The Role of Academic International Affairs Institutes in the Public Policy Landscape

Insights Drawn From Perry World House Experts' Meeting February 12-13, 2015

University of Pennsylvania

Michael C. Horowitz, William Burke-White, Laurie Jensen, Katelyn Leader, and Mira Patel

University of Pennsylvania

December 2015

Perry World House Working Paper

About Perry World House: Perry World House is the University of Pennsylvania's new hub for global engagement. Opening its doors in fall 2016, Perry World House will be a home for Penn's global activities, a gathering place for students and scholars to engage on issues of international concern, and an interdisciplinary research center designed to translate academic work into innovative approaches to global challenges. Perry World House will serve the Penn community as a catalyst, a connector, and a communicator for international research, teaching, and engagement.

You can learn more about Perry World House on Twitter (@perryworldhouse) or on the web at: https://global.upenn.edu/perryworldhouse

About the authors: Michael C. Horowitz (@mchorowitz) is associate director of Perry World House and associate professor of political science at the University of Pennsylvania. William Burke-White (@wburkewh) is director of Perry World House, Richard Perry Professor, and professor of law at the University of Pennsylvania. Laurie Jensen is a program coordinator at Perry World House, Katelyn Leader is a program associate at Perry World House, and Mira Patel received an MBA from the Wharton School at the University of Pennsylvania.

Executive Summary

How can academic international affairs institutions contribute to the foreign policy sphere and have a greater effect on the policy making efforts of government agencies, non-governmental organizations, and international institutions? This paper derives conclusions from a series of conversations that occurred during the Perry World House Experts' Meeting held in February 2015 at the University of Pennsylvania. It builds on extensive research and dialogue on the divide between academia and policy. First, the paper introduces the Global Innovations Institute at Perry World House, the reason for which the University of Pennsylvania initiated a conversation on the role of academic international affairs institutes in the foreign policy process. The paper then provides a brief overview of the causes and consequences of this divide based on research that has been done up to this point. The Key Takeaways section is the heart of the paper, presenting critical points that emerged in the meeting for consideration moving forward. These include the following recommendations: engaging new audiences; understanding the importance of time horizons in academic research; identifying effective features of academic international affairs institutes; and reflecting on outputs that influence the policy making process. The paper concludes with final thoughts on how academia can best catalyze these different processes and policy innovation moving forward.

Key Takeaways

1. A key goal of the Global Innovations Institute should be to create policy relevant outputs by exploiting academe's ability to produce analysis and generate public dialogue grounded in historical, political, and social context.
2. The Global Innovations Institute should encourage research that focuses on significant, timely policy issues and is written so as to be accessible to policy makers in governments, NGOs, international organizations, and other institutions.
3. In addition to promoting excellent scholarship, Global Innovations Institute outputs should provide actionable analysis and recommendations for pressing global challenges and opportunities.
4. Building linkages with other institutions, including think tanks and emerging institutions in developing countries, can help ensure that the Global Innovations Institute becomes a leader in the academic think tank space.

What is the Global Innovations Institute at Perry World House?

Perry World House is the University of Pennsylvania's new hub for global engagement. Perry World House seeks to internationalize Penn by co-locating internationally-oriented research, outreach, and student activities; convening faculty and experts to address complex, interdisciplinary issues; and catalyzing Penn's global engagement by connecting Penn to the world.

Perry World House will serve as a public forum for interdisciplinary engagement and debate and will offer Penn's 12 schools a setting to convene around international topics and host diverse speakers, seminars, and conferences. Without its own public policy or international studies school, the University of Pennsylvania instead relies on its existing schools to provide policy expertise. Perry World House will help centralize and streamline academic research and analysis to ensure that Penn's scholars are maximizing their influence in international dialogues.

In preparation for its formal launch in fall 2016, Perry World House is focusing on connecting new audiences and building meaningful partnerships. Its vision also aligns with the Penn Global Strategic Plan by providing Penn students with increased opportunities to engage in global issues and experiences and offering another space where international students can feel connected to the world while at Penn. The initiatives and programming housed at Perry World House will also facilitate innovative collaboration, moving Penn forward as a global agenda setter.

