
C. Fred Bergsten: Intellectual Entrepreneur

MICHAEL MUSSA

C. Fred Bergsten's extensive contributions to the debate on key issues of international economic policy are examined extensively in subsequent chapters of this volume. This introduction reflects briefly on Fred's enormous contributions, beyond what appears on his bibliography (listed in appendix A). Most important is his role as the intellectual entrepreneur who has created, directed, and developed the Institute for International Economics—now renamed the Peter G. Peterson Institute for International Economics—as the world's leading think tank for the analysis of international economic policy.

In extolling Fred Bergsten's performance as an intellectual entrepreneur, I shall not need to appeal to one of Fred's favorite marketing strategies—"responsible excess." The plain fact is that without Fred's very broad knowledge of international economics, his extraordinary energy in fundraising and marketing, his keen insight and foresight in perceiving critical policy issues as (or especially before) they become important, and his skill in selecting a team of key staff and in motivating and directing their activities, there simply would be no Institute for International Economics as we know it today.

Fred's talents are mutually reinforcing. His selection and direction of staff and his capacity to foresee key policy issues clearly depend on his own substantive knowledge of international economics (and politics). But it's also true that his broad and deep substantive knowledge derives in

Michael Mussa has been a senior fellow at the Institute since 2001.

part from the fact that Fred personally reads and approves all of the Institute's research proposals, policy briefs, policy analyses, monographs, and books, and this in turn contributes to his outstanding ability to market the Institute's intellectual product. In seminars, public debates, and meetings with government officials or business leaders, Fred can readily cite the Institute publication (sometimes forthcoming) that provides the relevant fact, analysis, or empirical result. As the genial host of the Institute's many public meetings, Fred is always prepared with the pertinent question or comment to get the discussion rolling or restart it if it begins to flag.

Some scholars disdain the grubby business of securing financing to support their intellectual endeavors. Others just don't like writing research proposals or other aspects of fundraising. Fred is not shy about asking for financial support for the Institute. More important, he is very effective at securing it. This success, of course, owes a good deal to the generosity of people like Peter G. Peterson, Anthony M. Solomon, David Rockefeller, the Niarchos Foundation, and others and to the decision of the German Marshall Fund (GMF) to provide the Institute with a very large start-up grant. This support initially came on the basis of Fred Bergsten's original proposal to found an institute focused on international economic policy. It continues to come because of confidence in Fred's ability to lead such an endeavor and to deliver the timely, relevant analyses of key international economic policy issues that are highly valued by those who make or influence policy in and out of government.

Fred's deep involvement in the intellectual work of the Institute is vital to his effectiveness as a fundraiser. People and organizations who contribute substantial sums to a think tank generally want the person in charge to be knowledgeable about the substance and to be able to provide effective leadership on the substance to his or her colleagues. The fact that Fred handles the fundraising activities virtually by himself not only frees colleagues from a task for which Fred has such a strong absolute and comparative advantage but also contributes significantly to the Institute's key strengths as an intellectual endeavor. The funding is already there, and it supports a group of experts who can work quickly and competently, and write clearly and forcefully, on a wide range of international economic policy questions. If Fred has an insight on an issue that the Institute should address, he does not need to apply for funding or search for relevant staff. He can immediately deploy available people (including himself) to prepare the relevant analysis. Similarly, when one of us has an issue for analysis, we can quickly arrange for Fred to review it. With the aid of the Institute's superb publications staff, the whole process from initial idea to public release of a detailed and persuasive study can proceed very rapidly. All this facilitates the Institute's renowned ability to diagnose critical policy issues as they become important and to prepare and disseminate timely, relevant, and highly competent analyses.

2 C. FRED BERGSTEN AND THE WORLD ECONOMY

As with others who achieve well beyond the norm, Fred's success owes a good deal to his personality. He is quite a character. The following remarks reflect on some key aspects of Fred's personality that have contributed importantly to his success and that of the Institute. They draw heavily on interviews that Howard Rosen conducted with Fred's friends and supporters in preparation for the celebration of the Institute's 25th anniversary.

