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Welcome and Introductory Remarks

Charles Wolf, Jr.

Ladies and gentlemen; graduating fellows; parents, spouses, relatives, and friends of the graduates; Provost Condoleezza Rice; distinguished honorees; President James Thomson; members of the RAND Graduate School faculty and student body; alumni of the School; and other members of the RAND family and friends – good morning, and welcome!

It is a privilege and pleasure for me to welcome you to the RAND Graduate School’s ninth commencement exercises, which coincide with the 25th anniversary of the School’s establishment at RAND.

In light of this quarter-century anniversary and also because “commencements” are implicitly semantically associated with beginnings, it may be especially fitting to spend a few moments in 1995 reflecting on how and why the RAND Graduate School began in 1970. How did this unusual educational institution come to be part of the unusual institution that is RAND?

RAND’s original articles of incorporation established as the institution’s goals: “to further and promote scientific, educational, and charitable purposes, all for the public welfare and security of the United States of America.”

From RAND’s inception in 1948, the institution has had close connections with academia. Half of the professional staff typically have had doctoral degrees. Many were recruited directly from universities where they held faculty appointments or were graduate students. Several dozen staff members concurrently taught at neighboring universities, and most of RAND’s several hundred consultants
were university professors. Also, RAND pioneered in developing and offering a widely publicized and comprehensive systems-analysis training course for government and service personnel. Typically and frequently, publications by RAND authors appear in academic journals, and RAND staff members have regularly participated in, as well as organized, academic conferences and symposia. Also, RAND has had several dozen graduate students as summer interns since the early 1950s. (Among those who participated in this stellar internship program were today’s commencement speaker [Condi Rice], RAND’s senior vice president and chairman of the present RGS Admissions Committee, Michael Rich, and the former dean of the Kennedy School at Harvard, Graham Allison).

So, RAND’s institutional atmosphere and culture have always had many of the attributes associated with university life: research, seminars, publications, and even frequent controversies among staff members! Indeed, one of the objections voiced in the 1970s by some who opposed the establishment of a formal educational effort at RAND was that we already had all the benefits of university life without students, so why add their troubling presence?

In this connection, you will recall that in the late 1960s, when the founding of RGS was being considered, the Vietnam War was under way, and serious student-related troubles pervaded American universities—the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) movement was in full swing at Berkeley; student activists occupied the offices of the presidents of the University of Chicago, Harvard, and Cornell, and the tragic shootings at Kent State University had occurred.

Another part of the relevant background was an important policy statement issued by the National Science Foundation in 1969, in which
NSF stressed the nation’s critical need for scientifically trained, interdisciplinary analysts, technically equipped to address the country’s serious and complex domestic policy problems, as well as our national security policy problems.

Against this background, RAND’s second president, Harry Rowen, appointed at the beginning of 1970 an Educational Advisory Committee to consider whether RAND should undertake a formal educational effort in response to the National Science Foundation’s pronouncement and in the context of the major domestic and international problems and challenges facing the United States. Harry appointed me, then head of RAND’s Economics Department, as chairman of the committee. Other members of the Committee included Fred Ikle, head of the Social Science Department; Yehezkel Dror also of that department; Lloyd Shapley of the Mathematics Department; Milt Weiner of the Systems Sciences Department; Albert Latter, head of the Physics Department; and Leona Libby, also from the Physics Department; Cullen Crain from the Engineering Sciences Department; Harvey Averch and Bob Slighton from the Economics Department; Mario Juncosa from Computer Sciences; and Carl Gazley from Environmental Sciences. (We had a lot of departments at RAND in those days!)

Beginning early in 1970, the Committee pursued an intensive schedule of internal meetings and outside discussions to consider the establishment of a formal degree-granting educational program at RAND—the pros and cons, risks and opportunities, costs and benefits. A subcommittee discussed and formulated the broad outlines of a graduate policy analysis curriculum, including on-the-job training as an explicit and unique feature.
The Committee also had extensive discussions with the faculty of the then-aborning public policy graduate program at the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard, including the possibility of collaboration between the two institutions, perhaps with the academic, classroom part of the curriculum to be conducted at the Kennedy School, while on-the-job training and dissertation work would be conducted at RAND.

Harry Rowen and I also had several discussions with Harold Brown, who was then president of Cal Tech, and with Professor Bill Libby and Chancellor Charles Young at UCLA, about the possibility of a joint effort between RAND and one or another of those institutions, as well. Harold, who was then, as now, strongly supportive of the idea of a RAND graduate school, made it quite clear that the problems of consultation, concurrence, and shared control between Cal Tech’s academic senate and RAND would pose difficult and maybe insuperable obstacles to formal educational collaboration between the two institutions.

In July 1970, the Educational Advisory Committee made a report to RAND’s Management Committee with the following conclusions endorsed by a large majority of the committee members, although not by all.

First, RAND had a significant opportunity to make a national contribution to higher education in this field – one that would be closely congruent with the purposes set forth in RAND’s corporate charter, as well as directly responsive to the NSF policy statement I referred to earlier.

Second, central to this opportunity, RAND could provide a unique environment for coupling applied “on-the-job training” in policy analysis, with formal academic training.
Third, if RAND were to proceed, its efforts should be confined to a doctoral program, rather than adding to the numerous master’s degree programs under way or beginning at Harvard, Berkeley, Carnegie-Mellon, Michigan, and other institutions.

Finally, undertaking such an effort in collaboration with a neighboring university, or indeed with Harvard on the East Coast, would be a nonstarter, because the “transaction costs” associated with such a joint venture would be so large as to hinder progress on the substantive issues of curriculum development, faculty recruitment, budgeting, organization and management, and so on.

On July 29, 1970, this report was presented to and discussed with RAND’s Management Committee, which then, as now, served as a discussion and information body, having little to do with actual “management”! The ensuing discussion was predominantly positive and supportive, though not unanimous.

Harry Rowen strongly endorsed the report. He urged Fred Ikle or me to “volunteer” to serve as director of what was to be called The RAND Graduate Institute: RGI! He concluded that we should start the program as a pilot effort in the fall of 1970, with the initial student body consisting of a group of 9 or 10 members of the RAND staff who had master’s degrees, but not Ph.D.s, and who had already signified their interest in entering the program notwithstanding its uncertain and experimental character.

Harry Rowen scheduled a full discussion of the new effort at the November 1970 meeting of RAND’s Board of Trustees, to obtain Board confirmation. Concerning leadership of the effort, Fred and I agreed that I would “volunteer” for an initial term as director, to be followed
by Fred after a three or four-year interval. Two and a half years later, Fred accepted an appointment by President Nixon to become director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, thereby evading this RGI obligation!

The discussion at the Trustees' meeting in November 1970 was lively and controversial, generally supportive, although once again not unanimous. Perhaps unsurprisingly, the two trustees who expressed the strongest reservations, especially to the idea of RAND's awarding a formal degree, were university presidents—Jim Perkins at Cornell and, as our commencement speaker will be interested to know, Ken Pitzer, who was then president of Stanford. Anyhow, the Chairman of the Board, Newt Minow, and other trustees, including Phil Mosely, Caryl Haskins, Mike Ference, Frank Stanton, and Ed Huddleson, provided more than countervailing support for going ahead.

The minutes of that meeting attest to the Solomonic decision arrived at by the Trustees. With an artful blend of decisiveness, deferral, and diplomacy that would do credit to international negotiations, the Trustees: “found the RAND Graduate Institute experiment to be interesting and encouraged its continuance. Reservations were expressed concerning plans for granting degrees, and the staff was asked to explore thoroughly the experience of others before making a commitment to grant degrees.”

The Board received a status report on November 10, 1972, on the School's progress, and on April 14, 1973, the Board formally approved the RAND graduate program, including the awarding of doctoral degrees. Our formal accreditation by the Senior Accrediting Commission of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges followed shortly thereafter.
While this is a severely truncated account of the School’s establishment, it includes most of the essentials. In 1985, the RAND Graduate Institute had its name changed to the RAND Graduate School for a number of reasons which, in the interests of time, can be saved for elaboration at the tenth commencement!

I will conclude these brief remarks with a few facts about the School’s record and accomplishments to date.

The RAND Graduate School has, with today’s graduates, conferred 113 doctoral degrees in public policy analysis – the largest number of doctoral degrees in this field conferred by any of the several dozen graduate programs in the United States. The next largest one is the Kennedy School which has conferred 111 Ph.D.s in policy analysis since its inception. Carnegie-Mellon’s Heinz School of Public Affairs has conferred 93 doctoral degrees, and the Graduate School of Public Policy at Berkeley has conferred 47.

The RAND Graduate School now has an annual rate of Ph.D. completions in this field of eight or nine, slightly larger than the second largest, at Harvard’s Kennedy School.

Of course, quantity doesn’t bespeak quality. The School’s quality is amply attested by the contributions of its graduates to policy research, by the caliber of their dissertations, and by their career accomplishments. RGS dissertations have resulted in six commercially published books, a like number of published book chapters, and four or five dozen articles published in refereed professional journals or delivered at professional meetings and conferences.

In their subsequent careers, RGS graduates have made notable contributions to public policy in the Department of Health and Human
Services, the Department of Defense, the Congressional Budget Office, the Treasury Department, the United States Senate Staff (on both sides of the aisle), in state and local governments in California and Virginia, in foreign government agencies in Indonesia and Korea, at the World Bank, and in private industry and commerce, including the Aerospace Corporation, AT&T, EuroDisney, McGraw-Hill, McKinsey, Pfizer, Pacific Telesis, Trust Company of the West, and Teledyne.

We now have 70 students, compared with approximately 35 students in the RAND Graduate Institute at the time of our first commencement exercises in 1974; and 52 faculty members, compared with 29 at the first RGI Commencement. The School currently has 6 boards and committees to advise, counsel, and guide us, compared with only 2 in 1974 — surely a sign of growth and maturity.

Looking to the future — say, the next 5 rather than 25 years — one overriding goal for RGS is to provide ample and independent endowment funding for the School so its further progress is assured and insured against the uncertainties and oscillations in the financial support RAND receives from its clients and sponsors.

