit or serendipity of pursuing something else, we may look to future generations with some hope. Surveys of today’s college students indicate much stronger interest among them on family, spirituality and service to their community. Perhaps they will do a better job of managing the progress paradox.

- David Davenport, research fellow, Deseret News (Salt Lake City), January 21

Difficulties [in the United States space exploration program] should not necessarily discourage us from embarking on a new age of exploration. The promise of knowledge, adventure and resource acquisition are extraordinary. Young citizens need a progressive challenge that they can believe in. We should begin this journey with optimism, goodwill, and a healthy dose of preparation for the storms that lie ahead.

- Jeremi Suri, national fellow, San Francisco Chronicle, February 1

The hardship that results from economic change always tempts politicians to limit individuals’ freedom to buy what they want and businesses to hire whom they desire. Such political restraints will make life more secure—but poorer and less dynamic. Ultimately, it will have no effect on the number of jobs in the United States but only make the ones that survive pay less.

- Russell Roberts, research fellow, Business Week, February 24

To be sure, the No Child Left Behind act has some glitches and needs repair work, a bit of which started when the education department offered states a degree of flexibility in testing recent immigrants who haven’t yet learned English. But most of the anti-No Child Left Behind grousing comes from the public-school system’s notorious aversion to change, its outrageous insistence that nothing can be done differently without more money, and the willingness of elected officials to pander to teacher unions and local school boards.

- Chester E. Finn Jr., Koret Task Force member and senior fellow, National Review Online, February 24

Complex times require complex foreign policies. The American government has the capacity to pursue multiple objectives at the same time with difficult but strategic countries like Russia. During the cold war, some American leaders tried to keep it simple and cast the entire world as communists against us and anti-communists with us. Such simplicity made thugs such as Jonas Savimbi in Angola and the apartheid regime in South Africa our “friends.” But the more effective leaders understood that the United States needed a more sophisticated approach that often included dual-track diplomacy toward the same country. In dealing with the Soviets, this meant the pursuit of arms control and democratic regime change in the Soviet bloc at the same time. A similarly complex strategy for dealing with Russia—and for that matter, Pakistan, Iran, Egypt, and Uzbekistan—is needed today.

- Michael McFaul, senior fellow, Washington Post, March 14

The argument that vouchers drain money out of the public schools may sound like a high-minded defense of the public system. But in reality it’s simple-minded, it isn’t true, and it provides no justification at all for denying needy children the educational opportunities that vouchers can offer.

- Terry M. Moe, senior fellow, New York Times, January 24
“America United or Divided? The 2004 Elections” was the topic addressed by Hoover fellows Morris P. Fiorina, Daron Shaw, and David Brady during the Hoover Institution’s Desert Conference 2004 in Southern California on March 23 and 24. A portion of each of their presentations is captured below in a Q and A format.

Morris Fiorina, senior fellow and professor of political science at Stanford University, whose specialty is political polling, discussed his view of the so-called polarization of America and true voter attitudes toward policy and social issues:

Q: Whereas many pundits and politicians argue about the increasing polarization of American voters, you have a different perspective. Can you discuss your view?
A: Despite what we see and hear in the news media, there is very little evidence that Americans today are any more polarized than they were thirty years ago. Most voters are neither far left nor far right. They sit near the middle of the political spectrum and are ambivalent about what they believe on many issues.

Q: Why then all the polarization stories in the news and the way in which the media dramatize so-called red and blue state differences?
A: Well, for one thing, the media misinterpret closely divided elections as deeply divided elections, despite evidence to the contrary. For another, the media love conflict, which leads them to focus on the extremes even if those views are not representative of the larger population. Finally, party activists and party officeholders in fact are more polarized than a generation ago because liberal Republicans and conservative Democrats have gotten scarce. But this polarization at the top fades out when we look at the broader population. For example, even on the issue of abortion, ordinary Democrats and Republicans in the population hold very similar views despite the close association of the party elites with pro-choice and pro-life groups.

Q: What about another hot topic, same-sex marriage?
A: The majority of Americans are opposed to it but not enough to have a political war over it. And acceptance of gay marriage is strongly related to age, so with the passage of time there’s more and more acceptance.

Q: How does this false belief in strong polarization affect the political process?
A: I think both parties have lost opportunities over the years. Recent presidential candidates Bill Clinton and George W. Bush appeal to voters in the middle, when they run, but they don’t follow through after they’re elected. Clinton was going to be a new Democrat, but as soon as he took office, he became an old tax-and-spend Democrat. George Bush ran as a compassionate conservative, but when he was elected, he tacked hard right on social issues. Neither one reached out to the ambivalent, uncommitted voters to forge a new majority.