The Global Innovations Institute is a new university think tank housed within Perry World House. The Global Innovations Institute will bring together Penn faculty, domestic scholars, and international distinguished fellows around crosscutting themes of global consequence that will engage multiple schools within the University. Academia becomes more useful to policy makers, international organizations, and NGOs when it can effectively convey meaningful insights for the appropriate time horizons. Perry World House aims to do just that while also examining how university-based think tanks can be drivers of policy innovation rather than bystanders. Although policy experts in government often face too much information and with very little time to process it, academic insight is too important to ignore. It is therefore part of the Perry World House mission to

identify and promote the most effective outputs by which to convey policy recommendations. For a brief summary of some other academic think tanks, see Appendix A.[1]

The Divide between the Ivory Tower and the Policy World

Academia has received criticism for its lack of involvement in the policy making world, from former MacArthur President Robert Gallucci's call for more relevance, to *New York Times* columnist Nicholas Kristof's fear that academic insights are not useful for the real world. Research by Peter Campbell and Michael Desch, Steve Van Evera, and Jim Steinberg and Frank Gavin, along with others, suggests that academics are not doing enough in the policy space.[2] Structural barriers often prevent the successful flow of cross-sector information and recommendations throughout the policy making process.[3] The blame for this falls on both universities and the policy world. Universities often struggle to balance their primary mission of teaching and academic research with public

---

[1] Some of the material that follows is taken with permission from Michael C. Horowitz, "What Is Policy Relevance?," *War On The Rocks*, June 17 2015, http://warontherocks.com/2015/2006/what-is-policy-relevance/.

[2] Robert Gallucci, "Academia and the Foreign Policy-Making Process," *MacArthur Foundation Speech*, May 7 2014, https://www.macfound.org/press/speeches/academia-and-foreign-policy-making-process-speech-robert-gallucci/; Francis J. Gavin and James Steinberg, "Mind the Gap: Why Policymakers and Scholars Ignore Each Other, and What Can Be Done About It?," *Carnegie Report* 6, no. 4 (2012): 10-17; Stephen Van Evera, "U.S. Social Science and International Relations," *War On The Rocks*, February 9 2015, http://warontherocks.com/2015/2002/u-s-social-science-and-international-relations/; Michael C. Desch and Peter Campbell, "Rank Irrelevance: How Academia Lost Its Way," *Foreign Affairs Online*, September 15 2013, https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/united-states/2013-2009-2015/rank-irrelevance; Nicholas D. Kristof, "Professors, We Need You!," *The New York Times*, February 15 2014, http://www.nytimes.com/2014/2002/2016/opinion/sunday/kristof-professors-we-need-you.html

[3] For a survey of the literature and commentary on policy relevance, more of which is cited below, see Daniel Maliniak et al., "International Relations in the Us Academy," *International Studies Quarterly* 55, no. 2 (2011): 437-464; Bruce W Jentleson and Ely Ratner, "Bridging the Beltway–Ivory Tower Gap," *International Studies Review* 13, no. 1 (2011): 6-11; Gavin and Steinberg, "Mind the Gap: Why Policymakers and Scholars Ignore Each Other, and What Can Be Done About It?."; Paul C Avey and Michael C Desch, "What Do Policymakers Want from Us? Results of a Survey of Current and Former Senior National Security Decision Makers," *International Studies Quarterly* 58, no. 2 (2014): 227-246; Joseph S. Nye Jr, "Scholars on the Sidelines," *The Washington Post*, April 13 2009, http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/2004/2012/AR2009041202260.html; Horowitz, "What Is Policy Relevance?; Catherine Weaver, "Mind -- and Measure -- the Gap," *International Studies Quarterly Online Symposium* 2014, http://www.isanet.org/Publications/ISQ/Posts/ID/1421/Mind--and-Measure--the-Gap; Michael Desch, "Technique Trumps Relevance: The Professionalization of Political Science and the Marginalization of Security Studies," *Perspectives on Politics* 13, no. 02 (2015): 377-393; Rogers M Smith, "Political Science and the Public Sphere Today," *Perspectives on Politics* 13, no. 02 (2015): 366-376; Daniel W. Drezner, "Policy Wonks Ignore Academic Political Science Journals at Their Own Peril," *Foreign Policy*, March 29 2012, http://foreignpolicy.com/2012/2003/2029/policy-wonks-ignore-academic-political-science-journals-at-their-own-peril/; Laura Sjoberg, "Locating Relevance in Security Studies," *Perspectives on Politics* 13, no. 02 (2015): 396-398; Erik Voeten, "Rigor Is Not the Enemy of Relevance," *Perspectives on Politics* 13, no. 02 (2015): 402-403.