Evangelist for the Open Economy

Those who have seen Fred Bergsten in operation—at a seminar, in a debate, or as the host of innumerable Institute luncheons to launch new publications—should not be surprised to learn that Fred is the son of a Methodist minister. Like most professionally trained economists, Fred understands the logical analysis establishing that an open international economic system—free of artificial impediments to the mutually beneficial exchange of goods, services, assets, and technology—will serve the economic interests of all nations. More than most, he is aware of the substantial benefits conferred on this country and the rest of the world by the open international economic system that has developed since the Second World War under the leadership of the United States. With Fred, however, these are more than matters of intellectual understanding; they support a moral conviction to go forward and persuade others to pursue the virtues of openness and to forsake the evils of protectionism in all its forms.

Stuart Eizenstat first got to know Fred when he was serving as President Carter's domestic policy adviser in the White House and Fred was the assistant secretary for international affairs in the Treasury. They continued their association in later years, including the period when Eizenstat was a senior official in the State and Treasury Departments during the Clinton administration. Eizenstat speaks eloquently of Fred's evangelism and its effectiveness:

Well, I think that in many ways the Institute has made me a much more fervent believer in the importance of an open trade and investment climate. I come from a more liberal Democratic background, and I've been really concerned about how my own party has drifted into a more anti-trade, anti-investment attitude. And I would say that Fred himself, through our work together in the Carter administration and since we've left the work he's done at the Institute have really reinforced for me the fact that there is no turning back on globalization, there is no turning back on free trade, that these are positives on a net-net basis, that we have an open foreign exchange and foreign investment climate, that we have to encourage countries to reform. And I would say that when I was ambassador to the European Union that Fred's studies gave me the ammunition to encourage the European Commission and the member states to adapt more open and flexible policies as well.

Others clearly appreciate the evangelical element in Fred’s character and its importance to his success. Aside from Fred himself, Peter G. Peterson has played the greatest role in the development of the Institute through his hugely generous financial support, his chairmanship of the Institute’s Board of Directors, and his continuing intellectual involvement in the work of the Institute—contributions recognized in the renaming of the Institute. Peterson comments thus on the role of Fred’s evangelism in the Institute’s success:

I don’t think it’s an accident that we’ve been named the most influential think tank in the country. One reason . . . we are influential dates back to Fred Bergsten’s talent, not only in defining issues that are going to be very relevant but in promoting them. . . . He’s a great outreach guy, and when the Institute does a project, like we’re now doing on China, for example, I’ve seen hundreds of references to our China project. Part of this is because Fred believes that outreach is a very important part of our mission, and you’ll see Fred and his colleagues testifying, and you’ll hear press conferences, you’ll see visits to the White House. . . . Only then does the policy work that we do . . . maximize its effect.

As president of the GMF, Frank Loy played a critical role in the founding of the Institute. Based on a proposal from Fred Bergsten, the GMF, under Loy’s leadership, agreed to provide an initial grant of \$4 million—one-quarter of the Fund’s entire budget—to get the Institute started. Loy reflects on the qualities that made Fred an attractive candidate to lead the new institute:

Well, I think we all recognized an intellectual nimbleness, an ability to articulate views that is much better than you find among many others, and we . . . guessed that he had leadership capabilities. We hadn’t much to go on at the time, but just looking at him, and talking about him, we came to that conclusion.

Fred Bergsten is a man with a message. The name of the Institute he directs signals the core of that message: the Institute *for* International Economics. Consistent with the logical analysis and empirical research of the economics profession, the Institute and Fred tend to have a positive orientation toward most aspects of globalization. Aside from this well-known orientation, however, neither Fred nor the Institute are politically partisan, nor do they ignore that globalization can have ill effects that should be alleviated, nor do they promote the interest of the United States at the expense of other countries. These qualifications are an essential part of Fred’s evangelism and are critical for the success of the Institute.