Daron Shaw, Hoover visiting fellow and a professor of political science at the University of Texas-Austin, continued the discussion about polarization and what he’s learned from first-hand experience with candidates about how campaigns are run.

Q: A voter sees a lot of what looks like heated competition between candidates, an us-and-them attitude, voters on each of the far ends of the spectrum, but what’s really happening in a campaign?
A: Close competition is often mistaken for polarization. People get very swept up in a campaign and they’re rooting for their “team.” But just because they want to win doesn’t mean that they hold extreme opinions on issues or that they consistently and intensely prefer their candidate’s policy positions. They may support a candidate but not like what he or she says about certain topics. Remember, too, that competition varies across the states and that the presidency is determined by the electoral, not the popular, vote.

Q: When do you start to see a campaign come together?
A: You see a lot of movement and decision making among voters in the late spring and early summer. This is the point when many voters choose their candidate. After the conventions, voter numbers don’t typically move much.

Q: Are there some defining moments in a campaign?
A: Usually, and several suspects are already out there for 2004. The convention, as I mentioned, is one. Another would be the debates. Voters naturally look for gaffes. And in this presidential election, another terrorist strike against America would be one. And if Osama bin Laden is captured, that would be another.

Q: What should voters look for in this presidential election?
A: There isn’t much time between the Republican National Convention in September and the election in November, so the fall campaign will be relatively compact. This means there will be little letup between September 1 and Election Day. On a related note, given his war chest, Bush should have a significant communication edge up until public funding kicks in around Labor Day. Also, it’ll be interesting to see which way Kerry goes with his campaign; the Democrats are conscious (perhaps overly so) of the failings of their 1988 and 2000 campaigns and clearly want to avoid the “mistakes” of Dukakis and Gore. Finally, voters should pay attention to the candidates’ attempts to project certain traits. Democrats are typically thought of as “empathetic” and Republicans as “bald” and “assertive.” This means that when a Democrat convinces people he’s a strong leader, it can be worth quite a
bit at the polls. Similarly, “compassionate” Republicans often do well on Election Day.

David Brady, Hoover deputy director and senior fellow and political science professor at Stanford University, whose work focuses on the U.S. Congress, finished the panel presentation with his analysis of the 2004 House and Senate Races.

Q: Every seat in the House of Representatives is up for election this year. You note that, in the Senate, there are 19 Democratic seats and 15 Republican seats to be filled. What do you look at as you watch these elections?

A: Given that I do not want to spend my time perusing all congressional races, we have created an algorithm, which identifies which districts are vulnerable, based on the alignment of the electorate and the Congress members’ voting record. The most vulnerable incumbents have voted out of line with the voters in their districts and are, therefore, most likely to be defeated. The results of our analysis for the 2004 congressional elections, up to this point, show that there are 23 vulnerable Republican House members and 18 vulnerable Democrats.

In the Senate, there are eight Democratic seats I’d call vulnerable and five of them are in the south: Florida (Robert Graham), Georgia (Zell Miller), Louisiana (John Breaux), North Carolina (John Edwards), and South Carolina (Fritz Hollings). Among Republican senators, five are vulnerable.

Q: What determines an election in the U.S. House?

A: The most important factor is incumbency. This is because incumbent members have more money, get favorable redistricting, have name recognition, and, through their district efforts, have a personal vote, all of which make 95 percent plus of incumbents safe. It is the incumbency factor that largely accounts for divided government, in that safe incumbents can withstand the swings against their party: Clinton wins in 1996 yet Congress stays Republican; Reagan wins big in 1984 and the House remains Democratic.

Q: Do you have any predictions for this year’s elections?

A: I think the Republicans’ advantage in incumbency, money, and redistricting (Texas) makes it very hard for the Democrats to take over the House unless there is a strong tide toward Kerry and the Democrats. Democrats would have to take more than two-thirds of the vulnerable Republican seats, which just won’t happen because, even if Kerry wins the election, it will be very close. In the Senate, my analysis is that the Republicans will pick up one to two seats.

Media Fellows Program Draws Top Professionals to Hoover

This spring the Media Fellows program hosted a wide variety of fellows from print and broadcast, including Jack Beatty, senior editor at the Atlantic Monthly, who was in residence March 8–12; Carolyn Lochhead, Washington correspondent with the San Francisco Chronicle (March 22–26 residence); and Ron Elving, senior Washington editor with National Public Radio (May 17–21 residence).