engagement. Some critics claim that academics often become so specialized that they struggle to make the quick and broader connections to real world policy concerns.[4]

Government officials face a time challenge, often picking up a new topic with each successive meeting and rarely having the chance to review or synthesize the daily deluge comprehensively. For example, senior policy makers at the U.S. Department of State are inundated with data and recommendations from around the world, including the intelligence communities' daily analysis of world events and trends. It is also important to recognize the multiplicity of policy audiences. As Deborah Avant points out, the policy world is broad, encompassing governments, NGOs, international institutions, and others.[5] It is too narrow to think only of the policy world as government decision-makers, though this is certainly a vital part of the policy world. Instead, when thinking about academic engagement with the policy world, this should include other actors in the policy space as well.

Experts in both academe and policy acknowledge the gulf between academic research, think tanks, and policy makers, despite their shared goals and complementary resources. Academics encounter an organizational structure that prioritizes research and academic publishing while simultaneously devaluing policy impacts. Some recent studies have found that academic international relations output is not as prevalent or relevant to policy makers as it could be.[6] Few academics tailor their products to the needs of policy makers and, likewise, few policy makers know whom to contact or make time to seek out academic thought leadership. Many accept this gap as an immutable outcome due to differences between organizational cultures but it is possible and imperative to narrow this gap. Academics bring subject matter expertise, linguistic skills, cultural competency, and knowledge of historical context, all of which is vital to producing comprehensive analyses of international relations. Engaging in the foreign policy space is critical for universities and well-aligned with their core mission. Of course, the burden of strengthening linkages to the policy world should not fall

---

[4] Kristof, "Professors, We Need You!."
[5] Deborah D. Avant, "Relevant for Whom? The Multiplicity of Policy Audiences," *Political Violence @ a Glance*, November 3 2015, http://politicalviolenceataglance.org/2015/2011/2003/relevant-for-whom-the-multiplicity-of-policy-audiences/.
[6] Avey and Desch, "What Do Policymakers Want from Us? Results of a Survey of Current and Former Senior National Security Decision Makers; Maliniak et al., "International Relations in the Us Academy." For another perspective on what academics can contribute, see Oliver Kaplan, "Academics Are Policy Troubleshooters," *Political Violence @ a Glance*, December 1, 2015 2015, http://politicalviolenceataglance.org/2015/2012/2001/academics-are-policy-troubleshooters/..

solely on the shoulders of academics. Despite the pressure to function at a fast pace, policy makers should endeavor to narrow the gap and strive to think beyond the immediate intelligence of the day. Supporting policy outcomes also enhances academic institutions' pedagogical roles and furthers connections between academics and society.

Attempts to bridge the gap between academia and the policy world, especially in the area of international relations, have accelerated in recent years. Several ongoing initiatives include the Bridging the Gap project, the Tobin Project, the Institute for the Theory and Practice of International Relations (TRIP), and a variety of others.[7] The Bridging the Gap project, for example, trains academics how to ask policy relevant questions and write for public policy audiences. To complement these efforts, academic understanding of policy relevance needs improvement. In particular, distinguishing between research with policy significance and research that is policy actionable can bring analytical clarity to the concept of policy relevance and help enhance efforts to bridge the gap.