Many people have contributed generously of their time, effort, experience, and judgment over the first 25 years of the RAND Graduate School’s existence. I will mention only a few:

- The School’s faculty and students are, of course, at the center of these efforts. They are the mainsprings of the unique learning experience that the School’s curriculum and the larger RAND environment have provided.
• Many RAND staff members have provided invaluable mentoring and guidance, as well as financial support, for students’ OJT and dissertations.

• The elected Faculty Committee on Curriculum and Appointments, as well as the internal RAND Advisory Board, consisting of both faculty and student members, have provided informed and effective contributions to the School’s planning and decisionmaking.

• The members of our outside Academic Advisory Board, chaired by Yale law professor Leon Lipson, have dispensed wise counsel on the School’s activities. Through its semiannual meetings, this board has provided a strong link to the outside academic community, and has been an invaluable source of independent ideas, as well as reactions to our own ideas on curricular and other matters.

• RAND’s Board of Trustees and especially its Committee for the RAND Graduate School, under the rotating chairmanship of various of its members including Michael May, Lloyd Morissett, and Charles Zwick, have contributed significantly to overseeing and guiding the School’s progress and activities.

• The School’s administrative staff, under the able direction of Darlene Thomson, performs functions that, at most graduate schools, would absorb twice the person power while generating half the product.
I wish to also thank for their music-making the members of the RGS commencement quartet: Ms. Galina Zherdev (first violinist), Mr. Robert Matsuda (second violinist), Mr. Zain Khan (violinist), and RAND senior fellow, Ed Edelman (cellist) who is Senior Visiting Fellow at RAND and the RAND Graduate School as well as the cellist of the quartet and who has played a major part in organizing and programming the music that we have been privileged to hear.

Finally, RAND's presidents — Harry Rowen, Don Rice, through the 17 years of his noteworthy tenure at RAND and support for RGS, and Jim Thomson — have provided invaluable oversight, encouragement, and direct involvement in the School's activities. Jim Thomson has made singular contributions to the School's development and growth through his personal commitment to it and through his firsthand knowledge and understanding of RGS as a faculty member for four years, during which time he earned a not-always-appreciated reputation among the students as one of the School's toughest graders. As RAND's chief executive officer over the past six years, he has sustained and reinforced that reputation in evaluating RAND's own senior management.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is a pleasure for me to call upon RAND's President Jim Thomson to address you now and to introduce our commencement speaker.
Graduating fellows, honorees, Provost Rice, Dean Wolf, RAND colleagues and guests.

This is a special day for several reasons. To put first things first, it’s a special day because of our graduating fellows.

Any Ph.D. program is a challenge, but responding to the demands that RGS presents is a truly enormous achievement. I salute you for your career vision, your dedication, your intellectual accomplishments and, not least, your endurance in completing one of the toughest of professional survival courses. We may not have taught you to eat ants and grubs like Air Force Captain O’Grady, but you’ve been through almost everything else. Of course, given the traditional pay scale of graduate students, you may have had some of that kind of experience too.

I also want to salute the family members and friends of the graduating fellows who are here with us for this happy occasion. You’ve had to display dedication and endurance in your own right. You may have even subsidized that pay scale, for all I know. This is your day, too, because it’s your understanding and support that saw these fellows through. Let’s all acknowledge the contributions of the families and friends!

The second reason this graduation is special is because it puts the total number of Ph.D.s that the RGS has awarded since its inception over the century mark. As Dean Wolf has noted, the new total, including today’s degrees, is 113. The number isn’t important in itself, but it
epitomizes the fact that our doctoral program in policy analysis is the largest such effort in the country.

That leads me to the final reason why this ceremony is so distinctive — it’s the high point in our celebration of the RAND Graduate School’s 25th anniversary, its first quarter century of educational service to the nation. This is, by any measure, one of RAND’s proudest accomplishments. Dean Wolf has just given you the RGS story, although he’s also left out one important thing.

When it comes time to honor the RGS MVP, there’s no contest. The RGS 25th is also Charlie Wolf’s 25th anniversary as first director and now dean. The school bears his intellectual stamp. It has flourished under and because of his leadership. The fact that this is the country’s premier doctoral program in policy analysis is, in great part, his testimonial. Let no Harvard president forget it — I might add that they do, occasionally, but invariably repent after hearing from Charlie. Derek Bok told me so.

What did the founders do that made RGS unique?

For starters, they designed an extraordinarily rigorous course of study in the policy sciences, continuing to refine the core and adding specialized tracks as experience and national analytical needs dictated. These offerings and materials have had an influence all their own, permeating the curricula, coursework, and ethos of public policy programs elsewhere.

Alongside the academics, they required fellows to spend at least half their time in on-the-job training as members of ongoing RAND research project teams. As a result, RGS maximizes the comparative advantage provided by RAND’s research environment, gives fellows
significant professional experience, and encourages a continuous wedding
of theory and practice.

Still, why does this kind of training matter? What was there
about the situation in 1969 and 1970, when the RGS idea appeared and
jelled, that called for the education of more and better policy
analysts?

It was a period of ferment. It was a period when far-ranging
proposals were frequently mooted and often adopted. It was a period of
raucous debates over domestic and international affairs. The details
differ, but the resemblance to today’s scene is striking.

On the national security front, the Vietnam War was raging, our
strategic systems were in the throes of expansion and modernization, the
nation was locked in debate over a proposed ABM system, and Richard
Nixon’s China card was being secretly prepared in an effort to tilt the
balance of power.

Although the Cold War and containment policy were constant,
Vietnam and other challenges were forcing the policy community to
rethink diplomatic and defense issues in the light of a newfound sense
of limits, a profound public distaste for casualties, and a widespread
desire for an easing of international burdens. Sound familiar?

At home, anti-war fever and urban outbreaks rent the social
fabric. The cities were in fiscal straits. Medicare, still in its
infancy, already was producing worrisome, unforeseen cost overruns.
Health care reform was moving onto a fast lane that proved to be a dead
end. Above all, the proper role and extent of government was being
hotly questioned. Sound familiar?
Policy analysts cannot hope to resolve the conflicting political
values that underlie such upheavals. But that still leaves a vast space
in which highly trained analysts can and do improve the quality of
public and private sector policies. It was this space that the RGS
founders hoped to populate.

Turbulent times obscure vision and muddle discourse. And that is
precisely when analysis becomes most imperative. Why? Because it is
policy analysis that can best clarify and articulate goals. Because it
requires policy analysis to systematically identify and assess the
alternative strategies for reaching them. Because analysis can
anticipate many of the effects each of these options would engender. As
old programs come under fire and new ones take wing, analysis is there
to evaluate their costs and their benefits and to identify savings and
efficiencies.

Sometimes policy analysts can provide the simplest, yet most
important, things to a politically charged debate – facts. Political
debates often involve values, assertions, and facts. The policy
analyst’s job is to reduce the three categories to two – to eliminate
assertions and thereby increase knowledge. For this, they are valued,
but sometimes not loved.

Today, as in 1970, we are in ferment. If anything, the challenges
we face are even greater. But so are the opportunities for those with
the skills and tools you graduating fellows now command.

In the national security field, our plate is full. We are obliged
to rethink the nation’s most fundamental interests while formulating new
doctrines and strategies from the ground up. How do we maintain
American supremacy even as defense resources decline and weapons of mass
destruction proliferate? The good news is that the problems are big and exciting. Be grateful you don’t have to retrace the ins and outs of defending the Fulda Gap like some of your predecessors.

Domestically, it sometimes seems that change is taking place at a pace and in a manner that mocks the analytical enterprise. Washington looks to be reinventing – or is it eliminating? – government without us. In the health care sector, market forces are overhauling the system with a speed that appears to put MBAs in the drivers’ seats and policy analysts in the back of the bus. But look again.

The fact is that an era in which such basics as the role, size, and power of government are up for grabs is an era that cries out for objective thinking and rigorous, transparent inquiry. Assertions abound; facts are in short supply.

The debates won’t end tomorrow. As they proceed, clarification of goals and assessment of means will become more vital, not less.

Sweeping changes are being made. Their effects will have to be evaluated.

As for the health system, the MBAs will squeeze the cost balloon – and out will pop the problems of access and quality of care. Measuring these developments and weighing the tradeoffs is your job.

I’ve spoken about the nation’s continuing need for analysts and the magnitude of the contributions we count on you graduating fellows to make. But let me take a moment to express gratitude for those you already have made. I spoke earlier about the RAND research environment and how it benefits you. The flip side is the stimulation, intense effort, and creativity you have given us. Thank you.
One last word. In his final graduation speech as RAND’s president, Don Rice raised the possibility — the spectre some might say — of creating an alumni fund. It was such a good idea that I made it my own. And in just a few minutes, you’ll be eligible for membership. Charles Wolf may not like this, but here’s my suggestion: Forget the cost benefit analysis and give from the heart.

* * * *

The program indicates that I should now introduce our commencement speaker. But, I want to divert temporarily from that task. Many graduates have suggested that something special should be done to acknowledge Dean Wolf’s 25th anniversary. He would never permit anything of the sort, were he consulted. So, he was not.

I’ve asked Phil Romero, a 1988 RGS graduate, to represent all graduates by pulling together some thoughts on Dean Wolf’s 25 years. Phil, could you come up?
IN HONOR OF THE
25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE RAND GRADUATE SCHOOL
AND THE LEADERSHIP OF DEAN CHARLES WOLF, JR.

PHILIP J. ROMERO

Thank you, Jim. Let me introduce myself. I am a 1988 graduate of
RGS, currently serving as chief economist and national security advisor
to Governor Pete Wilson.

I was honored when Jim invited me to speak on behalf of all the
alumni, on the occasion of RGS’ 25th anniversary, to acknowledge and
thank Dean Wolf for his leadership and service to this institution.

Even referring to RGS as an “institution,” sounds more than a bit
strange to most of us alumni. For us, RGS is frozen in our memories as
a brash young upstart.

But just as men past a certain age are described as
“distinguished” and women as “handsome,” at age 25 RGS has now become an
“institution.” As Harry Rowen noted at the previous commencement, the
original experiment begun in 1970 has now been officially declared a
success. But as Dean Wolf has noted, in the beginning it was still an
experiment.