Media fellows have the opportunity to exchange information and perspectives with Hoover scholars through seminars and informal meetings and with the Hoover and Stanford communities in public lectures. Disengaged from their normal career routines, media fellows can produce books and articles that often fall outside their regular duties. They meet with members of Hoover’s academic community without the routine pressures associated with media deadlines, and they exchange information and views on the economic, political, historical, and social contexts of public policy views. As fellows, they have the full range of research tools Hoover offers available to them.

Other media fellows included Michael Fletcher, Washington Post March 15–19, 2004
Michael Potemra, National Review
March 17–24, 2004
Tom Bethell, American Spectator

March 19–26, 2004
Steve Goldstein, Philadelphia Inquirer
March 29–April 3, 2004
Mohini Patel, BBC Radio 4
March 25–April 4, 2004
John Tierney, New York Times
April 5–9, 2004
Neil King, Wall Street Journal
April 12–16, 2004
Shailagh Murray, Wall Street Journal
April 12–16, 2004
Mark Sandalow, San Francisco Chronicle
April 12–16, 2004
David Kaplan, Newsweek
April 19–23, 2004
Kevin Merida, Washington Post
April 26–30, 2004
Andy Nagorski, Newsweek International
May 9–14, 2004
Michael Zielenziger, Knight Ridder
May 10–14, 2004
He also noted that those qualities—and the American family—are endangered by technology and affluence. D’Souza noted that California voters selected Arnold Schwarzenegger in last year’s governor’s recall election because he represented hope and because voters trusted his instincts.

New York Times columnist David Brooks drew attention to the growing gulf in ideology between conservatives and liberals. “One of the main questions to answer, and one that clearly shows where people do stand, is ‘Do the American people believe that America is an exceptional nation and responsible for spreading democracy or should it work in concert with other countries no matter what?’

Senior Fellow Victor Davis Hanson discussed war and the war on terrorism. He addressed the imprecision of the use of the words “war on terrorism,” noting that the war now being fought in the Middle East is actually much like earlier wars waged against fascist regimes.

Senior Fellow Larry Diamond and Research Fellow Williamson Evers discussed the prospects for democracy and development in Iraq and offered a fairly optimistic analysis. Evers was a senior adviser for education working with the Coalition Provision Authority under Ambassador Paul Bremer. Diamond also spent time in Iraq earlier this year working the U.S. authority to help move that Iraq toward democracy.

Treasury Secretary John Snow said that U.S. job growth appears to be strong and that tax cuts should be continued to help pour money into entrepreneurial efforts that will employ more people.

Stephen Friedman, assistant to the president and director of the National Economic Council, spoke at dinner about the U.S. labor market and the challenges posed by transformational economic and cultural changes around the world.

Karl Rove, senior adviser to President Bush, gave an informative and entertaining talk to more than 200 persons on February 24.

Rove noted that President Bush set a new tone in the White House, bringing a sense of history and an understanding of the lessons of leadership, and he lauded the capable and able team surrounding the presi-
dent. Rove also touched on the domestic and international challenges facing the president and the United States since September 11, as well as those dealing with a rapidly globalizing economy.

Earlier in the day, Washington Post columnist Charles Krauthammer also discussed President Bush, pointing to the president’s interest in what he called “large issues” such as immigration, Medicare reform, tax cuts, and a reinvigoration of the space program.

Krauthammer said he believed that Bush’s decision to take action in Iraq had definitely sent a message to other countries in the Middle East and thus has had a positive effect in that area.

Tim Russert, managing editor and moderator of Meet the Press, told the afternoon audience he believed that the presidential campaign will revolve around three issues: the economy, Iraq and terrorism, and cultural values. And he remarked that there is a large degree of polarization, not seen in the 2000 election, between members of the two major political parties.

Also speaking were Joshua Bolton, director of the Office of Management and Budget, and Bill Thomas, U.S. member of Congress and chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

The Hoover Library and Archives have acquired a rare handwritten political manuscript by Evita Peron and the bulk of Juan Domingo Peron’s archive from 1955 to 1972, the years of his exile.

The new Peron materials, consisting of almost 1,200 letters and other documents, raise the total Peron-related correspondence in the Hoover Archives to some 1,500 pieces.

About 150 of the letters are by Peron to such colleagues as Hipolito Paz, Maria de la Cruz, Americo Barrios, and Atílio Garcia Mellid. Most of the newly acquired letters are to Peron from his confidants and others, chief among them Pablo Vicente, Pedro Michelini, Raul Matera, Ramon Landajo, and Jorge Antonio.