The information age has allowed academics to communicate directly with the policy world, and has increased their willingness to do so. Academics have a greater number of venues than ever before in which to publish policy-relevant insights based on their scholarship, from blogs run by academics (e.g. Washington Post's Monkey Cage blog, Duck of Minerva, Political Violence at a Glance, Just Security, Lawfare, and others),[8] to social media avenues such as Twitter, to media outlets that consistently publish academics with policy insights (e.g. *Foreign Affairs*, War *on the Rocks*, *Foreign Policy*, *Defense One*).

The Unique Potential of Academic Think Tanks

---

[7] To learn more about these, go to: Bridging the Gap (http://bridgingthegapproject.org/), Tobin Project (http://www.tobinproject.org/research-inquiry/national-security), TRIP (http://www.wm.edu/offices/itpir/trip/), and the new Maxwell School initiative (http://www.maxwell.syr.edu/news.aspx?id=124554054994).
[8] For example, see: Monkey Cage (https://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/monkey-cage/), Duck of Minerva (http://duckofminerva.com/), Political Violence @ a Glance (http://politicalviolenceataglance.org/), Just Security (https://www.justsecurity.org/), War on the Rocks (http://warontherocks.com/) and Lawfare (https://www.lawfareblog.com/).

The discussion at the University of Pennsylvania in February 2015 revealed some of the challenges academic think tanks face as they compete in a decentralized environment – both within academia and in the public policy world. In general, one way academic think tanks can make a unique contribution is by building interdisciplinary interactions that foster awareness on current research, build networks, and break down silos on campus. Academic think tanks can promote multidimensional impact by convening spaces of trust between policy makers and academics, bridging diverse organizational missions. In addition to producing policy relevant content, international affairs institutes can build credibility by training academics to write, communicate, and engage effectively with government officials. Moreover, universities need to invest in internal infrastructure which incentivizes interdisciplinary research.

Given their access to diverse fields of expertise and distance from the pressure of constant decision-making, university-based international affairs institutes are particularly well positioned to foster innovative thinking outside of policy making centers in Washington, Brussels, and Beijing.

Most broadly, academic research traditionally contributes by engaging in public debate on important issues of the day. Academic writing in the public sphere can help set the agenda for discussion even when it is not designed to influence short-term public policy activities. Writing by scholars such as Paul Kennedy or Samuel Huntington exemplifies this type of agenda-setting research.[9] This type of writing can help shape how policy makers think about various important issues and evaluate the world when they make decisions, but does not explicitly guide any particular choices. For example, John Mearsheimer's 2014 article in *Foreign Affairs* on Western responsibility for ongoing Russian aggression in Ukraine stimulated public dialogue, even though it was unlikely to be implemented given the Obama administration's commitment to pushing back against Russian actions.[10]

Many policy makers agree that academic contributions to historical, economic, and cultural context and regional understanding, when effectively shared, can be invaluable to shaping sound policy decisions. Academic research also supports norm setting on specific policy areas informed by theoretical elements (e.g., human rights, gender, and democratization) and helps identify new policy

---

[9] For example, see Paul M. Kennedy, *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers: Economic Change and Military Conflict from 1500 to 2000*, 1st ed. (New York: Random House, 1987); Samuel P. Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996).
[10] John J Mearsheimer, "Why the Ukraine Crisis Is the West's Fault," *Foreign Affairs* 93, no. 5 (2014): 77-89.

approaches that are not always evident to those most intimately involved in day-to-day policy making. For a list of potential areas for research identified by participants in the workshop, see Appendix B.[11]

One way the Global Innovations Institute can achieve its mission is by encouraging research with policy significance, a key subcomponent of policy relevance. Policy significance, most simply, is research that has implications for the policy world. A large percentage of international relations research, even that involving advanced statistical methods and academic jargon, arguably fits this description. For example, in a response to a piece by Thomas Ricks,[12] Paul Staniland points out the utility of many recent political science articles and books for understanding topics ranging from how rockets launched from the Gaza Strip influence voting patterns in Israel to what we can learn about the emerging balance of power in East Asia from studying the period before the outbreak of World War I.[13]

Unfortunately, many of these pieces are inaccessible or too long for mainstream policy makers to read. Paul Avey and Michael Desch's research on how policy makers view academic journals notes that policy makers doubt the utility of academic journal articles featuring quantitative work and game theory (whether any senior policy makers read any journal articles, regardless of method, is a different question).[14] This is why a second major goal of the Global Innovations Institute should be to aid the University of Pennsylvania's world-class scholars in writing in policy-accessible ways so as to reach relevant NGOs, governments, international organizations, activists, and others.