Leslie Gelb has known Fred since childhood, worked with him closely when they were both assistant secretaries (at State and Treasury) in the Carter administration, and has continued a close association since then. He comments on the importance of nonpartisanship:

I don’t think that the Institute is partisan at all, which is one of its real virtues, one of the key things about the place it occupies . . . in the universe of think tanks.

4 C. FRED BERGSTEN AND THE WORLD ECONOMY

People don't believe that the Institute has a score to settle or a political game to play; . . . its work really is about solving problems.

As the US trade representative (USTR), Carla Hills was in charge of US trade policy during the administration of President George Herbert Walker Bush. She too emphasizes the importance of nonpartisanship in the work of the Institute:

Today there seems to be perhaps less harmony, more polarization, less capacity to listen, and therefore I suppose one might say greater need for the Institute to bridge the gap because the Institute is nonpartisan, apolitical, and doesn't run into the allegation that it represents one party or the other party.

Business leaders who support the work of the Institute also see its nonpartisanship as essential to its success. James Owens is the CEO of Caterpillar and a member of the Institute's Board of Directors:

Caterpillar is keenly interested in global free trade. We've been a strong champion for many, many years. But if we are lobbying on that subject, we're seen as having a huge vested interest. If we can support the Institute and its economic analysis and thoughtful assessments of trade policy, and they come to the same conclusions that trade liberalization benefits our citizenry, they are much more effective at reaching the Congress . . . and helping get good legislation. . . . They have established themselves as a highly credible, independent, and nonpartisan think tank in that area.

George David, CEO of United Technologies Corporation and vice chairman of the Institute's board, expresses similar sentiments:

To me the glorious thing about this Institute is it is decidedly . . . nonpartisan. . . . It produces simply first-class analysis, not biased left or right, and therefore we can really believe and rely on it.

The impression that the Institute is professional and nonpartisan in its analyses is reinforced by the care that is taken in recognizing that trade liberalization (and globalization more generally), despite its overall benefits, can have harmful effects on some parties. The Institute's continuing work on trade adjustment assistance—a field in which Fred Bergsten is a pioneer—is particularly notable in this regard. Stuart Eizenstat comments:

Fred and the Institute are at the forefront of trying to stress the positive aspects of globalization, why it's actually a good thing, but also to recognize that unless governments put in place programs . . . to build a safety net for those who would otherwise fall through, that we're going to lose public support for the kind of flexible, open policies we need to succeed in a globalized world.

Of necessity, the Institute's work concerns not just the United States and its economy but the rest of the world as well. Indeed, a major and continuing focus of Institute work has been on other important economies in Europe, Asia, and the developing world (most recently China)—includ-

ing but not limited to the interaction of these economies with the United States. This work is widely read and influential around the world because of its professionalism and because, although it comes from a US-based institution, it takes a broad internationalist view of economic problems and their solutions.

Paul Volcker, who was chairman of the Federal Reserve Board from 1979 to 1987 and who knows Fred and the Institute well, comments on the growing importance of the Institute's internationalist orientation under Fred's direction:

You know, right now a challenge for the Institute, a challenge for all of us, is a tendency for the United States [to be] rather unilateral, aggressive, almost arrogant toward the rest of the world. . . .

And whether it's deliberate or not, I think it's a matter of pure instinct, the Institute has always been international if they're nothing else. Their whole purpose is international and getting some harmonious consensus around the world, particularly about the economic system and how the adjustments are going to be made. And whether or not you're successful in the specifics and whether or not all the particular suggestions make sense or not—I think that [this international] focus is absolutely critical for the country.

The Happy Cassandra

One of Fred Bergsten's enduring characteristics is his proclivity to forecast economic calamities. When the foreign exchange value of the US dollar was very strong in the early 1980s, the US and world economies were, according to Fred and Steve Marris, threatened with the imminent prospect of a "hard landing" for the dollar. With the dollar once again very strong, the global economy now faces the significant risk of a "dollar crash." Although trade liberalization has made fairly consistent, and cumulatively very substantial, progress throughout the postwar era, the world economy is increasingly threatened by wholesale regression into protectionism. Indeed, as discussed in the chapter by Mac Destler and Marcus Noland, according to Bergsten's famous "bicycle theory," if trade liberalization does not maintain sufficient forward momentum, it will not simply fall over like a bicycle but will start rolling backward.