But no one knows better than Charlie Wolf how uncertain that
experiment was when it began back in 1970.

In his remarks this morning, Charlie outlined the history of RGS’s
foundation; what he didn’t mention were his own trepidations at that
time. He has written that “a number of us – myself included – were also
concerned about possible risks.”
When Charlie finally overcame his doubts I cannot say, but it was not before he reluctantly took charge of the new venture. As Charlie put it, “I hadn’t actually planned to run the experiment, but when Fred left RAND, I was holding the bag.”

Whatever prudent caution may have leavened Charlie’s optimism, it never showed to his students.

No one is more committed to bringing facts and logic to bear on the great decisions we as a society must make than Charlie, and therefore no one was better qualified to found and run an institution designed to train young scholars who share that vision.

In the ensuing 25 years, Charlie has maintained a truly remarkable commitment to public policy education. Standing with him throughout have been RAND’s presidents, Harry Rowen, Don Rice, and Jim Thomson; and RAND’s trustees like Lloyd Morrisett, who have never wavered in their support.

But Charlie’s leadership extends far beyond RGS to the entire discipline of policy analysis, overseas as well as in the United States.

He was instrumental in founding the Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management in the late 1970s, served on its policy council in the 70s and early 80s, including a stint as president.

He serves on the boards of several other graduate public policy education programs, including Carnegie-Mellon and UCLA. At RGS he acted as an informal advisor and mentor to virtually every student and alumnus in this room.

He has also served on numerous students’ dissertation committees, an experience many of us recall with, let’s say, fond ambivalence.
As a fellow student once told me, “RGS is a small school. This has two implications. The good news is that you can be closely supervised by the dean himself. The bad news is that you can be closely supervised by the dean himself.”

On a personal level, I think that two particular personality traits most influenced Charlie’s leadership of this once-risky, now-premier graduate school. Let me tell brief stories to illustrate each of them.

The first is that Charlie doesn’t simply teach and write about economics, he is a living example of homo economicus, rational economic man.

Peter DeLeon, a 1978 RGS graduate, tells the following story: “One day on the way to a tennis match, we were discussing that Mrs. Wolf was shopping around for the best price to get her car painted. She had shopped around and decided that Earl Schieb’s $29.95 price was the best all-around deal. I mentioned to Charlie that a friend of mine had been doing a similar price comparison and finally ended up paying $3,000 to have his car painted — that’s a one hundred-fold difference. Charlie, without even arching an eyebrow, immediately intoned: ‘Well, I’ve always said you couldn’t make interpersonal utility comparisons.’”

Charlie’s rationalist roots, by the way, go back to the very beginning of his career, long before RAND and the RGS. Hadi Soesastro, a 1978 graduate, reports that “In 1948 Charlie wrote a book called ‘The Indonesian Story...’ based on his time as a young American vice-consul who lived in Indonesia in 1946 and 1947...” “Charlie in those early days already had a clear idea of what makes a good and relevant analysis. In the preface to his book he explained that: ‘A sincere
effort has been made to be objective in the analysis; that is, to present each side of the controversy in its own terms and from its own point of view. Where value judgments have been made, I think they will stand out clearly as such to the reader."

The other trait is captured in a story, not about Charlie, but a man much like him, William Hewell, who was the master of Trinity College at Cambridge in the early 1800s. Hewell was well read in many subjects and could speak with authority on any topic of conversation that arose in the Trinity Senior Common Room, to the infuriation of some of his colleagues. To trump him, they gathered up a number of reference books, including an old encyclopedia, selected the obscure subject of Chinese musical instruments and studied it intensively for several days. During the after-dinner conversation the next Sunday, they introduced the topic. Those who weren’t in on the conspiracy were astonished at the unexpected erudition of their colleagues. Even Hewell remained silent for a while. Then, turning to one of the conspirators, he remarked, "I gather you have been reading the encyclopedia article on Chinese musical instruments I wrote some years ago."

Now, Charlie’s breadth of knowledge about economics and policy analysis is so vast that he rarely fails to awe his students. Those of you who are regular readers of The Wall Street Journal know that a week without a Charlie Wolf column is a week without economic enlightenment. But occasionally he surprised even those long accustomed to his versatility.

Greg Carter, RGS’s first graduate, in 1974, tells a story about one time when he and Charlie went to dinner in Brussels—and Charlie ordered his meal in fluent Flemish!
John F. Kennedy was fond of saying that “success has a hundred fathers, but failure is an orphan.” I think the graduates we are honoring here today, and those like me who have come before, will attest that we stand on the shoulders of giants. Our academic success did have a hundred fathers, but Charlie Wolf is—THE “GODFATHER!”

Let me close now not with my own words, but with those of two people who know Charlie’s profound influence on public policymaking.

First, I want to read a brief letter from Greg Rest, a 1986 RGS graduate, who is now chief legislative analyst for the state of Virginia’s equivalent of the congressional budget office.

As I read the letter, I’d like Charlie and Jim Thomson to join me so that I can next present them with a proclamation from Governor Wilson commemorating this important anniversary. From Greg:

“Dear Charlie: I always remember that if it weren’t for you and the RGS, I wouldn’t be where I am today—especially when I’m in a state prison or mental institution. (Luckily, it’s normally on legislative business, so I manage to get out sooner than the average inmate.)”

“The longer I’ve been away from RAND, the more I appreciate your vision and leadership in creating a highly innovative program of education. Every year it seems I benefit in some unexpected way. Congratulations on the completion of the first 25 years—may the next 25 continue to be as innovative and productive!”

Finally, it is my great honor to present the following proclamation from Governor Wilson, who has employed two RGS graduates as close advisors, to Charlie and to Jim Thomson, on behalf of RAND:

Whereas, in 1970 RAND founded the RAND Graduate School to teach advanced policy analysis techniques in an applied setting; and
Whereas, the RAND Graduate School has emerged as the premier Ph.D.
granting institution in the field of public policy education; and

Whereas, Dean Charles Wolf, Jr., founded the RAND Graduate School
and has continued to lead it throughout its formative years; and

Whereas, Dean Wolf continues to inspire students, alumni, and
interested observers of RGS by his trenchant research and writing on
international economics, security, and fiscal policy, and his sustained
high personal productivity; and

Whereas, 1995 is the 25th anniversary both of RGS’ founding and
Dean Wolf’s tenure as the leader of this institution that benefits all
Californians;

Therefore, I, Pete Wilson, Governor of California, hereby declare

Thank you.

* * * * *

Jim Thomson: Charles, on behalf of all of the graduates of the
RAND Graduate School and RAND itself, I want to give you this on their
behalf.

Charles Wolf: This is an unexpected honor and a surprise and I
appreciate the time, effort, and thought put into arranging it. Because
it is a surprise, it is all the more appreciated. But I don’t want it
to detract from the main purpose of this exercise which is to honor the
graduates, so the only other thought I would add is that if there is
close supervision by the Dean of the graduate fellows when they are in
RGS, I want to be clear that once they leave, I have no control over
them at all. Thank you very much.
INTRODUCTION OF CONDOLEEZZA RICE

JAMES A. THOMSON

As our commencement speaker this morning, we are delighted to welcome Dr. Condoleezza Rice.

In order of importance, Condi has been a RAND intern and consultant, special assistant to President George Bush for Soviet and East European Affairs at the NSC, a member of the Stanford University political science faculty, and a fellow of such other Stanford-based organizations as the Hoover Institution, the Institute for International Studies, and the Center for International Security and Arms Control. In 1986, while an international affairs fellow with the Council on Foreign Relations, she was a special assistant to the Director, Joint Chiefs of Staff.

She currently serves Stanford both as provost and as a professor of political science. She is also a valued member of the RAND Board of Trustees.

Condi took her undergraduate degree in political science from the University of Denver, her masters degree from Notre Dame, and her Ph.D. from Denver University’s Graduate School of International Studies. She is the author of several books and numerous articles on Soviet and East European foreign and defense policies and is a recognized authority on international relations and comparative politics.

It is important to note, however, especially on this occasion, that mentorship has been as high on her priority list as scholarship. She has repeatedly received Stanford’s highest award for excellence in teaching.

Condi, we are honored that you have chosen to address this commencement.

Friends and colleagues, Dr. Condoleezza Rice.
COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS

CONDOLEEZZA RICE

Thank you very much. Let me join in congratulating Charles Wolf and Jim Thomson and all of those who have nurtured the RAND Graduate School through this 25 years. As a member of the RAND Board of Trustees, I know that it is a great jewel in the crown of RAND, and I expect its excellence to continue for some time to come. The quality of today’s graduates is the reason that the RAND Graduate School is making its mark in our public policy debates. I also want to note what Jim said; that I am a specialist on Soviet and East European politics and defense policy, which shows what a dinosaur I really am. In fact, I wrote a book called The Soviet Union and the Czechoslovak Army, and neither of those countries actually exists today. So we have been through a really rapid and extraordinary period of change. In fact, the years during which these graduates whom we honor today have been here at RAND have been extraordinary.

This very year, this past spring, we have been commemorating the end of World War II; the sacrifice as well as the unifying experience of that great moral crusade. But in commemorating that war’s end, we need to remember that the hard work had really just begun - the rebuilding of Europe and much of Asia, decolonization, the creation of stable democracies in Germany and Japan that then became firm pillars of a more stable and prosperous world.

Fifty years later, we can see the successes of that era. There is no doubt that the community of prosperous and free nations grew and that old enemies joined in alliances and in friendship. Peace between them
flowed from the common values and aspirations of a democratic way of life.

The policymakers of that day managed the world with extraordinary aplomb. We owe them a great deal. When one looks back at what must have seemed in 1945 an utterly devastated world, destroyed by that most comprehensive of wars; where vanquished and victor lay equally devastated, one wonders how the leaders of the time found the strength, the energy, the insight, and the creativity to build the new world order. How did they know that democracy could spring from the soil of places where it had never taken root before — from German soil, from Japanese soil? Did they wonder aloud as we do today about Russia — whether democratic tradition is indeed a prerequisite for a democratic future? How did they know that an international economic system based on free trade could, unlike one in which everyone protected a fixed economic pie, actually grow and expand and make so much of the world richer? How did they manage to bring that prosperity home to America — not at the expense of others, but in concert with new friends, trading partners, and neighbors? How did they find a way to rally America and her people to a continuous and abiding engagement in the affairs and concerns of others a continent away? Were they that much smarter and more committed; was the world simpler?