Policy accessibility reflects the essential readability of research – whether presented as a book, journal article, or blog post, for the policy world. A journal article and blog post by the same person

---

[11] That list is a starting point for discussion, not the final word on what Perry World House and the Global Innovations Institute view as interesting areas for exploration.

[12] Paul Staniland, "Tom Ricks Doesn't Know What He's Talking About," *The Washington Post: Monkey Cage*, September 26 2014, https://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/monkey-cage/wp/2014/2009/2026/tom-ricks-doesnt-know-what-hes-talking-about/; Thomas E. Ricks, "Given All That Is Going on, Why Is 'International Security' So Damn Boring?," *Foreign Policy*, September 15 2014, http://foreignpolicy.com/2014/2009/2015/given-all-that-is-going-on-why-is-international-security-so-damn-boring/.

[13] For example, see Anna Getmansky and Thomas Zeitzoff, "Terrorism and Voting: The Effect of Rocket Threat on Voting in Israeli Elections," *American Political Science Review* 108, no. 03 (2014): 588-604.

[14] Avey and Desch, "What Do Policymakers Want from Us? Results of a Survey of Current and Former Senior National Security Decision Makers."

on the same issue could have equal policy relevance but demonstrate very different levels of policy accessibility. The journal article might feature many theoretical references and discussions of academic debates that make it policy relevant, but not policy accessible. The blog post, in contrast, might be policy accessible based on its simplification of ideas and direct references to policy recommendations.

One might even refine this concept further by distinguishing between writing that is policy accessible at the working level in the government, often staffed by younger people with more recent engagement with academic research, and writing for senior policy makers. Senior policy makers have even less time than their busy staffers to consume outside writing, and, unless they come from academia, potentially less familiarity with academic concepts. Another way to refine the concept of policy accessibility is to think about different mediums as having different levels of policy accessibility for different audiences. Even within the policy world, outlets targeted at the Defense Department (DoD) versus the public conversation on an issue might require writing in different ways. Fluency in DoD jargon and policy levers renders research more accessible to busy staffers in a DoD office. In contrast, writing a mass media op-ed requires using language designed for the broadest audience.

When significance and accessibility come together, it increases the ability of scholars to generate outputs with policy actionable insights--recommendations that the intended audience can implement. Most academic work is not fundamentally policy actionable because it does not suggest specific foreign policy actions. For example, international relations research might suggest that countries with high male-to-female ratios are more likely to start military conflicts or that countries that acquire nuclear weapons become harder to coerce.[15] Such studies might have important policy implications, but they are not necessarily going to drive specific U.S. policy on Iran or North Korea, especially without full access to government intelligence.[16]

---

[15] Valerie M. Hudson and Andre M. den Boer, *Bare Branches: The Security Implications of Asia's Surplus Male Population* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2004); Michael Horowitz, "The Spread of Nuclear Weapons and International Conflict: Does Experience Matter?," *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 53, no. 2 (2009): 234-257.

[16] While this particular example focuses on US government policy, the general appoint is applicable to other governments, NGOs, or whatever the relevant policy community of interest is on a given question.

Academic research can provide in-depth analysis of foreign policy trends but rarely transcends mere policy relevance; scholars leave it to the policy makers to apply the research to the issues of the moment. In these instances, however, policy makers then figure out whether the particular case they are dealing with, e.g. Russia's invasion of Eastern Ukraine, fits the baseline and gives them useful information. That is to say, the policy maker is taking policy relevant research and making it policy actionable. For example, understanding that democracies generally do not fight each other, the phenomenon known as the democratic peace, could help shape policy maker expectations about whether a given dispute between two democracies will escalate into violence, all other things being equal, thus influencing a policy response.[17]

In some situations, policy relevant writing can be actionable in theory but not in practice. For example, arguing that the United States should withdraw from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) is a specific policy recommendation, but it is not a realistic recommendation given the strong commitment of the United States to remaining in NATO. However, it can still be useful for agenda setting or generating dialogue.