Whereas almost everything Peron wrote was political, Evita rarely wrote down her political views, making what was probably the draft of a speech unusual. In it she discusses the “soul” of the Argentinean people, General Peron, political traitors, and the beneficiaries of Peron’s “new Argentina.”

Peron was president of Argentina from 1946 until removed by a military coup in 1951; he returned to Argentina in 1972 and was president again from 1973 until his death in July 1974. The party Peron founded is the major party in Argentina today, and has been in power for most of the past 14 years.
AT INVITATION OF GOVERNOR AND LEGISLATORS, KORET TASK FORCE CREATES SCHOOL POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR TEXAS LAWMAKERS

In response to an invitation from Texas governor Rick Perry and legislative leaders, the Hoover Institution Koret Task Force on K–12 Education has created a set of 10 key policy recommendations for the consideration of Texas education lawmakers. The recommendations were presented in February to the Texas legislature’s House Select Committee on Public School Finance in Austin. The task force provided background and analysis on current education policies and proposed reforms that can be expeditiously implemented in the state.

Koret Task Force members applied the principles of accountability, transparency, and choice to Texas, responding to the challenges enumerated by state leaders in their invitations to the task force.

“These proposals, based on research and national experience, will enable Texas policymakers to provide more effective, equitable, and efficient primary and secondary schooling for all the state’s citizens,” said Chester Finn Jr., the task force chairman. “Texas has long been regarded as a national leader in education reform. With strong accountability reforms already in place and growing opportunities for education choice, the Lone Star State is building on a solid foundation as it moves forward to improve its education system.”

By simultaneously addressing all the key elements of this reform—including school finance, school choice, rewards, teachers, principals, standards, tests, textbooks, and school boards—Finn said that Texas has a rare opportunity to forge coherent and bold policies that will work for the state’s children, parents, educators, and taxpayers.

Ten highlights of the Koret recommendations follow:

- Revamp school finance
- Strengthen accountability
- Create incentives and rewards for teachers and principals
-Invoke a professional contract for teachers and principals
- Give vouchers to students in urban districts with failing schools
- Give scholarships to students with disabilities
- Create more and better charter schools
- Restore democracy to local school boards
- Improve reading competence via smarter testing
- Deregulate textbook purchasing

Authors of the memoranda are members of the Koret Task Force on K–12 Education: John E. Chubb, Chester E. Finn Jr., Eric A. Hanushek, Paul T. Hill, E. D. Hirsch Jr., Caroline M. Hoxby, Terry M. Moe, Paul E. Peterson, Diane Ravitch, and Herbert J. Walberg.

The Koret Task Force on K–12 Education is the centerpiece of the Hoover Institution’s Initiative on American Public Education. Supported by the Koret Foundation, the members of the task force are nationally recognized experts in education and education policy. More information about them and the task force’s work is available at http://www.hoover.stanford.edu/koret/default.htm.

BOLOLAND WINS 2003 BOOK AWARD
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Bertrand M. Patenaude is a research fellow at the Hoover Institution and an expert in Russian and modern European history. He is researching a study of the 1992 Moscow trial of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, based on thousands of primary documents collected by the Russian prosecutors and available on microfilm at the Hoover Institution.

HENRY ROWEN
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rence H. Silberman and Senator John McCain of Arizona.

Henry Rowen was appointed a Hoover senior fellow in 1983. He is the Edward B. Rust Emeritus Professor of Public Policy and Management at the Stanford Graduate School of Business. He served as assistant secretary of defense for international security affairs from 1989 to 1991, chairman of the U.S. Intelligence Council from 1981 to 1983, and deputy assistant secretary of defense for international security affairs from 1961 to 1964.

Rowen’s full biography is at http://www.hoover.stanford.edu/BIOS/rowen.html.

Hoover Digest

www.hooverdigest.org

■ “The War on Terror: A Changed World.” “I cannot emphasize too strongly the danger we are facing. We are engaged in a long and bitter war. Yet this is a war we cannot—and will not—lose.” By Hoover fellow George P. Shultz.

■ “Iraq: The Long Haul.” Helping Iraq to establish a free and democratic society is the most important task our nation will face for years to come. By Hoover fellow Larry Diamond.

■ “When Words Go Bad.” The empty vocabulary of anti-Americanism. By Hoover fellow Victor Davis Hanson.

