

May 1977

INSTITUTE FOR POLICY STUDIES

(Executive Summary)

The Institute for Policy Studies (IPS) is an avowedly radical organization formed in 1963 by Richard J. Barnet and Marcus G. Raskin, both of whom had backgrounds of government employment. Barnet had worked for the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, while Raskin had worked for several members of Congress and for the National Security Council. Along with Barnet and Raskin, the most prominent IPS figure has probably been Resident IPS Fellow Arthur I. Waskow, who served at one time as a legislative assistant to Congressman Robert Kastenmeier of Wisconsin. All three have also been noticeably active in radical movements, including the anti-Vietnam war movement; Barnet traveled to Communist North Vietnam during the war, and both Barnet and Raskin were reported to have had contact with representatives of the Communist government of Hanoi in Paris during the same period.

The Institute exists to influence the formation of public policy, and it operates to this end as a tax-exempt, non-profit organization incorporated in the District of Columbia. Support for IPS programs over the years has come from several colleges and universities and from a number of major tax-exempt foundations, including the Ford Foundation, the Samuel Rubin Foundation, the Field Foundation, the Commonwealth Fund, and the Stern Family Fund. It appears that the major single contributor at this point is the Samuel Rubin Foundation, which is reported to have contributed an amount equal to half the IPS operating budget in 1975. The Institute has a budget of approximately \$1,000,000 at present as compared to \$177,432.82 for its first full year of operation (1963-1964).

IPS has maintained a close relationship with several universities and colleges, including, at various times, the State University

IPS seminars and conferences have been characterized by participation from diverse sections of American life, especially government, organized labor, and the education and other professions. A number of Congressmen and Congressional aides have spoken at IPS conferences, and several of the members of Congress associated with IPS programs over the years have been prominently identified with activities of the influential and liberal Members of Congress for Peace Through Law (MCPL).

INSTITUTE FOR POLICY STUDIES

INTRODUCTION

The Institute for Policy Studies (IPS) was first incorporated in Washington, D.C., in November 1962; it did not begin operations, however, until October 1963. An official IPS publication, The First Three Years of the Institute for Policy Studies, 1963-1966, stated that

The Institute for Policy Studies, which opened in October 1963, is an independent center for research, education, and social invention on public policy problems in Washington, D.C. The Fellows of the Institute sometimes begin from theoretical analyses of social change and work toward the application of theory to a particular social problem; sometimes they begin from the perception of a specific social issue and work toward the construction of theory. Frequently the Fellows try to test theory by experimenting with "social inventions"-- that is, practical projects that try to deal with an important social difficulty. From the success or failure, or unexpected results, of these projects the Fellows then try to develop a new understanding of social change.

The same publication asserted that the IPS "guards the freedom of the Fellows to be critical and creative by refusing government contracts and consultantships, although its Fellows do often (without pay) advise government agencies and governmentally financed projects." As will be seen at a later point in this study, IPS programs have been characterized over the years by a heavy degree of participation on the part of people from Congressional offices and from agencies of the executive branch of government.

That IPS has always been inseparable from governmental concerns in its basic conception is clearly indicated by the following passage taken from another Institute publication, Beginning the Second Decade, 1963-1973:

The Institute for Policy Studies was formed by a group of men each of whom had come to Washington between 1958 and 1962 to work in or on the edges of government. In their work and in talking with each other, they found that their experiences and efforts in Washington changed their views of government and society. These men were in their 20s and 30s, all were white, all were university-trained. They had come to Washington believing that the American governing process was mostly responsive to public pressure

and public needs; they found that the government was chiefly responsive to institutional interests that were divorced from public need. They wondered whether the major institutions of American life had not become inimical to the life and safety of the public. They had come believing that their educations were reasonably accurate in describing the United States -- even in describing "human behavior"-- and reasonably helpful in providing analytical tools by which to understand both; they discovered that both descriptions and analytical tools had to be totally remade if they were to be able to understand the world of policy, politics and power. But most important, they did not shrug off their discoveries; they listened carefully to the changes within them and decided to act upon them.