I can tell you that I have asked myself those questions many times, and when I had the good fortune to serve in the Bush administration as the Cold War was ending, I probably asked myself those questions every day. Sometimes, in 1989 and 1990, the world seemed to be turned almost upside down. When I went to Washington, I never dreamed that I would return to a world in which Soviet forces were
withdrawing from Germany and from Eastern Europe, in which Germany was unified, and in which the Soviet Union was falling apart. From 1989 to 1991, so much was happening that it was hard to get one’s bearings. I can tell you that in 1989 I don’t even remember the Romanian Revolution. I know that it happened because Ceaucescu was shot or something like that, but we were busy. Germany was unifying, the Czech Republic was forming, the Soviet Union was breaking up as the Baltic States were declaring their independence. We couldn’t do everything. Romania was not so important under the circumstances. Contingency planning was of little use. We couldn’t keep up with the shifting tide every day.

In fact, one of my really extraordinary experiences – one of the telling experiences in government – was that I wrote what I thought was a really foresightful memo in October of 1989. I had just returned from a trip to Germany, and I came to the conclusion that German unification was back on the agenda. Before I could get the memo cleared through to the president, the wall came down, and I thought, okay, it’s now common wisdom.

From time to time, I read accounts of that period – some five years later – that treated the whole peaceful end of the Cold War as somehow inevitable. Let me tell you that the peaceful end to the Cold War was not inevitable, it was very difficult indeed.

Now, in 1995, we are still in the midst of that great and challenging transition. The Cold War’s end brought euphoria and hope: the images of German meeting German across the no-man’s land that had been the Berlin Wall, the celebration of democracy’s dawn in Poland, the velvet revolution in Czechoslovakia, the peaceful death of the Soviet Union as on Christmas night in 1991, the “Hammer and Sickle,” the flag
of the mighty empire, was lowered from atop the Kremlin for the last time. And more recently, the images of the old and sick in South Africa voting for the first time, voting with enthusiasm and pride for a future they will likely, personally, never see. The images were and are powerful, and they have not been forgotten, but they have certainly faded and given way to a kind of quiet despair; the despair of Bosnia, the despair of Rwanda. As we look ahead, the hard work never gets done.

The work is made harder because we have also turned inward to look at ourselves – at the state of democracy at home here in America. And there is much at stake here and abroad because people still look to America to see if a multiethnic democracy can work. During the Cold War, I sometimes chuckled to myself when American presidents talked of the United States as a beacon for democracy. Sometimes I was just plain embarrassed. I chalked it up to hyperbole, to bad speech-writing, or to both. But I want to tell you that as I traveled throughout Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union as the grip of totalitarian government slipped, I had to admit that the claim was true. You could see it in people’s eyes. You cannot know the strength of democracy’s pull, the pull of the dignity that comes with the right to say what you think, until you see it in the eyes of someone who has been denied that promise. And for so many, America was what I saw in their eyes.

But, I would protest, we have so much more to do in the United States. Ours is, after all, an imperfect democracy. It was imperfect at its birth. When the founding fathers said “We the people,” they did not mean me. To them, my ancestors were property, a fraction of a man. But therein lies the lesson. Democracy is a work in progress. The hard
work is begun again each and every day. As a matter of fact, for anything that is worth having, the hard work is done each and every day.

That then is the cycle of the human experience? Great changes are accompanied by euphoria and hope, but they give way to the hard work, the heavy lifting; hopefully, inching forward each time to include more and more of the human race in the community of democracy, prosperity, and peace.

As graduates of a program that tried to prepare you for a role in public policy or in the private sector, I want to encourage you to think for a few moments about the very special part in that heavy lifting that you may play. I want you to think about what makes policymakers successful because you will have to support them, and you may even have to make policy yourself. It’s a scary thought. But while policymaking is always hard, it is especially difficult yet rewarding in times of rapid change.

That we are uncomfortable with how well we are doing right now is abundantly clear. There is a lot of talk today, particularly among aficionados of foreign affairs, that our problem is that we have a lack of vision, a lack of a grand strategy somehow to equate containment, something to make sense of the world. I would submit to you that indeed containment looks better in retrospect than it did at the time. "Containment" was, in fact, just a kind of comment about the nature of the Soviet Union. It was George Kennan’s insight, a prescient one to be sure, that said if the Soviet Union could be denied the easy course of external expansion, it would have to turn back and deal with its own internal contradictions. And, indeed, that is precisely what happened. But, it was, at best, an insight about Europe. Applied to Southeast
Asia, it turned out to be a disaster called Vietnam. So I ask you, was it this insight that led to the victory of the West in the Cold War some 45 years later? Are we to pin all our hopes on insight and grand strategies?

To be sure, it is important to know where you want to go, but I actually think we know that. We want to increase the number of democratic states, to strengthen market economies in the search for international economic growth, to expand the zone of peace, and to do all of that in a way that strengthens rather than weakens America at home. And, we know, too, that we have to attend to America’s problems and make certain that more, not fewer, of our citizens are included in our collective future. The problem, of course, is how to get there.

To contribute to the achievement of both goals, I want to suggest that the policymaker certainly needs to be guided by principles and vision and a sense of where you want to go. But, in reality, that’s a small part of the problem. It is true in public policy, it is true in business, it is true for me at Stanford, as I worry about the future of the University. The problem is not where you want to go but how to make good strategic decisions that get you there, and secondly, to work day to day to support and further the strategic choices that you’ve made. For example, to make the world safe for democracy, or to keep America engaged in order to enlarge the community of democratic states, are fine statements of where we’d like to go, but they don’t tell us much about how to do it. Would you want to make the world unsafe for democracy or perhaps shrink the community of democratic states? Of course not. At the end of World War II, the leaders found a way to articulate their goals in a way that informed strategic choices. They knew, for
instance, that they wanted to tie U.S. security to that of Europe and Asia. That was an operational strategic choice on which the decisions to form the alliance that we call NATO, to deploy American troops abroad, and so on and so on, were made. Once that was done, the daily problem was to stay on track. In fact, when one thinks back on recent success, German unification, one can see that the Western governments made a set of operational strategic choices. They decided, for instance, that Germany should unify on West German terms, that the Germans should take the lead, and that it should happen as fast as possible. Once strategic choices have been made that are really concrete, they provide guidelines for day to day policy. But, we must then move on to the next level, the execution of those strategic choices. I would submit to you, that it is here that most of the mistakes are made.

What is to be done? Allow me to make a few suggestions. First, daily, it is important to ask, what is the relationship of what I am about to do to the strategic direction that I have chosen? It is actually a lot harder than it sounds because you will often find competing priorities. The question is to untangle them and decide what is really important. Second, when trying to execute policy, I think that it is important to realize that policy takes groundwork, investment up front with those that you will need and those on whom you will call later. Here I learned a great deal from President George Bush. When I first arrived in Washington, I noticed that all of us were asked to place various phone calls for the president so that he could talk to Helmut Kohl, or Margaret Thatcher, or Francois Mitterrand, often about what seemed to me to be trivial matters. Trained as a political
scientist, I had been led to believe that such personal contacts really didn’t matter. After all, it was great forces out there that were driving things, not the personal relationships of leaders. But, I can tell you that it was a lot easier for George Bush to make the call to Helmut Kohl when he needed to talk about whether Germany would stay fully integrated into NATO. In short, it is not good to make your first call or your first contact with a constituent or a stakeholder when you need something. The investment needs to be made up front.

Third, policy must be timely. If a policy choice is not made in time, you actually don’t have a policy. The most elegant policy overcome by events will have no effect, and related to that, it is often important to know when to stop considering options and to consider a decision. The tendency is to want to put things off, to gather more information, to know everything, but you always have to keep account of the time. Will it matter by the time you do it?

Fourth, policy needs to be consistent across all parts of a government or an institution. And, interestingly, here, the devil is really in the details. The slightest statement from one agency or another, from one department or another, that seems to contravene a policy line can do enormous damage and sow a lot of confusion. Deciding to follow the detail is not easy. I often wondered why Brent Scowcroft insisted that we wait at the National Security Council until a cable from, for example, the State Department or the Defense Department came over before we cleared it. But, you’d be surprised at what is sometimes hiding in one of those cables, and unless you take the time to actually read it, and to actually compare the language, and to know whether or not it is consistent, you will set off a storm of uncertainty in
capitals around the world. People will start assuming that there has been a change in policy. Details matter.

Fifth, remember that the art of policy is actually to do the difficult. If there is an easy problem, there is little need for policy. In doing the difficult, it is best to decide what is best and then how to do it. My experience at Stanford has been that I have a hard time getting people to tell me what is best. They want to tell me what is politically feasible, or least expensive, or a whole host of other criteria. But you need to ask first what is best. There are policymakers who suffice and those who optimize. Sufficing is hardly worth the trouble. You will pay a political price anyway. If you are lucky, events may be moving your way, but it is very easy to underestimate, even in circumstances where you should win, the ability to brag about an outcome that is far less than optimal.

Sixth, it is important to know when to play your role on the stage and when to play it off stage, and that is particularly hard in government these days because people want to know what the president has done for world peace today. We often confuse leadership and showmanship, and the tendency, then, is to take the role that is more public even if the private role makes more sense.

Finally, it is important to realize that no policy is actually ever finished. The fallacy of the finished policy has destroyed more good policies than you might imagine. You must remember that the minute a policy is in place, all kinds of forces, circumstances, other governments are eating away at it. It is important to go back to it, make certain that it is working, and shore it up over and over and over again. While these seven points on the executing of policy may sound
mundane, particularly given my admonition about the great transformation we face, the fact is that great changes will take place anyway with or without sound policies. The only question is whether you will be able to direct those changes in ways that benefit the country, the state, the institution.

That, then, is the link between dramatic change and change for the better. A lot of hard work stands between knowing where you want to go and getting there.