■ “Intelligence Reform: Less Is More.” How can we improve the nation’s spy agencies? By concentrating on the basics and building the capabilities we need to defeat today’s threats. By Hoover fellow Bruce Berkowitz.

■ “Defining Social Welfare—and Achieving It.” Whether you define social welfare as wealth, health, or happiness, you’ll discover that it’s best achieved by way of property rights and limited government. By Hoover fellow Richard Epstein.

■ “Why Vouchers Will Enrich Public Schools.” Voucher programs would starve public schools of funding. True or false? Hoover fellow Terry M. Moe provides the answer.

■ “From the Hoover Archives: Troubling Images.” The Northern Ireland conflict as seen from the participants’ strikingly different perspectives. By Exhibits Coordinator Cecile Hill.

Policy Review

www.policyreview.org

■ “Power and Population in Asia: Demographics and the Strategic Balance.” By Nicholas Eberstadt.


■ “Intelligence Failures: The Wrong Model for the War on Terror.” By Richard L. Russell.


In the third of a series of Stanford University–Hoover Institution–Knowledge Networks reports on the California primary election, both Senator John Kerry and Senator John Edwards led President Bush among registered voters likely to vote in the March 2 California Democratic primary.

Kerry led Bush 43 percent to 38 percent, and Edwards led Bush 44 percent to 37 percent. As expected, the results demonstrate that partisan loyalty is a key factor, overshadowing differences between the two Democratic candidates. Three in four Democrats support Kerry and Edwards over Bush, while four in five Republicans support Bush.

The poll, which was administered on the World Wide Web, was designed by Stanford University communications professor Shanto Iyengar and Stanford political science professors David Brady and Morris Fiorina, who also are Hoover Institution fellows. Their aim was to learn more about voter attitudes and preferences as the California presidential primary approached on March 2. They worked in concert with Knowledge Networks’ vice president and managing director Michael Dennis on the administration of the survey and analysis of the results.

Senator John Kerry continued to lead John Edwards by more than a 2-to-1 margin. When given the actual presidential primary ballot, 49 percent of the respondents voted for Kerry, 22 percent for Edwards, with the rest divided among the remaining candidates listed on the ballot (even though in most cases these candidates had terminated their candidacies).

The third report included 162 interviews conducted with registered voters in California between February 27 and February 29 and included additional interviews with 505 registered voters conducted between February 23 and February 26. The survey was administered to a random adult sample of the Knowledge Networks web-enabled panel between February 23 and February 29. The analysis is based on interviews with 667 registered voters likely to vote in the primary election. The sampling margin of error is plus or minus 3.8 percentage points for the full sample and 4.5 percentage points for the analysis of the Democratic primary.

This was the third of three surveys conducted before the California primary. The results of the first survey were released on February 18, the second set of results was released on February 27, and the third set was released on March 1.

The poll was conducted using the Knowledge Networks web-enabled panel, which provides a representative sample of Californian households (http://www.knowledgenetworks.com/ganp). The survey results were weighted to U.S. Census population benchmarks for adults residing in the state of California in terms of age, race/ethnicity, education, occupation, and urban/rural status.

The California secretary of state’s records for political party identification.
Niall Ferguson, Victor Davis Hanson, A. Michael Spence named senior fellows

The Hoover Institution recently welcomed three new senior fellows who will play a growing role in its research and programs during the year ahead.

They are historian Niall Ferguson, classicist Victor Davis Hanson, and economist and Nobel laureate in economic sciences A. Michael Spence. The appointments were announced by Hoover Institution director John Raisian.

Niall Ferguson, the Herzog Professor of Financial History at the Stern Business School, New York University, and a noted author, is also a senior research fellow at Jesus College, Oxford University, where he is a visiting professor of history.


Born in Glasgow in 1964, Ferguson was awarded a Demyship (half fellowship) for his academic achievements by Magdalen College, Oxford, in 1981 and graduated with First Class Honours in 1985.

Victor Davis Hanson joined California State University, Fresno, in 1984 to initiate a classics program. In 1991 he was awarded an American Philological Association Excellence in Teaching Award, which is given yearly to the country’s top undergraduate teachers of Greek and Latin.

Hanson was a National Endowment for the Humanities fellow at the Center for Advanced Studies in the Behavioral Sciences, Stanford, California (1992–93), a visiting professor of classics at Stanford University (1991–92), a recipient of the Eric Breindel Award for opinion journalism (2002), and an Alexander Onassis Fellow (2001) and was named alumnus of the year of the University of California, Santa Cruz (2002). He has also been a visiting Shifrin Chair of Military History at the U.S. Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland (2002–3).