Policy actionable writing goes beyond literature that is simply policy relevant. Policy actionable writing takes political and bureaucratic realities into account and translates policy relevant material into policy actionable recommendations, engaging directly with foreign policy or other relevant debates, depending on the audience.[18]

Scholars can take measures to facilitate their effective participation in the foreign policy making process, rendering their research more policy actionable. First, they can provide input on policy revisions according to a set public timeline. For example, major development initiatives like the Millennium Development Goals, and now the Sustainable Development Goals, or framing documents such as the State Department's Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review require regular milestones and updates that provide natural input points. Secondly, academics can

---

[17] Bruce M. Russett, *Grasping the Democratic Peace : Principles for a Post-Cold War World* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1993).

[18] For example, on arming Ukraine, see Kimberly Marten, "Why Arming Ukraine Is a Bad Idea," *The Washington Post: Monkey Cage*, August 7 2014, https://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/monkey-cage/wp/2014/2008/2007/why-arming-ukraine-is-a-bad-idea/.

influence policy debates by developing personal relationships and fostering open dialogues that prioritize confidentiality and respect. Academics can create these relationships and networks by reaching out to different audiences that might include alumni networks, Capitol Hill staff, international organizations, and even private firms. Universities can also create platforms for public discussion on campus by hosting foreign policy officials. Finally, campaigns and transition teams allow space for thinking about new ideas, and academe can seize on those openings to transmit and shape new ideas.

In order to shape policy outcomes, it is important to identify influential actors and strategically target audiences based on their interests and required time horizons. It is also important to speak multiple cross-sectoral languages and not simply consider issues of government policy. Business, media, and NGOs are growing more powerful in their capacity to influence foreign policy (e.g., philanthropic spending is larger than the USAID budget) and do not have the constraints of government. Academics may want to consider areas in which academic research can benefit corporations and large foundations (e.g., anti-corruption). It is important to consider regularly how to engage new audiences and facilitate new interactions among those audiences, which can be a source of innovation.

Recommendations

The Global Innovations Institute at Perry World House will be poised to build a bridge between Penn and the world through its global research themes and by offering the University of Pennsylvania's talented scholars opportunities to contribute to foreign policy debates.

The Global Innovations Institute should produce a variety of content that can address the high demand for translating complex issues into accessible language. Policy makers in governments, NGOs, international organizations, and other groups deal with disparate issues and often encounter difficulty addressing complex structural issues while dealing with a paucity of time and resources. Scholars seeking to influence policy should first aim to understand stakeholder concerns and identify the audiences that have overlapping interests. Overall, policy makers have a strong reliance on

informal outreach to trusted personal networks. Academics can proactively reach out to senior policy makers to promote new ideas or bolster existing approaches.

The Global Innovations Institute should capitalize on the University of Pennsylvania's reputation for rigorous research and actively advocate for new ideas across audiences. In addition, the Global Innovations Institute should convene discussions with diverse experts in a neutral space. Further, alumni represent a critical bridge between academia and the policy world, as well as a resource for students. Academic institutions should use their alumni base to cultivate relationships with policy makers and hold formal and informal events with policy makers.

One key responsibility of the Global Innovations Institute must be to stay abreast of important policy debates in ways that help affiliated academics make more meaningful contributions. Washington is ideologically polarized, and certain formats or genres may not conform well to a scholarly agenda. To be influential, scholars must understand and determine where certain ideas will fit within the great ideological debates playing out in the policy world and understand the partisan lenses that shape decisions.

Strategic partnerships with think tanks can help amplify ideas inside and outside the beltway, especially through rapid response social media. Think tanks now play more of an intervening role than ever before, and the Global Innovations Institute could build institutional linkages through internship programs for students, regularized cooperation, and other measures. In concert with the broader Perry World House mission, the Global Innovations Institute could also focus on skills development and networking for the next generation of academic and policy makers in an effort to build trust and long-term relationships.