You can leave the sweep of history to the historians. When one reads the history of the great transformation after World War II, we tend, in retrospect, to impose order on events and decisions, making them more coherent than they were. In reality, the great decisions and outcomes of the post-war world were reached step by step. Read the correspondence sometimes. Read about the options not taken. Read about the difficult meetings, the corrections in course, the little steps that moved things forward. You will see that the tendency to see the outcome of the post-World War II process as either a triumph of grand strategy or the product of great brilliance is misplaced. That lesson makes it easier for us, ordinary and quite mortal humans, to think that, with a little hard work of our own, we might actually make a contribution to the great transformation that faces us today.

Thank you very much and all the best to you in the future.
AWARDING OF HONORARY DEGREES

JAMES A. THOMSON

It's my honor to award the honorary degrees. Let me read the citations for each, and ask each to come up in turn after I read each citation.

Lloyd N. Morrisett. Nationally respected foundation leader, educator, and civil servant, Lloyd Morrisett has made a glowing career of guiding some of America's foremost nonprofit institutions. As president of the Markle Foundation, he has supported and inspired a steady stream of research aimed at improving the mass media, facilitating information services, and understanding the promise and perils of the information revolution. He has served and shaped the nation's education and social science research systems as a member of the University of California's faculty and of the Social Science Research Council staff, as Chairman of the Children's Television Workshop, as a trustee and chairman of the Board of Trustees of Oberlin College, and as a trustee of the Research Triangle Institute, the Riverside Research Institute, and the Systems Development Foundation. His most important contribution to education may have been the initiative that became known as Sesame Street. His deft leadership and wise counsel have been vital to RAND for more than a quarter century, first as chairman of the New York City RAND Institute, and as trustee, and, finally, as chairman of the RAND Board, he has devoted time, energy and intellect to strengthening this institution. With the concurrence of RAND's president and Trustees, the RAND Graduate School is pleased to confer upon Lloyd Morrisett the honorary degree of Doctor of Public Policy.

Lloyd Morrisett

It's a great privilege to be a member of this graduating class today. As I thought about it, I have two wishes for the graduates, both of which I am confident will come true. The first is great professional success. I think this will naturally flow from your hard work and because RAND is a great intellectual institution. The second is really different. RAND is also a place that fosters friendships. My own experience here is a longer one than I would like to think about, but
really began with my first friends from RAND, Herb Simon and Al Lowell, whom I met here in 1961. It extends to Charles Wolf, Condi Rice, Don Rice, Mike May, and Jim Thomson. Not every institution fosters friendship. Some are distinctly inimical to it. Others are neutral, and some foster it. RAND does foster it. So my second wish for you today is that you will benefit as I have from the friendships you have made and will make because of RAND.

Jim Thomson

**Sam Nunn.** Distinguished legislator, national political leader, and national security authority, Sam Nunn has devoted much of his career to assuring that America’s armed forces are both preeminently prepared and prudently committed. Elected to the United States Senate in 1972 after service to the United States Coast Guard in the Georgia State House of Representatives, he has become one of the most influential figures in American public life on issues ranging from defense and foreign policy to the economy and tax reform. Former chairman and current ranking democrat on the Senate Armed Services Committee, his mastery of past and current defense programs has commanded international admiration. His persistent determination to question prevailing assumptions and to call attention to approaching security challenges has won him deep respect, transcending party lines. His efforts to reduce the threat of nuclear war have been creative and tireless. The nation and the Senate are the better for his rare combination of deep policy expertise, profound political acumen, and strong personal integrity. With the concurrence of RAND’s president and Trustees, the RAND Graduate School is pleased to confer on Sam Nunn the honorary degree of Doctor of Public Policy.

Sam Nunn

Thank you very much, Jim Thomson, and the whole RAND family, for this tremendous honor which I will cherish forever. From Don Rice to Jim Thomson to Bill Hoehn who is now on my staff — Jim Roach I see in the audience — and many others who have the expertise that has been developed here at RAND, I have been the beneficiary of your wisdom and
your advice and your counsel from the SALT treaty long years ago to the START treaty to the CFE treaty in Europe, to the publication, The Cost of Soviet Empire, which came before, Condi, the empire fell, the military manpower, the B-2 bomber, the drug and health policy, and many other areas, I have relied on your sound, intellectual reasoning. It has been said in the past that the acquisition of knowledge is the mission of research. The transmission of knowledge is the mission of teaching. And the application of knowledge is the mission of public service. RAND Graduate School combines these three missions in a unique and valuable way. Condi, we need you back in Washington. I can tell all assembled here today that too much of policy in Washington today is made by that old motto, "Ready, fire, aim." To the graduates, we need you. We will cherish your wisdom and your experience you've gained here, we will benefit in public policy for years to come from this expertise. I congratulate each of you and, again, to the RAND family, thank you very much for this great honor.

Jim Thomson

Donald B. Rice. Eminent public official, corporate leader, and policy analyst, Don Rice has brought grace to the power of cool and objective thought in the heat of combat of the policy arena. He has served his country as an army officer, a Pentagon cost and resource expert, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, Secretary of the Air Force. He has been a director and top executive of leading American corporations. During 17 years of exemplary leadership as President of RAND, he revised and burnished the institution's reputation at home and abroad while expanding the scope of its domestic and national security contributions. Passionate exponent of the value of policy analysis and the need to augment its core of practitioners, he championed the recently established RAND Graduate School from the beginning of his presidency in 1972. He left RAND after building an endowment that did not exist when he arrived. RAND benefits daily from this achievement. Fiercely competitive and committed to advancing the role of reason, he made RAND more competitive and our national
policies more reasonable. With the concurrence of RAND’s president and Trustees, the RAND Graduate School is pleased to confer upon Donald B. Rice the honorary degree of Doctor of Public Policy.

Donald B. Rice

Thank you Jim, Dean Wolf, and Susan’s and my many, many RAND friends and colleagues here today. You have heard a lot about the history of the RAND Graduate School today on the occasion of its 25th anniversary, and I certainly want to join in congratulating the RGS for its achievements over 25 years. As Charlie told you in the history, the institution was in its infancy, had not yet awarded degrees, had not completed its second academic year when I arrived on the scene here. And I can tell you that some of the controversy that Charlie glossed over quickly was still abounding in the halls, and so it was a subject that I had to examine and take on early in my tenure, really right at the beginning of it. And, as you have heard, there are very good reasons why RAND should take on this exercise and establish the graduate school. There was an obvious demand for the product, and there was an obvious capability at RAND to offer the product to the country. Those were among the important considerations at the time. Another important consideration was that it would be good for RAND to do it, and I think, looking back on it, probably that thought combined with the others made the difference in my mind because it was clear, looking forward, that if we made a success of the graduate school, that that would help RAND expand its outreach to many communities, some of whom, as Charlie mentioned, we already had established relationships with in academia. But many other communities, across many other subject matters, that would only be good for the institution in the long run; and,
furthermore, despite the comments, having graduate students in our midst would be good for the RAND staff and the institution, both for the opportunities it would provide the staff to be part of the faculty and, even more broadly, for the spirit of inquiry that having students in our midst would add. So, I think we shouldn’t be bashful about recognizing on the occasion of the 25th anniversary that there was a little bit of selfish motive on the point of view of the institution in deciding to go forward with the RAND Graduate School, and it sure looks to me that there is no basis for any regrets whatsoever for having made that decision. Secondly, I would like to thank all of you for this honor, and, most especially, for the special honor of being included in this group here today, and I would like to offer my congratulations to Condi for reminding all of us what’s important in this life, both by the well-chosen words she spoke, but also by her presence and attainment, and going beyond that yet, to give us a number of very useful guidelines of how to get there from here. It’s also a special privilege to share this with Lloyd Morrisett. Of course, as you can tell by hearing about both our backgrounds, Lloyd and I have worked closely together during all of the time I was at RAND, and he has been a bulwark of support for this institution for 25 years, and most especially within that, for the RAND Graduate School. He’s an outstanding representative of the RAND Board of Trustees, though we sometimes tend, at sessions like this, maybe, to forget the amount of debt we owe the Board of Trustees for all the support they give the institution. And, then, lastly, the honor of sharing this occasion with my friend and colleague, Sam Nunn. I can tell you, and you heard a little of it in the citation, there has been no other elected official in public life in this country in the last two
decades or more, who has been a more effective consumer of the kind of thing that RAND is all about than Sam Nunn. And not just an effective consumer, a voracious consumer, I have to tell you. You’ve heard a little of that in his own words, too, but then no one else has shown the continuing ability to turn and make use of, in a productive and effective way, the products of a good, sound analysis in forming public policy. So, there could not have been assembled a finer class for me to be a part of, and that includes, of course, the graduates. And let me just add a word of congratulation. We’re finally, I think, getting to the point where we get to turn the ceremony over to you. Thank you.

Jim Thomson

Charlie, will you come up now for the next awards.

Charles Wolf

I think I’ll keep the hat on, partly to identify with the graduate students and partly because I have less hair to work with. We move now to an interval where we will be presenting the Herbert Goldhamer Award, the Richard E. Sherwood Award, and the Edwin E. Huddleson Outstanding Teacher Award before we finally get to the main business of this meeting which is presenting the doctoral degrees to the 15 graduates.
HERBERT GOLDHAMER MEMORIAL AWARD

CHARLES WOLF, JR.

Let me say something about the Herb Goldhamer Award and its eponym.

Herb Goldhamer was a senior staff member and consultant at RAND for 29 years, as well as a faculty member of the RAND Graduate School. He taught courses on Foreign Policy Problems, on Sociological and Political Aspects of Policy Analysis, on The Expert and Society, and on The Adviser. Apart from Herb’s other notable contributions, including a book coauthored with Andy Marshall entitled Psychosis and Civilization, Herb’s course on The Adviser led to a really extraordinary book that presents and analyzes the policy writings of advisers to chiefs of state, kings, emperors, and other policy leaders, over a period of 2,500 years of recorded history. It is a timeless work.