BASIC AIMS OF IPS

The above passage indicates two essential things about the IPS and its reason for being. It indicates that the Institute's founders hoped to have an impact upon governmental policy, and it indicates that the Institute's founders hoped that this impact would be a radical one. The rhetoric of IPS publications is always couched in radical terms, bespeaking a fundamental dissatisfaction with the very bases of American society and government; indeed, it is not unfair to say that the rhetoric of IPS and its leaders bespeaks an essentially revolutionary perspective on our society and the means required to cure its presumed ills -- an outright rejection, if one prefers, of our society, our government, and our economic system.

Such a perspective is reflected in the following passage taken from Beginning the Second Decade, referring again to the "group of men" whose concerns had led to the founding of IPS:

 Their action focused around two perceptions:
 -- that government had become unresponsive and destructive in large part because all fresh political ideas and moral truths were smothered in the bureaucratic process; and
 -- that the universities were churning out false images and ideas because they insisted that social action be kept totally distinct from social theory except where it served the status quo.

The linking of social theory and social action has always been central to the rationale for IPS, a fact indicated by the same

publication's emphasis "on the premise that social theory must be informed by, as well as inform, social action." Tied to this belief is an equally strong belief that the American university has failed to produce scholarship sufficiently radical to cause or at least aid meaningful change in our political, social, and economic life. A mimeographed five-page publication, The Institute for Policy Studies, issued shortly before the formal opening of IPS in 1963, set forth the following with respect to what the new organization would be:

The Institute for Policy Studies has recently been established in Washington, D.C. It will bring university scholars and other creative thinkers to the Capital to carry on research on key problems of public policy and American civilization under conditions permitting close contact with the policy making process. The Institute will also train younger scholars to carry on research in these areas.

IPS AND THE ACADEMIC COMMUNITY

The same prospectus reflects a concern with what the founders of IPS saw as "relationships between government and the academic community" that are "either too close to or too far from the operations of government." In either case, the result was seen as harmful to the advancement of proper public policy aims. Such "too-close associations" as consultantships and contract research, it was argued, tend to convert academicians into "supporters of government policies, rather than critics [emphasis in original]," so that scholars "are not -- or do not feel -- invited to challenge existing policy (especially the basic premises) much less to suggest or prepare alternatives." Contrarily, researchers and institutions "too far from the operations of government" suffer from possibly being "out of touch with the changing ways in which government actually operates, and may transmit, both in their writings and their curricula, an out-of-date or largely theoretical picture" of policy formation and the interplay of political and administrative forces [emphasis in original].

The aim, with respect to American higher education, was to be "a growing corps of teachers, researchers, and scholars, who will return to their respective universities with a more sophisticated and realistic awareness of how government really operates," such awareness to be reflected in both teaching and writing, including the writing of social science textbooks. The hoped-for "new curricula" would bear down on "real problems" in government and society, encouraging students "to be more policy and solution-minded." In other words, the goal was an educational process

that fed from, and in turn stimulated, radical social and political activism; thus, the IPS prospectus could assert that an "effort will be made to avoid research which is primarily of value to the development of particular academic disciplines." This view is buttressed by the following statement from the same publication:

(d) It [IPS] will also, in the process, produce a body of new knowledge in the field of political and social science -- not merely ivory-tower, abstract knowledge that disregards existing institutions and forces, but, hopefully, knowledge practically enough grounded to point to the how as well as the what of solutions to difficult public problems [emphasis in original].

IPS AND GOVERNMENT

As already indicated, a primary goal of the IPS program, including the Institute's concentrated efforts among academics, was to be impact on the policy-making processes of government in the interests of a radical transformation of American society. Thus, it would be necessary to maintain maximum contact with government personnel as well as with academic types. The following language, drawn from the Encyclopedia of Associations, is reflective of the interaction contemplated:

..."Center of intellectual activity in which scholars and government officials can exchange ideas and collaborate on some of the problems most critically in need of new thought." Appoints fellows who frame the research questions they pursue and are able to take independent and critical positions. Work of the fellows has three basic goals: "to study the governmental process at first hand to describe more adequately the social, political, and economic reality within which major public problems must be considered; to fashion possible solutions to some of these problems; and to consider how these solutions might be put into effect through the institutions of society." Sponsors seminars, conferences, and lectures.