Hanson was educated at the University of California, Santa Cruz (B.A. 1975), the American School of Classical Studies (1978–79) and received his Ph.D. in classics from Stanford University in 1980.

A. Michael Spence, who was awarded the Nobel Memorial Prize in Economics Sciences in 2001, is also Philip H. Knight Professor Emeritus of Management in the Graduate School of Business at Stanford University.

Spence is the fifth Hoover fellow to also be a Nobel laureate.

Spence served as Philip H. Knight Professor and dean of the Stanford Business School from 1990 to 1999. As dean, he oversaw the finances, organization, and educational policies of the school. Since 1999, he has been a partner at Oak Hill Capital Partners in Menlo Park.

He taught at Stanford as an associate professor of economics from 1973 to 1975.

From 1975 to 1990, he served as professor of economics and business administration at Harvard University, holding a joint appointment in its Business School and the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. In 1983, he was named chairman of the Economics Department and George Gund Professor of Economics and Business Administration.

Spence was awarded the John Kenneth Galbraith Prize for excellence in teaching in 1978 and the John Bates Clark Medal in 1981 for a “significant contribution to economic thought and knowledge.”
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Senior Fellow Eric Hanushek discussed the importance of class size and the mistaken notion that all classrooms should be small, particularly in higher grades, on KAMC-TV (ABC) in Lubbock, Tex., KIII-TV (ABC) in San Diego, KGUN-TV (ABC) in Tuscon, Ariz., WAAY-TV (ABC) in Huntsville/Decatur, Ga., WBAY-TV (ABC) in Green Bay/ Appleton, Wis., WHAS-TV (ABC) in Louisville, Ken., WKBW-TV (ABC) in Buffalo, N.Y., WMUR-TV (ABC) in Boston, WVED-TV (ABC) in Norfolk/Portsmouth, Va., on March 22; KBMT-TV (ABC) in Beaumont/Port Arthur, Tex., KRGV-TV (ABC) in Harlingen/Brownsville, Tex., WTAE-TV (ABC) in Pittsburgh, Penn., WZZM-TV in Grand Rapids/Kalamazoo, Mich., on March 23; WLS-TV (ABC) in Chicago, WTVC-TV (ABC) in Chattanooga, Tenn., on March 24; and WJBF-TV (ABC), Augusta, Ga., on March 25. The report was part of a segment prepared by SciCent for national distribution.

Hoover visiting fellow Nicholas Economides addressed the dispute between Microsoft and the European Union on The Big Picture on WBRR-AM radio (NBC/ABC), New York, on March 24.

Research Fellow Stanley Kurtz was one of four panelists on same-sex marriage on National Public Radio's popular Talk of the Nation on March 9. He also was featured on The O'Reilly Factor on the same subject on Fox News on March 8.

Senior Fellow Thomas Henriksen discussed former White House counterterrorism chief Richard Clarke's work and new book on KGO-TV (ABC), San Francisco, on March 22.


Developments in Iraq also were discussed by Research Fellow Donald Abenheim on KNTV-TV (NBC), San Francisco, on March 7 and by Senior Fellow Larry Diamond on KCBS-AM radio (CBS), San Francisco, on March 5.

Research Fellow Bill Whalen talked about the seriousness with which the White House is taking California as the presidential campaign season opened on KGO-AM (ABC), San Francisco, on March 22.

Research Fellow Dinesh D'Souza was one of three panelists on The Dennis Miller Show on CNBC-TV on March 8 who discussed the end of the Howard Dean presidential campaign.

The Lysander Spooner Awards are presented by Laissez Faire Books to honor those who continue to advocate freedom. This honor is awarded monthly to the most important contributions to the literature of liberty, followed by an annual award to the author of the best book on liberty for the year.

Sowell, a syndicated columnist and prolific author of popular and academic volumes, is the Rose and Milton Friedman Senior Fellow in Public Policy at the Hoover Institution.
Anti-Americanism in Europe: A Cultural Problem
by Russell A. Berman
(ISBN: 0-8179-4512-1)

Although the meaning of the phrase anti-American doesn’t need to be explained, why anti-Americanism is spreading, especially in countries that have been allied with the United States, requires more consideration.

In Anti-Americanism in Europe: A Cultural Problem (Hoover Institution Press, 2004), Hoover senior fellow Russell Berman delves into the reasons behind the strained relations between the United States and some of its traditional European allies since September 11. In his new book Berman explores various dimensions of contemporary European anti-Americanism.