The Goldhamer Award was set up after Herb’s death in 1977 by his friends, relatives, colleagues, and Mrs. Joan Goldhamer whom we are delighted to have with us this morning. Recipients of the award must meet a set of formidable criteria, which those who established the award regarded as characteristics of Herb’s own work. I quote from the award’s charter:

The Goldhamer Award, to be presented to an outstanding RAND Graduate School student, recognizes those who, as prospective advisers, are proficient in the techniques of policy analysis and, in addition: approach general problems through particular situations; respect the individuality of events and do not attempt to fit them to some favored technique or analytic scheme; avoid jargon and, where feasible, the use of technical terms; show a sensitivity to the nuances of human experience; and seek to enrich their understanding of the present through an appreciation of the past.
The committee that I convened to try to apply these formidable criteria included Jeremy Azrael, Konrad Kellen, and Al Williams. The committee, indeed, found this task to be daunting, because these criteria are virtually like those establishing the capacity to “walk on water.” But we proceeded to try to meet this daunting challenge as best we could by reviewing dissertations and other materials germane to arriving at judgments about the application of these criteria.

Let me mention a few words about prior recipients of the Goldhamer Award.

The first recipient in 1980 was Bruce Bennett, who is currently a senior policy analyst at RAND. Other recipients have included Ken Thorpe, currently a deputy assistant secretary in the Department of Health and Human Services; Yilmaz Arguden, currently an adviser to the president of Turkey; Robert Levine, in the intelligence community; Loren Yager, a senior economist with the General Accounting Office; and Rachel Schmidt, currently an analyst at the Congressional Budget Office’s National Security Division.

Now let me tell you briefly something about the three recipients of the 1995 Goldhamer Memorial Awards, as I ask them to come forward to receive the awards. The order of these presentations is strictly alphabetical.

The first recipient served as co-principal investigator on a study for the Health Care Financing Administration to develop a capitation payment method for the Medicare end-stage renal disease program.
Donna’s dissertation found many things: among them, that not-for-profit dialysis providers in more competitive markets tend to use more expensive staffing levels, while for-profit providers tend to maintain efficient staffing regardless of how much competition they face. I may have picked out that item because of reasons that were alluded to earlier. Anyhow, it’s a rich dissertation that displays the criteria that the Goldhamer Award is intended to recognize.

So, I am pleased to announce that the first recipient of this year’s Goldhamer award of $1,000 is Donna Farley. Donna, please come forward. Congratulations to you.

The second recipient also worked on RAND projects that focused on health issues. He studied ways of measuring quality of health care provided to children, and his dissertation research addressed adolescent sexuality and the prevention of AIDS, of other sexually transmitted diseases, and of unwanted pregnancy.

The second recipient of this year’s Goldhamer award of $1,000 is Mark Schuster. Mark, please come forward. My congratulations to you.

The third recipient’s on-the-job training in RGS and RAND focused on the military acquisition system, using interactive system dynamics models to show possible gains from joint acquisition efforts among the services.

His dissertation, which I was privileged to closely supervise, explored the linkage between strategic R&D alliances of firms in the aerospace, automotive, and semiconductor industries and the extent to which those alliances promoted innovation as reflected in patent productivity and profitability.
The third recipient of this year’s Goldhamer award of $1,000 is Wayne Walker. Wayne, please come forward. Congratulations.
PRESENTATION OF THE
RICHARD E. SHERWOOD MEMORIAL AWARD

CHARLES WOLF, JR.

Let me turn next to presentation of the Richard E. Sherwood Memorial Award, and precede this by telling you something about Dick Sherwood and the award that commemorates his name.

In an age of narrow specialization, Richard Sherwood was an enormously gifted man whose searching mind, intellectual curiosity, and public contributions transcended traditional bounds. He was a distinguished lawyer, a keen observer of and active participant in foreign affairs, and a patron of the arts. His many civic duties included, especially, his outstanding service as president of the Los Angeles Museum of Art.

As chairman of the Board of Overseers of the RAND-UCLA Center for Soviet Studies, from 1986 until his death in 1993, Dick was the architect and stabilizing force in the program’s founding and development. His tireless efforts in assembling a Board whose eminence was equal to his own is a crucial and lasting legacy for RAND’s new center of advanced training and research in Russian and Eurasian studies.

The Sherwood Award has been set up, through the generosity of the Board of Overseers of the RAND Center for Russian and Eurasian Studies, to establish a permanent memorial to Dick’s involvement with RAND over the past several years. Recipients of the award must be RAND Graduate School fellows, nominated by their respective dissertation committees, and judged to have completed the best RGS dissertation in foreign affairs among their graduating colleagues.
As Dick challenged our researchers and students to think clearly and critically about the world around us, we intend the Sherwood Award to recognize innovation and excellence in each new crop of young foreign policy analysts. We are particularly glad that Dick’s wife, Dorothy Sherwood, and his son, Ben, are with us today on this occasion of the second Sherwood Award.

Let me tell you something about today’s recipient of the Sherwood award. Her on-the-job training in the RAND Graduate School included work in the following fields: (1) A Post-Soviet “Common Market,” including several months spent in field work in Almaty, Kazakhstan; (2) Prospective Migration and Emigration from the Former Soviet Union; and (3) Long-term Economic Trends in the Greater Middle East.

In her dissertation, the alternative development paths available to Kazakhstan as it chooses between participating in an economically integrated arrangement with Russia and other republics of the former Soviet Union, or, alternatively, charting a more autonomous development path, is an innovative work that has significant implications for the future of their policies and our policies toward them.

I am pleased to announce that the recipient of this year’s Sherwood award of $1,000 is Patricia Brukoff.
Jim Thomson

Now we come to the outstanding teacher award. I'm pleased to announce that within the week this award has been endowed in the memory of Edwin E. Huddleson, Jr. This was made possible by a gift from the Huddleson family. The gift was and is being supplemented by other contributions to RAND made in his memory.

Ed was one of the key figures in RAND's history. He joined the Board of Trustees in 1954. He was reelected twice, serving 27 years in total. He was also our corporate counsel for 31 years. He played central roles in many important developments in RAND's history, including dealings with sponsors during difficult times, helping to work on programs to develop RAND's buildings, security issues, the spawning of new research ventures and of the graduate school, and the establishment and growth of the endowment.

Many here knew Ed. We relied on his judgment, no-nonsense advice, and warm encouragement. It is a great honor to announce the establishment of the Edwin E. Huddleson, Jr. Outstanding Teacher Award. Now, the procedure for choosing the winner of this award is that the students, as you would hope, do that. Michael Shires and Vladimir Shkolinikov will come to the podium and make the presentation on behalf of the students. After the presentation of the award, two graduating fellows, Michael Dardia and Carolinda Douglass will speak to us on behalf of all the students.
Michael Shires

Thank you, Jim. I'm Mike Shires and this is Vladimir Shkolnikov, and we're here on behalf of the RAND Graduate Students Organization and also the RAND Graduate School to recognize a member of the RGS faculty who has shown particular dedication to teaching and to helping us become better policy analysts and moving us along to where we are today. The award was first presented at the 1993 graduation, at the previous graduation of the RAND Graduate School. Today is the second awarding of this award. The first recipient was Carl Richard Neu, who is in the audience today. The students pick the outstanding teacher award today as an intellectual process. All the teachers who taught in the RAND Graduate School are eligible for selection to this award. It is important to recognize that both the current students and the graduates did pick this teacher. So this teacher represents someone who is special to all the students in the RAND Graduate School at this time. Now, the criteria for selecting the outstanding teacher were several. The first criterion is that the teacher is recognized as having prepared carefully for each lesson, which, with a group such as us, can be challenging. Also, that the teacher has provided challenging and interesting classroom instruction. That the teacher is readily available to the students. That they demonstrate an excellence in communicating to the students. That they attend both to theoretical issues and to practical applications in a policy context. That they make the experiences in the classroom real to us and to their application in the real world. That the instructor will create an atmosphere of mutual respect and intellectual curiosity. And, finally,
that they will engage, encourage, and inspire students to their highest level of achievement and commitment.

Vladimir Shkolnikov

Now, to say that this year’s recipient merely satisfied these criteria is definitely to say too little. In his class many students discovered what the real meaning of the much overused term “discussion” is. Also, he reminded us that good teaching is, above all, an art form. For many of us, his class in Behavioral Science Perspectives on Policy Analysis, which he first taught at RGS in 1989, provided an important link between theoretical models which were learned in other RGS classes and explanations for actual everyday human behavior. He is currently practicing his art of teaching at University of California, Berkeley. I am very honored to announce that this year’s winner of the Outstanding Teaching Award, which carries with it a monetary prize and inscription of the winner’s name upon a plaque which will remain mounted next to the RGS office, is Rob MacCoun.

Rob MacCoun

First, I want to thank Charlie Wolf. It’s risky for an economist to ask a psychologist to teach a core course. The risk was that I would teach the students that people aren’t actually rational economic actors. That’s exactly what I did. I think Charlie saw it as a schooling mechanism where there were the students who believed me and then the really good students. There is a cliché that teachers say that I think the students have taught me as much as I’ve taught them. To which a rational economic student would say, “Fine, you pay me tuition.” And I think Charlie should be glad that perhaps these students are perhaps not
rational economic actors, although maybe at the request of Charlie. But, in fact, the cliche is really true here. These are not ordinary students. These are really extraordinary students. They are mature students who bring to the program a great deal of professional training and expertise – very diverse training in many different academic disciplines, many different professions. And, in fact, we have students from many different nations. In fact, it’s quite a terrifying thing to walk into the classroom and teach these students. When RGS faculty asked Charlie for a raise, it’s his favorite response to say, “It’s an honor and privilege to teach these students.” And, in fact, it was really an honor and privilege to teach them. I am really very proud to receive this award.
Michael Dardia

On behalf of all the graduates, I want to thank you for spending a beautiful Saturday morning indoors to celebrate our graduation. Perhaps it will serve as a vivid reminder of the many beautiful Saturdays we graduates have spent in this very building, in order to be here today. Remarkably, until the previous graduation ceremony there were no student speeches; to make up for past deficits, this year there will be two. Carolinda Douglass will follow me. I’m not sure about Carolinde’s speech, but in this speech I’ll ignore the warning given by Frank Stanton in his 1978 commencement address. Stanton said “Unsolicited advice is seldom heeded. Even more rarely is it welcomed. Socrates, for instance, was one who went around giving people good advice. In return, they gave him poison.” Now Stanton did have a special plea to make though, which was for the graduates to add the dimension of public opinion to their work on policy issues. It is on this subject that I will hazard poisoning.