Despite such gloomy predictions, I always find it surprising that Fred maintains a fundamentally optimistic outlook. Max Baucus, the senior senator from Montana and ranking Democratic member of the Senate Finance Committee, has long been concerned with issues of international trade and finance; he has known Fred and valued his work and that of the Institute for many years. Using his shrewd politician's instinct, he sizes up Fred Bergsten as follows:

Well, Fred is quite a guy. He's a pistol. Fred's got more energy than about 10 other people I can think of. He's always excited, he's always positive, he's always

upbeat, and he's trying to find, you know, a solution to a problem. He's not a downer, he's not pessimistic, he's not dour. I think the world of Fred.

Thus although Fred is, among international economists, a leading Cassandra, he is a very happy Cassandra. How does he square his often gloomy forecasts with the fact that they typically fail to materialize? In a recent conversation, he explained:

Academic theoreticians and even some market practitioners pooh-pooh the risk of international financial crises. They kind of half assume that the rest of the world will finance the United States forever and that good logic will prevail and [we will] avoid the application of protectionist trade measures. The problem with that reasoning is that past history shows that it can actually happen.

It is true that when past crises have loomed or even appeared—in 1971, 1978, 1979, the middle 1980s . . . those crises were managed in ways to avoid the worst. The United States never did suffer a catastrophic hard landing or depression. The global trading system staggered through. The exchange rate system managed to survive, more or less untrammelled. But in all cases, it was a very close call and only through official action and a lot of international economic cooperation was the deluge avoided.

As someone who publicly argued that the dollar was too strong in the mid-1980s and would need to depreciate substantially, but who also publicly doubted the “hard landing” scenario, I do not entirely subscribe to this explanation. There is something to be said for getting the forecast right.

Nevertheless, I concede that Fred is also right that in seeking to motivate constructive action, or avoid destructive action, there is often some value in “responsible excess” in characterizing the risks of inaction or inappropriate action—at least as long as what you are arguing for is unlikely to be worse than what you are arguing against. Moreover, many share Fred’s view that emphasizing the risks of potential crises is valuable in motivating actions that can help prevent them. Paul Volcker, for example, has a range of experience that makes him particularly well qualified to remark on this issue:

[I]n the eighties when we did have a balance of payments problem and the dollar had gotten very high for a while, . . . there was a lot of concern articulated: most clearly, repeatedly, and forcefully by Steve Marris, who was a leading member of this Institute for International Economics. . . . And I think [it] had a constructive influence because it brought to the policymakers’ attention that there was a danger. . . . [W]hile it never happened and we learned that markets could adjust, I think that policies in the later part of the eighties helped prevent [a crisis].

I used to argue with Fred because I thought it [the dollar] would come down anyway; we didn’t need his help. But however that may be, I think it is true that the concern—particularly the later concern—about operating in cooperation to maintain some stability in exchange rates was influenced by Fred and John [Williamson] and others who were centered . . . in the Institute.

Concerning the threat of protectionism, one may also question whether the “bicycle theory” is perhaps somewhat overdone. But the fact is that both congressional and public support for open policies toward interna-

tional trade (and capital flows) have been eroding in the United States, and the situation is hardly better in Europe and elsewhere. Outside the Institute, many well-informed observers are increasingly worried.

One of them is Phil English, who was elected to Congress from Pennsylvania in 1994 and was the first freshman Republican to be appointed to the House Ways and Means Committee since George H.W. Bush in the 1960s. As a leading congressional expert on international trade matters (who expresses great appreciation for the work of the Institute), Congressman English worries,

What I find is there is a rising fear within the public, within the business community, within workers' organizations—fear of unfair trade. And this is evolving, I think, potentially [into] a backlash that could move us away from international engagement. I'm afraid that in terms of international economic policy there's a great deal of pressure for us to disengage from the world trading system, to pull back on ourselves. And the fact is, no country has ever done that successfully and maintained its standard of living.