Because anti-Americanism is a cultural problem—albeit with enormous consequences for policy—Berman approaches it using the tools of cultural analysis. Thus the chapters in this book look at anti-Americanism in a variety of contexts.

Chapter 1 examines several recent surveys to determine the quantitative scope of anti-American sentiment, especially since September 11, with a focus on Germany. Chapter 2 describes how anti-Americanism goes beyond rational debates over policy—a critic of this or that American policy is hardly necessarily an anti-American—and takes on an obsessive character. Chapter 3 examines the shape of anti-Americanism in the debates over the Iraq war. Chapter 4 explores another aspect of anti-Americanism: a reluctance to criticize bad regimes for fear of siding with the United States. The fifth and final chapter looks at another variation of anti-Americanism: the movement against globalization.

With anti-Americanism on the rise, this timely book contributes to understanding an important ideological challenge.

Berman, the Walter A. Haas Professor in the Humanities at Stanford University, is a senior fellow, by courtesy, at the Hoover Institution.

The Bushes: Portrait of a Dynasty
by Peter Schweizer and Rochelle Schweizer
(ISBN: 0-385-49863-2)

A new book on the Bush family provides an unusually open and candid look at this very private family. In The Bushes: Portrait of a Dynasty (Doubleday, 2004) Peter Schweizer, Hoover research fellow, and Rochelle Schweizer have done remarkable research on the history of the family.

From family patriarchs such as Samuel P. Bush and Bert Walker, who made—and sometimes lost—fortunes in business, to family matriarchs such as Dorothy Walker Bush, who exerted a strong influence on the values of the family, to today’s president, the making of this family dynasty is examined generation by generation. For those who seek insight on the Bush family and the influence of its members on society, this book provides a wealth of information.

Peter Schweizer is a research fellow at the Hoover Institution and the Cullen Professor of Economics at the University of Houston, and a team of researchers began work in 1996 on materials in the Soviet archives in Moscow and at the Hoover Institution.

What they determined, Gregory writes, was that the system in the Soviet Union failed not because of the “jockey” (i.e., Stalin and later leaders) but because of the “horse” (the economic system).

Although Stalin was the system’s prime architect, the system was managed by thousands of ‘Stalins’ in a nested dictatorship,” Gregory writes. “This study pinpoints the reasons for the failure of the system—poor planning, unreliable supplies, the preferential treatment of indigenous enterprises, the lack of knowledge of planners, etc.—but also focuses on the basic principal-agent conflict between planners and producers, which created a sixty-year reform stalemate.”

He notes that once Gorbachev gave enterprises their freedom, the system had no direction from either a plan or a market, and the system imploded. He believes that, if repeated today, this same...
“experiment” would retain its basic contradictions and inherent flaws and that the economic results would again prove inferior.

Paul Gregory is also research professor at the German Institute for Economic Research in Berlin. He has published widely in the field of Russian and Soviet economics for more than thirty years and served as a visiting professor at Moscow State University.

Gregory received his Ph.D. in economics from Harvard in 1969.

**Competing with the Government: Anticompetitive Behavior and Public Enterprises**

*by R. Richard Geddes*  
(ISBN: 0-8179-3992-X)

Government-owned and government-subsidized firms compete with private firms in a variety of activities but are often endowed with privileges and immunities not enjoyed by their private rivals. *Competing with the Government* reveals how these privileges give government firms an artificial competitive advantage that fosters a wide range of potentially harmful effects.

Examining a variety of instances in which government and private firms compete—including freight carriage, electric utilities, financial services, and others—the authors raise fundamental questions about the proper relationship between business and government in a market economy and underline the need for significant policy change regarding competition between government and private firms.

Drawing from a wealth of case studies, they detail how state-owned enterprises (SOEs) enjoy an array of government-granted privileges and immunities that can be used anticompetitively, revealing why an SOE is more likely to engage in anticompetitive behavior than a privately owned firm—and why anticompetitive behavior by SOEs is likely to be harmful to society. They show how the U.S. Postal Service—as well as postal services abroad—has consistently been guilty of anticompetitive behavior. And they make a strong case that government-sponsored enterprises such as Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac have actually violated the Sherman Antitrust Act by monopolizing the automated underwriting market.

Richard Geddes is a research fellow at the Hoover Institution and an assistant professor in the Department of Policy Analysis and Management at Cornell University. From 1991 to 2002, he taught economics at Fordham University in New York.