Now, Charlie Wolf has mentioned Herb Goldhamer’s book, The Adviser, a fascinating essay tracing the role of the policy adviser over the past 2,500 years. Goldhamer’s adviser is the same analyst to whom Aaron Wildavsky directed his policy analysis textbook, Speaking Truth to Power: that is, the dispassionate analyst who, after carefully considering the problem at hand and perhaps even redefining the original question, whispers his or her judicious advice into the policymaker’s ear. RAND graduates are well-schooled in this mode, and professional
policy analysts as a whole have done a very good job at it for many years. I would like to suggest that our job must also include speaking truth to the public.

On many policy issues of our time — Social Security, health care, crime, income inequality — there is a surprising level of agreement among most analysts. Analysts on both sides of the issue often agree on the basic facts, even when they vehemently disagree about their interpretation. What often frustrates many of us is the large gap between what analysts know to be the case and what the political leadership seems to be doing about it. We may rail at politicians’ inability to understand what we’ve been whispering in their ears all this time — apologies to Senator Nunn — but they are often responding to what the public believes to be true. As political power has become more fragmented, the way the public apprehends issues is a major constraint on feasible policy responses. This may not be a new development. As Abraham Lincoln noted, “Public opinion is everything. With it, nothing can fail, without it nothing can succeed.” But all too often, the pundits frame the debate for the public in simplified, almost cartoonish descriptions of policy issues, while we go right on whispering advice into policymakers’ ears.

Some analysts grow weary or cynical at the enormous task of influencing public opinion, and who can blame them? Interest groups spend many millions annually to influence the public on various issues; and paid political consultants target their biased messages to narrow segments of the population. Now, although none of these groups is encumbered by objectivity, the biggest spenders don’t always win. Public opinion responds to more than just PR. Sometimes it responds to
common sense, and sometimes even to empirical evidence and honest analysis.

Some psychology experiments we covered in a class taught by Rob MacCoun, this year’s Distinguished Teacher, may provide us an example of the powers of persuasion and how to overcome them. Researchers showed groups of people pairs of lines and asked them whether the lines in each pair were the same length. In one of the pairs the lines were clearly of very different lengths. Unbeknownst to the real subject, all but one of the other participants were in on the experiment, and the real subject was questioned last. The results were depressing. If all the other participants said that the lines were of equal length, most of the subjects agreed — despite the evidence right in front of them. However, if just one other person said that the lines were different, then most of the real subjects told the truth and admitted that the lines were different.

We as analysts need to do the same. We need to repeatedly state to the public, as well as to policymakers, that the lines are different, even when that is unpopular; in fact, especially when it is unpopular. Thank you.

Carolinda Douglass

Good morning. I am pleased to speak to you today on behalf of the RGS graduates. It is a great day for us all, and I would like to start by saying that I am quite proud and honored to sit among this group of distinguished colleagues. We all came to this point from various individual paths but we share the common bond of our RGS education. It is my charge today to share with you some insights into that common
experience. To this end, I followed in the proud RAND research tradition and conducted a small e-mail survey of the graduates, and I am happy to report that I had a 100 percent response rate. I realize that this may be the only time in my research career when I am able to make this claim, so I want to make the most of it. And even though this group may seem like a captive audience, it was no small task getting them all to respond. I asked each of the graduates a series of questions relevant to their experiences at RGS related to three general themes. The first was how did each of us come to RGS and what types of challenges did we face while here? The second inquired about our memories both good and bad about our days at RGS and finally, the third related to skills we gained while here, where we will go from here, and what pearls of wisdom we can offer to new incoming students. I want to thank all the graduates for their thoughtful, candid, and sometimes quite colorful responses, some of which I will share with you now.

First, I asked the group, “Why did you choose to attend RGS to study policy analysis (if you can remember back that far)?” A few of the graduates replied that they were influenced by personal contacts they already had with RGS faculty, students, or alumni; by the generous stipend given to RGS students; or by the Southern California location. Dr. Shkolnikov said it was because he couldn’t afford Harvard. But by and far, the majority of the graduates indicated that it was for the outstanding research skills to be gained here, especially quantitative, statistical, and economic skills. As Dr. Van Winkle said, “RAND is a research Mecca” and most of us wanted an opportunity to learn from some of the best researchers in the country.
What were the greatest challenges we faced while at RGS? The responses to this question fell roughly into three groups. First, there was the straightforward "Get That Dissertation Done Group." Several people indicated that the greatest challenge for them was, as Dr. Jardia said, "starting the dissertation and then finishing the darn thing." I cleaned that up a little bit. The second group, which I like to call the "Balancing Act Group," indicated, as Dr. Bozzette responded, the greatest challenge was "balancing all the competing demands (coursework, OJT, social life, etc.) and keeping all the balls up in the air." Finally, there was a third camp, many of whom came from human-services orientations and backgrounds, who just found the RAND environment itself quite challenging. I like to call this group the "Touchy-feelies in the land of the Quantoids Group." For us, and I am one of these people, it was a challenge just to get up each day and come in to RAND, knowing that we were going to be faced and tested by an environment where the dominant views, attitudes, and values were far different from our own. The challenge came in finding a way to learn and grow in this environment without losing sight of ourselves.

The second theme of the survey was memories from our time here. My favorite question was, "What was your fondest memory from your days at RGS?" This question drew the greatest volume of responses, which is a finding in itself and was really fun to read and talk about. I'll share a few of those with you now. Dr. Peabody said, "Small group study sessions." Dr. Shires' favorite memory was, "Easy question, signature number 3!!!" Dr. Farley said one of her fondest memories was the Quals (this is definitely an outlier response!). She said that "they were exhausting but provided an opportunity to synthesize the tools and
knowledge we had been learning through a real analytic exercise."  "The supportiveness of my friends" was mentioned by Drs. Brukoff, Martin, Douglass, Damberg, and Sine. Dr. Damberg also answered, "Milkshakes during quals!" Which, I'd like to know where I was during milkshakes!

And finally, Dr. Walker reminds us that although we stand up here alone today, for most of us, the Ph.D. process is a family affair and we owe a debt of gratitude to our family and friends. He writes that his favorite memory was "The afternoon in March when, after reading Charlie's e-mail, I called my wife and said, 'This is Dr. Walker.' There was a long, long pause as Terri sorted through the possibilities. Then a scream. She told the kids, and they started screaming, too. When I came home, they all kicked me out of the house until they finished preparing their celebration. And as I sat down to an exquisite candlelight dinner, with our finest china, I shed more than one tear. The relief and joy on their faces spoke volumes about the hopes, pain, and uncertainty they had all shared with me."

Next I asked, "What would you most like to forget from your days at RGS?" The most popular answer was "Quals, Quals, Quals!!" Dr. Bozette added "sleep deprivation." Dr. Dardia says he would most like to forget "the reduction in his savings account from spending five years as a graduate student." I'd like to know how he still had a savings account! Dr. Daley mentioned that he'd most like to forget "sleeping for just two hours on the WWII (or is it WWI) surplus cots in our 'lounge' the night before a big microeconomics exam." Sadly, I think many of us have had similar experiences with those cots. Dr. Damberg said she'd like to forget, among other things, "the earthquake, her house value dropping, how long it took to finish, working day and night,"
the food in the cafeteria, Room 2198, and the disruption to her personal life." I think that sums it up for us all.

The final theme of the survey was what did we get from RGS, where will we go from here, and what have you learned that you’d like to pass on to others in the program? There was a great deal of agreement in the responses to the question, "What skills have you gained at RGS that you most value?" The answer, "Quantitative Skills and the Policy Analysis Framework!" Dr. Peabody answered, "the multidisciplinary nature of the training and the presentation and writing skills that RGS emphasizes." Dr. Martin added that he learned the skill of "integrating different kinds of analyses and analytic frameworks in the scope of a single study." This, I would add, is truly the definition of a policy analyst.

Next I asked the graduates, "Where will you go (or have you already gone) from here and how have your experiences at RGS helped you to go (or get) there? This was basically one of those "feel-good" questions that you throw into a survey to give the respondents a chance to feel good about themselves. In a nutshell, the graduates are all doing great things, and we all have RGS to thank for it. But in the interest of time, I’ll let Charlie fill you in on all of the specifics.

The final question I asked was, "What sage advice can you offer a new entering student at RGS?" Here’s a selected list of the responses. Dr. Shires responded, "Run while you can!" Dr. Sine warned, "Try not to take it too personally." Dr. Daley said, "Avoid the ancient academic curse: ‘May you write your dissertation in interesting times.’" From Dr. Martin, "None, I have no advice." Dr. Shkolnikov said, "Rethink what you’re doing. Talk to a number of people and be sure this is the best place for you." From Dr. Farley, "Be willing to humble yourself a
little bit and learn from anybody." Dr. Schuster suggests that the new students "Maintain a life apart from RGS." And Dr. Peabody says, "Begin your dissertation in earnest by the end of the first year and try to find papers in your classwork that can be published in the scientific literature." Kind of a tall order! Wish I'd had that advice!

Finally, I'd like to add my own little bit of advice. Choose your path here deliberately and wisely. You can do this best, I found, by opening your mind to all the ideas and information available here and then guiding yourself through that explosion of knowledge. Listen closely to your heart and follow where it leads you. Thank you.
AWARDING OF DOCTORAL DEGREES
IN PUBLIC POLICY ANALYSIS
CHARLES WOLF, JR.

Carolinda, I would like to get those dos and don’ts printed up so we can present them to the new entering class in September. We turn now to the final and essential purpose of these exercises: award of the School’s doctoral degree in public policy analysis. This degree is a distinctive one, and so it is appropriate to explain precisely what it signifies and what is distinctive about it.