Conclusion

The Global Innovations Institute at Perry World House can marshal the full range of Penn's collective intellect and expertise to address the central challenges of our world. The institute is part of a larger vision for the University of Pennsylvania that includes three central pillars: *inclusion* by increasing access to higher education with a focus on diversity and globalization; *innovation* through

integration of knowledge across interdisciplinary boundaries; and *social impact* at the local, national, and international levels. As a university, Penn seeks to prepare students for a globalized society, strengthen the institution as a global agenda setter, and promote healthy, inspiring, and productive lives for its international population.

Ultimately, Perry World House can help make academic ideas more salient in policy circles by producing output that is appropriate in form, scope, and content and by building and maintaining the networks through which ideas are promulgated. Perry World House can play a role in building diversity in scholarship, prioritizing interdisciplinary projects, and encouraging policy relevance.

Perry World House should develop strategic partnerships with other domestic and international universities and institutions, supporting dynamic global learning and leveraging technology to connect classrooms virtually. Effective policy intervention requires perspective on time horizon, framing, and personal relationships. Perry World House must understand the importance of engaging diverse audiences through interdisciplinary scholarship and outreach and playing a convening role both inside and outside the Beltway. It can serve to enhance partnerships within Penn and promote collaborations with fellow centers, universities, think tanks, governments, and others in the policy space.

Appendix A: Description of Some Existing International Affairs Academic Institutes and Think Tanks

By examining other international affairs institutes, Perry World House can learn from and build on existing efforts to bridge the gap between academia and policy, adding to the dialogue on lessons learned and new approaches to addressing today's challenges. What follows is an assessment of some larger and more established institutions at prominent universities that are already engaged:

Princeton Institute for International and Regional Studies (PIIRS), Princeton University
PIIRS defines itself as an academic studies institute that does not aspire to be a foreign policy think tank or public policy school. Its goal is to foster an interdisciplinary space that promotes innovative research and learning and dialogue on issues of global importance. The center provides funding for activities that advance global comparative sciences and support interdisciplinary conversations across and between societies, as well as for scholarships that provide resources and staffing for academic areas without endowments. International relations, history, and area studies are critical complementary fields, and PIIRS believes that centers must understand and promote comparative and regional perspectives to be successful. PIIRS also trains scholars and students as global citizens by furthering international research networks. It supports interdisciplinary research committees that focus on various global challenges, an international and visiting fellowship program, and a study abroad program. PIIRS's foundational approach lies in an agenda focused on faculty-driven research and solutions and suggests caution at replicating the work of think tanks.

Weatherhead Center for International Affairs, Harvard University
The Weatherhead Center seeks to promote scholarship and dialogue on transnational issues. The center plays a philanthropic role by supporting faculty proposals for research clusters that are faculty-led and student-researched. The interdisciplinary program also supports a community of scholars through undergraduate study abroad programs and grants and hosts a practitioner/scholar in-residence program for diplomats, NGO leaders, and journalists, among others. Weatherhead leverages convening power to sustain dialogue over the course of the academic year by providing space and funding for work that would not otherwise be done. Weatherhead suggests that Perry

World House focus on ensuring information sharing across academic disciplines and provide space for in-residence fellows to engage in cross-sectoral collaboration.

Columbia Global Policy Initiative, Columbia University

The Columbia Global Policy Initiative has a think tank-like approach that is focused on solutions-oriented outputs based on the client's focus. It follows a longer term time horizon for multidisciplinary research centered on expertise at Columbia (e.g., freedom of expression with the legal community and journalists). The initiative is distinct due to the university's rich international studies and policy making environment (e.g., SIPA, Earth Institute, regional institutes) and support for adventurous academics who are willing to take on topics that might have been lost in bureaucracy. Its location in New York City lends the advantage of proximity to world leaders but has the disadvantage of a competitive think tank landscape. The Columbia Global Policy Initiative suggests that Perry World House determine what makes it unique based on Penn's own academic and geographic advantages.