Geddes’s current research interests include the economics of the Postal Reorganization Act, the effects of rate-of-return regulation on corporate governance, and the economics of women’s rights.

In this Harvard University Press volume, National Fellow Jeremi Suri puts the tumultuous 1960s into a truly international perspective in the first study to examine the connections between great power diplomacy and global social protest. Profoundly disturbed by increasing social and political discontent, cold war powers united on the international front in the policy of détente. Although reflecting traditional balance of power considerations, détente thus also developed from a common urge for stability among leaders who by the late 1960s were worried about increasingly threatening domestic social activism.

In the early part of the decade, cold war pressures simultaneously inspired activists and constrained leaders; within a few years activism turned revolutionary on a global scale. Suri examines the decade through leaders and protesters on three continents, including Mao Zedong, Charles de Gaulle, Martin Luther King Jr., Daniel Cohn-Bendit, and Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn. He describes connections between policy and protest from the Berkeley riots to the Prague Spring, from the Paris strikes to massive unrest in Wuhan, China.

Designed to protect the existing political order and repress movements for change, détente gradually isolated politics from the public. The growth of distrust and disillusion in nearly every society left a lasting legacy of global unrest, fragmentation, and unprecedented public skepticism toward authority.

Suri is a 2003–4 W. Glenn Campbell and Rita Ricardo-Campbell National Fellow at Hoover who is researching “Henry Kissinger and the Transformation of International Society.”

**Power and Protest: Global Revolution and the Rise of Détente**

*by Jeremi Suri*  
(ISBN: 0-674-01031-0)

2003 Phi Alpha Theta Best First Book Prize

In this Harvard University Press volume, National Fellow Jeremi Suri puts the tumultuous 1960s into a truly international perspective in the first study to examine the connections between great power diplomacy and global social protest. Profoundly disturbed by increasing social and political discontent, cold war powers united on the international front in the policy of détente. Although reflecting traditional balance of power considerations, détente thus also developed from a common urge for stability among leaders who by the late 1960s were worried about increasingly threatening domestic social activism.

In the early part of the decade, cold war pressures simultaneously inspired activists and constrained leaders; within a few years activism turned revolutionary on a global scale. Suri examines the decade through leaders and protesters on three continents, including Mao Zedong, Charles de Gaulle, Martin Luther King Jr., Daniel Cohn-Bendit, and Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn. He describes connections between policy and protest from the Berkeley riots to the Prague Spring, from the Paris strikes to massive unrest in Wuhan, China.

Designed to protect the existing political order and repress movements for change, détente gradually isolated politics from the public. The growth of distrust and disillusion in nearly every society left a lasting legacy of global unrest, fragmentation, and unprecedented public skepticism toward authority.

Suri is a 2003–4 W. Glenn Campbell and Rita Ricardo-Campbell National Fellow at Hoover who is researching “Henry Kissinger and the Transformation of International Society.”
Uncommon Knowledge™, the weekly public affairs television program coproduced by the Hoover Institution and KTEH-TV (PBS) in San Jose, presents a wide array of issues and guests in new segments for spring 2004 now available on the Public Broadcasting Service.

Hosted by Emmy-nominee and Hoover research fellow Peter Robinson, it is broadcast by more than 50 PBS stations across the United States. The audio content is carried overseas by National Public Radio International.

Details about each segment are available at the Hoover Institution web site, www.hoover.org. New programs this season include

- High-Wire Act: Reforming the Electricity Industry
  Guests: Vernon Smith, 2002 Nobel Prize–winner in economics and professor of economics and law, George Mason University, and Ralph Cavanagh, energy program director, Natural Resources Defense Council

- Prophets and Losses: The Rise and Decline of Islamic Civilization
  Guests: John Esposito, professor of Islamic studies, Georgetown University; Azim Nanji, director, Institute of Ismaili Studies; and Vali Nasr, professor of national security affairs, Naval Postgraduate School

- Putin the Terrible? Vladimir Putin and Russian Democracy
  Guests: Steven Fish, professor of political science, University of California, Berkeley, and Michael McFaul, professor of political science, Stanford University, and senior fellow, Hoover Institution

- A Crash Course in Dubyanomics: President Bush’s Economic Policy

- Give War a Chance: The Utility of War
  Guests: Victor Davis Hanson, author, Ripples of Battle: How the Wars of the Past Still Determine How We Fight, How We Live, and How We Think, and senior fellow, Hoover Institution, and Jonathan Schell, author, The Unconquerable World: Power, Non-violence, and the Will of the People