In a formal sense, the School’s doctoral degree signifies that its recipients have previously received a master’s degree or equivalent postbachelor’s training or experience, which is required for admission. The School’s doctoral program requires, further, that recipients have taken not less than 20 courses and policy-related workshops in the School — including eleven required courses in economics, quantitative methods, social and behavioral science (including the course that Rob used to teach to enlighten economists), and technology applications — and that they have performed creditably in these courses.

The degree further signifies that those who receive it have accomplished several years of on-the-job training in applied policy-related research at RAND. This is an integral part of the RGS curriculum and one that distinguishes it from all other graduate public policy programs in the United States. And, for that matter, in the world.

The degree also means that those who receive it have performed satisfactorily in an exacting set of written and oral qualifying examinations (that was the Quals shorthand that Carolinda referred to)
extending over a five-day period. The examinations are evaluated by a faculty committee that includes members of the RAND Graduate School and sometimes of other academic institutions, as well.

Finally, the degree signifies that its recipients have written dissertations relating to the RAND research they have engaged in, that the dissertation is both relevant to policy and is a contribution to knowledge, and that it has been evaluated according to these two criteria and approved by each student's dissertation committee.

In sum, the process of meeting the requirements for the RGS degree is a demanding one. Its successful completion warrants admiration and respect, as well as the recognition that is embodied in the doctoral diploma. I will now read a brief account of each graduating fellow's accomplishments and then ask him or her to step forward. Before doing that, I want to read the citation that appears on each diploma rather than repeating the citation each time. The diploma that each fellow receives reads as follows:

The Dean and the Faculty of the RAND Graduate School with the concurrence of the President and Trustees of RAND have conferred on [named recipient], the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Public Policy Analysis and have granted this diploma as evidence thereof.

By authority duly committed to us we have hereunder placed our names and seals on this 15th day of July, one thousand nine hundred and ninety-five.

Each diploma is signed by Jim Thomson as president and by me as dean.

Although each diploma certifies the achievements of the named graduates, they know, you know, and I know that others besides the graduates themselves share directly and substantially in the achievement. Spouses, parents, "significant others"—many in this
room—have provided the essential encouragement, support, and stamina without which the doctoral degrees would not have been attained. So, in effect, the diplomas honor you as well as the graduates.

I will now ask the graduate to come up, as I tell you something about each of them briefly, and receive the diploma:

Sam Bozzette entered RGS in September 1991 with a B.S. in Biology from Georgetown University and an M.D. from the University of Rochester. His dissertation, which was approved in March 1995, is entitled “Towards Comprehensive Outcome Assessment of New Medical Therapies: Lessons from AIDS.” His dissertation committee was chaired by Al Williams. Sam is currently an associate professor of medicine at the University of California, San Diego; a senior research associate of the Department of Veterans’ Affairs, and director of the Health Services Research and Development Unit at the San Diego Veterans’ Affairs Medical Center.

Patricia Brukoff entered RGS in September 1988 with an A.B. in Politics from Princeton University. The year between her undergraduate studies and RGS she spent studying Russian at Leningrad State University and completed the first year of a two-year master’s program at the University of Michigan, concentrating on Soviet-type economic systems, and ethnopolitics in the Soviet Union. Her dissertation, which I referred to earlier, was approved in May 1994 and is entitled “The Unwilling State: Exploring Kazakhstan’s Resistance to Economic Autonomy in the Post-Soviet Period.” Her dissertation committee was chaired by Dick Neu. Patti recently joined the U.S. Department of Treasury as an international economist.
Tad Daley entered RGS in September 1986 with a J.D. from the University of Illinois College of Law and an M.Sc. in International Relations from the University of Southampton in England. His dissertation, which was approved in April of this year, is entitled "The Lessons of Afghanistan for the Soviet Union and Russia." His dissertation committee was chaired by Jeremy Azrael. Tad is currently developing a new non-profit organization, called The Campaign For A New United Nations Charter, whose aim is to enact improved structures of global law and governance to meet the challenges of the twenty-first century.

Cheryl Damberg entered RGS in September 1989 with a B.S. from Michigan State University and an M.P.H. in Public Health from the University of Michigan School of Public Health. Her dissertation was approved in April 1995 and is entitled "Health Care Reform: Distributional Consequences of an Employer Mandate for Workers in Small Firms." Her dissertation committee was chaired by Arleen Leibowitz. Cheryl recently accepted a position as director of research at the Pacific Business Group on Health.

Michael Dardia entered RGS in September 1989 with a B.S. in Biological Sciences from the State University of New York at Stony Brook and an M.S. in Policy Analysis and Management from the W. Averell Harriman School of Management and Policy Analysis, at SUNY Stony Brook, the State University of New York at Stony Brook. His dissertation was approved in October 1994 and is entitled "Is Small Beautiful? Firm Size and Job Losses in the Aerospace Industrial Base." That’s quite a title! His
dissertation committee was chaired by Jim Dertouzos. Michael is currently a research fellow at the Public Policy Institute of California in San Francisco.

Carolinda Douglass entered RGS in September 1989 with a B.S. in Human Relationships and a Certificate in Aging Studies from the University of Minnesota and Masters’ degrees in Public Administration and Gerontology from the University of Southern California. Her dissertation was approved in October 1994 and is entitled “Diagnostic Assessment and Treatment Service Utilization Among Alzheimer’s Disease Clients in California.” That’s probably the longest title! Her dissertation committee was chaired by Deborah Hensler. Carolinda is currently a postdoctoral fellow at the Institute for Health and Aging and the Institute for Health Policy Studies at the University of California, San Francisco.

Donna Farley entered RGS in September 1989 with a B.A from Coe College in Cedar Rapids, Iowa; an M.P.H. and an M.S. in Environmental Health Management from the University of Illinois Medical Center in Chicago. Her dissertation was approved in September 1993 and is entitled “Effects of Competition on Dialysis Facility Service Levels and Patient Selection.” Her dissertation committee was chaired by Grace Carter. Donna is currently a senior analyst with the Physician Payment Review Commission – an advisory commission to the U.S. Congress in Washington, D.C.
Thomas Martin entered RGS in September 1986 with a B.S. in Psychology from Loyola University of Chicago and an M.A. in Industrial Psychology from St. Mary’s University in Texas. His dissertation was approved in September 1994 and is entitled “Who Stays? Who Leaves?: An Analysis of First-Term Army Attrition.” His dissertation committee was chaired by Dick Buddin. Tom is currently senior analyst at the Institute for Social and Economic Development in Iowa City.

John Peabody entered RGS in September 1991 with a B.S. in Biology from Stanford University, an M.D. from University of California, San Francisco, and a Diploma from the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine. His dissertation, which was approved in September 1994, is entitled “Will Measuring the Quality of Antenatal Care Tell Us How It Works?” Arleen Leibowitz chaired his dissertation committee. John is currently an assistant professor of medicine at the University of California, Los Angeles, and the principal investigator of the RAND research and policy analysis team that is investigating reform of the health care systems in Papua (New Guinea) and in Ecuador.

Mark Schuster entered RGS in September 1991 with a B.A. in History from Yale University, an M.P.P. from the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard, and an M.D. from the Harvard Medical School. His dissertation, approved in December 1994, is entitled “Adolescent Sexuality and Risk Prevention.” His dissertation committee was chaired by David Kanouse. Mark is now an assistant professor of pediatrics at UCLA and is conducting health services research at RAND.
Michael Shires entered RGS in September 1990 with a B.A. in Economics from the University of California, Los Angeles, and an M.B.A. from the Anderson Graduate School of Management at UCLA. His dissertation was approved in January 1995 and is entitled "The California Master Plan Revisited: Prospects for Providing Access to Public Undergraduate Education in California." Roger Benjamin chaired his dissertation committee. Michael is presently a research fellow at the Public Policy Institute of California in San Francisco.

Vladimir Shkolnikov entered RGS in September 1989 with a B.S. in Electrical and Electronic Engineering from the California State University in Sacramento, and an M.S. in Electrical Engineering from the University of California at Irvine. His dissertation was approved in September 1994 and is entitled "Potential Energy: Emergent Emigration of Highly Qualified Manpower from the Former Soviet Union." His dissertation committee was chaired by Steven Popper. Vlad will soon be a migration adviser for the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe. He will also be working closely with the Policy Planning and Operations Staff of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees based in Warsaw, Poland.

Jeffrey Sine entered RGS in September 1988 with a B.S. in Biology from St. Lawrence University in New York and an M.P.H. in Health Services and Epidemiology from Boston University School of Public Health. His dissertation was approved in December 1993 and is entitled "Demand for Episodes of Care in the China Health Insurance Experiment." Shan Cretin chaired his dissertation committee. Jeff is currently a senior
financial policy specialist at The Futures Group International in Washington, D.C., managing projects on family planning and reproductive health programs in Egypt, Turkey, Southern Africa, and Indonesia.

**Jeannette Van Winkle** entered RGS in September 1988 with a B.A. in History from Whitman College in Washington and an M.A. in International Economics and Soviet Studies from The Johns Hopkins University, School of Advanced International Studies in Washington, D.C. Her dissertation was approved in October 1994 and is entitled “Capital Accumulation, Financial Reform, and Investment Planning in Russia.” Her dissertation committee was chaired by Dick Neu. Jeannette will be working in the Budget Analysis Division of the Congressional Budget Office.

**Wayne Walker** entered RGS in September 1990 with a B.S. in Physics from Brigham Young University, an M.S. in Aerospace Engineering from the University of Arizona, and a J.D. from Harvard Law School. That’s probably why your family screamed with relief when they heard you had your doctorate. Wayne’s dissertation was approved in March 1995 and is entitled “Technological Innovation, Corporate R&D Alliances, and Organizational Learning.” The dissertation committee was chaired by George Donohue. Wayne Walker is hosting a weekly public policy radio talk show called NationTALK, combined with an interactive on-line service, which aims to motivate deliberation and increased societal learning. He is also forming a quantitative analysis and organizational learning consulting firm.
Ladies and gentlemen: This concludes the ninth commencement exercises of the RAND Graduate School. I would ask you now to rise and join me in acknowledging the new Doctors of Philosophy in Policy Analysis.

After the graduates recess out of the room, please join us on the adjacent patio for refreshments and an opportunity to congratulate the graduates individually.