RADICAL PERSPECTIVE OF IPS

That the "possible solutions" were to be radical ones is made clear in a detailed discussion published in the Spring 1968 issue of the leftist journal New University Thought. This article has particular significance because it was written by Arthur Waskow, perhaps the most prominent of all IPS Fellows

since the Institute's formation. Waskow's credentials as an extreme radical activist are beyond cavil. He has been associated with such militantly radical movements as Students for a Democratic Society and the most pro-Hanoi and disruptive segments of the Communist-dominated "peace" movement during the Vietnam war. As he stated in the 1968 article, "I have a gut preference for disorder," and this preference has characterized his entire career as a radical scholar and activist.

The Waskow article provides the following insight -- from the inside, so to speak -- into just what IPS was intended to be:

...The Institute is not just an ordinary research center because it's committed to the idea that to develop social theory one must be involved in social action and in social experiment. And therefore, the Institute stands on the bare edge of custom in the United States as to what an educational research institution is, as against what a political institution is. By standing on that bare edge, it creates tension.

The result of this "tension" will, in Waskow's view, be what he calls "creative disorder." This creative disorder can be used to aid in the development of revolution, hopefully on an international scale. Waskow is much concerned, for example, with whether "the underclass of the world is going to be able to create an effective social technology of rebellion. The possibility exists; that is clear. Whether it works, whether it becomes real, is not clear [emphasis in original]." Waskow's view of means and ends, as explained in the same article, is especially instructive:

The procedure I have outlined offers one way of coping with the traditional problem of means and ends. In effect, it says that the means are the ends or that the ends become the means. In a sense it is the ends that justify the means but only by becoming merged with them. If one has identified an end goal which one considers desirable, then if one translates that goal bodily into the present as a means to the achievement of the end, one has avoided the problem of judging whether certain means are legitimate to achieve certain ends [emphasis in original].

IPS FINANCING

As stated at the outset, the Institute for Policy Studies, in its own words, "opened in October 1963." It had, however, been formally incorporated in the District of Columbia in November 1962.

During the intervening months, the Institute's founders gathered money from a variety of sources with a view to starting operations. As IPS later described it, "By the fall of 1963 they had been able to bring together enough money from small and middle-sized foundations to open the Institute for Policy Studies. They also secured the help and support of a group of colleges and universities." The same publication, Beginning the Second Decade, particularly acknowledges "an initial major grant from the Stern Family Fund," in addition to the following principal sources:

- * the Bernstein Foundation and a bequest from Dan Bernstein,
- * the Fontaney Corporation,
- * the Janss Foundation,
- * Irving F. Laucks,
- * the Rubin Foundation,
- * the San Francisco Foundation,
- * the Sperry family,
- * the late James P. Warburg and the Warburg family, and
- * the Field Foundation.

The "group of colleges and universities" from which assistance was received included the State University of New York at Stony Brook, the University of California at Berkeley, Cornell University, the University of Illinois, Reed College, Antioch College, Tougaloo College, and Virginia Theological Seminary. Over the years, the Institute has maintained an especially close relationship with Antioch College, whose president, James Dixon, was among the earliest Institute trustees.

Other sources of significant financing for IPS which have been identified include the following:

- * the Ford Foundation,
- * the Institute for International Order,
- * the Society for the Psychological Studies of Social Issues,
- * the National Board of the Presbyterian Church,
- * the Cudahy Fund,
- * Jennifer Cafritz,
- * Watts E. Meyer,
- * Michael Gellert,
- * the Commonwealth Fund,
- * the Jacob Ziskind Trust,
- * the Palisades Foundation, and
- * Community Research and Development, Inc.

Support of a different sort has been derived from various publishers who have issued a stream of volumes written by IPS personnel and associates over the years. In addition, information

has been developed which indicates that in 1966, at least \$6,500 was contributed to IPS by the Louis M. Rabinowitz Foundaton, an organization known to be a major source of funds for extreme radical and, in some cases, outright pro-Communist groups.