Center for International Studies, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Established in 1951, the Center for International Studies is one of the longest-serving centers for international scholarship. It seeks to integrate natural sciences in policy, mobilize technical expertise in an international context, and advance security studies. The center supports an international education program through the MIT Science and Technology Initiative, sending undergraduate students abroad to work in engineering, sciences, or emerging technologies labs. It also furthers interdisciplinary conversations through a program on privacy, surveillance, and secrecy, partnerships with NGOs that have outreach capability, and research that supports and complements social, humanitarian, and policy initiatives.

Appendix B: Potential Issues for Engagement by the Global Innovations Institute

Effective long term analysis should occur, as Secretary of State Dean Acheson noted, "[B]eyond the vision of the operating officers caught in the smoke and crises of current battle; far enough ahead to see the emerging form of things to come and outline what should be done to meet or anticipate them."[19] There are several key issues around which experts are calling for policy innovation. These issues are particularly conducive to the research produced in universities, and they should alert scholars to the types of research that will continue to be policy relevant for the foreseeable future.

The Future of the International System

Conversations at the Perry World House Experts' Meeting underscored two competing schools of thought about the international system. One paradigm suggests that there is an intact global order with no existential threats; the other finds that we are on the verge of a total revision in global world order. Globalization holds fundamental implications for each of the key areas for policy innovation. As the future of the international system becomes increasingly unclear and authoritarians rise, academics can provide clarity on whether the world can or should maintain multilateralism or return to the approaches of balance of power and spheres of influence between nations. The nature of warfare is also in question and seems to be moving towards a grey area of hyper warfare and provocation short of war, as powerful actors attempt to build influence through civil society infiltration (Russia), challenge maritime/air norms (China), and provide destabilizing state-sponsored support for terrorist organizations (Iran).

Democracy versus Authoritarianism

Challenges to democracy are emerging as authoritarian regimes learn from each other and clamp down on civil society advocacy and unrest. Can and should governments actively attempt to tilt the balance towards democratic movements? Further exploration is required to understand the implications of governance on the growing middle class in developing countries. In particular, does

---

[19] Dean Acheson, *Present at the Creation: My Years in the State Department* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1969), p. 214.

this group prioritize democracy and human rights or is it more interested in economic opportunity? Scholars must continue to consider what comprises a capable state, especially for those that may not fit specific models of governance, such as democracy or authoritarianism.

Technology Implications

Geographic configuration limits linkages between Silicon Valley and Washington. Washington must be proactive in gauging the security aspects of emerging technologies in areas such as biotech and big data, which have long-range (35 years) security implications. The industry has a deep mistrust of government regulation and maintains opacity on new innovations, while the intelligence community is poorly suited to react to emerging threats, because they have not been following technological innovation; this creates potentially disastrous implications for cyber security coordination. Technology firms are not inclined to think about the broader social impact of what they are producing, and there are many ethical questions that require multidisciplinary attention.

New communication tools are also shaping the content and speed of policy analysis in the public and government spheres. Given the burgeoning use of social media in an open democracy, questions arise about operating a stove-piped bureaucracy when the public conversation is making determinations far ahead of the policy deliberations. Washington is slow to embrace technological innovations and to recognize the growing importance of social media outlets for informing policy decisions. Both industry and academe have a strategic advantage of tech savvy scholars and equipment that governments can and should leverage to make sound, data-driven, public policy decisions.

Population Shifts

Finally, academe should address economic, demographic, and geographic trends that are reshaping a pluralistic global society. With increasing income inequality and youth unemployment, new notions of sustainable capitalism and international development raise questions about prosperity and the relationships between interconnected markets, nations, and multilateral institutions. The emergence of sharing economy also has implications for urban populations' views on capitalism, as technology

facilitates greater consciousness and participation in those economies, particularly in developing countries. Meanwhile, urbanization might advance economic prosperity, but it also presents a variety of other challenges to society, for example, through cyber security, environmental risks, and various forms of urban inequalities. As some industrialized nations face the social implications of aging, developing countries are confronting a youth bulge. Innovations in human and material sciences are changing longevity and challenging bioethics, with related security implications.