The Institute for Policy Studies describes itself as "a non-profit, tax-exempt educational institution incorporated in the District of Columbia" and is classified as a 501(c)(3) organization under the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. Thus, contributions made to the IPS are tax-deductible. The Institute's budget has grown considerably since 1963, as shown by a number of sources available. The Institute's own statement of expenses for the fiscal year ending on September 30, 1965, showed total expenses of \$213,878.36 and a projected budget for the 1965-66 academic year of \$220,000.00; the budget projected by the IPS co-directors for the 1966-67 academic year was \$238,000.00. IPS tax returns for taxable years ending September 30, 1964, and the same day in 1965, 1966, 1967, and 1968 reflect the following total expense figures: \$177,432.82 (1964); \$213,878.36 (1965); \$255,109.41 (1966); \$363,321.51 (1967); and \$359,858.31 (1968). A "Cash Flow-1968" statement on the IPS letterhead revealed that "The Institute requires approximately \$32,000. each month," or \$384,000 per year. Early in 1970, a source estimated that the IPS budget had reached approximately \$400,000 per annum. The most recent indication has been an article in the Washington Post for January 23, 1977, in which it was stated:

The institute's federal tax return for 1975 shows that many of its major supporters during the '60s -- the Stern Family Fund, the Daniel J. Bernstein Foundation, the Janss Foundation -- had reduced their contributions to \$50,000 or less. The largest single grant -- \$450,000, nearly half the IPS operating budget -- came from the Samuel Rubin Foundation in New York....

Thus, the Institute for Policy Studies has gone from a total expense figure of \$177,432.82 for the October 1, 1963-September 30, 1964 year (its first full year of operation for tax purposes) to an operating budget that today approaches \$1,000,000. Further, as indicated by the Washington Post article, a single donor -- the Samuel Rubin Foundation -- contributed, by itself, more money in 1975 than it took to operate the entire Institute in 1970; in fact, based on the available data, it would appear that IPS at least doubled its budget from 1970 to 1975 alone.

IPS FOUNDERS

When IPS was incorporated in November 1962, there were three trustees listed on the certificate of incorporation. They were David Riesman, professor of political science at Harvard University, who later served as an IPS Visiting Fellow, and Marcus

Raskin and Richard J. Barnet, co-directors of IPS since its inception. Along with Arthur Waskow, Barnet and Raskin are probably the best-known of all IPS personnel and the most intimately identified with the Institute's efforts. All three men were, prior to the founding of IPS, connected with the government at some point; and all three seem to share a similarly radical perspective on many issues.

A complete tabulation of available data on the radical backgrounds of all those associated with IPS over the years would obviously be far beyond the scope of a study such as this. However, because it is fair to say that the Institute for Policy Studies has been since its inception a reflection, in a very real sense, of Raskin, Barnet, and Waskow, the following information is essential to any informed understanding of what IPS is intended to be.

RICHARD J. BARNET

Richard J. Barnet, Co-Director of the Institute for Policy Studies, has been a fellow of the Center for International Studies at Princeton and of the Russian Research Center at Harvard. In 1961, he was appointed a Foreign Affairs Officer in the Department of State's Disarmament Administration; he subsequently became Deputy Director of Political Research for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Barnet has been an Advisor for the Council for a Liveable World, a leftist pressure group that was the third-highest spender of the lobbying organizations which filed reports in 1968. The Council reportedly takes credit for assuring the original election victory of Senator George McGovern by having its membership contribute some \$22,000 to the Senator's campaign.

In February 1969, Barnet served as a speaker at the Third National Mobilization of an organization known as Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam (CALCAV), a militantly anti-Vietnam war group described by the House Committee on Internal Security as having "given aid and support to American deserters abroad" during the course of the war in Southeast Asia. CALCAV was among the active organizational components of a succession of anti-Vietnam war coalitions the blatant Communist control or domination of which was thoroughly documented in Congressional hearings and reports over a period of many years.

It was reported that in March 1969, Barnet participated in talks in Paris with negotiators from Hanoi and from the National Liberation Front, the Hanoi-run instrumentality through which the Communists were fighting to take over all of Vietnam.