Carla Hills, who has remained very actively involved with international trade issues (and with the Institute) since leaving the office of the USTR, shares similar worries:

I'm very concerned that we are experiencing creeping protectionism. I worry that although tariffs have come down, dumping actions, safeguard actions, and particularly actions over domestic regulations like standards are creeping in to keep foreigners' products out. . . . That will have an adverse effect on the growth of the global economy and on the well-being of our national economy.

Star Player, Team Leader

When you enter the Institute's new building on Massachusetts Avenue and walk past the reception area, you come to the large room where the Institute holds its book release luncheons, conferences, and other public functions—invariably with C. Fred Bergsten as the designated "host." This room is about 30 feet wide and over 100 feet long. In view of Fred's parentage, some might think that it resembles a modern church. More appropriately, I believe that it resembles a basketball court. Because Fred Bergsten is in fact a bit of a basketball fiend.

Les Gelb reflects on the importance of basketball in the career of his long-time friend:

Fred and I have known each other since I was ten and he was eight, and it had to do with basketball. His father was the pastor of St. John's Methodist Church in New Rochelle, New York. And St. John's sported the only indoor gymnasium in the city that you could use on Saturdays. So on Saturdays I became a Methodist and went over there to play basketball. Fred was always there. And he and I had this passion for that game which we share to this day. . . . Fred and Jenny, and my wife Judy, we even had season tickets to the Washington Bullets basketball games for many, many years.

Fred . . . had a certain basketball skill that was directly transferable to his success at the IIE, namely luck. Those balls that he shot up, he couldn't have even seen the basket on half those shots. He was just heaving them up all the time, and . . . all sorts of them actually went in. . . .

Whenever you run a place like the IIE . . . some things you can attribute to your skill, but you're making calls all the time between this program [or] that program, this senior fellow or that senior fellow, and . . . Fred Bergsten had an awfully high percentage of right calls. . . .

Fred has a very consistent personality. If you took a vote among foreign policy people who have known him over the years, they would vote Fred the most unchanged. In basketball he used to take the most shots . . . whoever was playing on his team, somehow or other Fred ended up taking 50 percent of the shots. Fred still has the knack now for getting attention to what he says. He's still taking a lot of good shots.

I hasten to add that not everyone who knows Fred and was important in his career was overly impressed with his performance on the basketball court. Stuart Eizenstat observes,

Fred is wise in many ways, and one of his greatest acts of wisdom was not asking me to play basketball, because I was a high school all-American basketball player and I might have shown him up too much.

Paul Volcker is even more succinct:

I don't play basketball with him, no. . . . He's too short. I don't play basketball with short guys with beards.

Despite these doubts about Fred's basketball prowess, I think Les Gelb is fundamentally right in attributing significance to basketball in forecasting and shaping key aspects of Fred's later career. It is true that in the work of the Institute, Fred is the leading shooter—and probably the leading scorer. Even more important, as a basketball player, Fred clearly learned that championships are won by great teams, not merely by highly talented individual players.

Richard N. Cooper, the Maurits Boas Professor of Economics at Harvard University and chairman of the Institute's Advisory Committee, has known Fred for nearly 40 years, since Fred first worked for him at the State Department as well as when they were both officials in the Carter administration. He emphasizes Fred's skill in recruiting a great team:

Fred Bergsten . . . has an outstanding way of drawing in excellent people and he has established an absolutely first-class team. It is easier to do once an institution has developed a reputation, but he started out at the beginning with an extremely good core of senior staff members, some of whom are still with the Institute.

Lawrence Summers, former US treasury secretary and former president of Harvard University, makes much the same point, while also noting Fred's performance as the Institute's leading shot taker:

Fred is irrepresible. He doesn't get discouraged—ever. He keeps coming back on his ideas. He listens, and he responds to the questions people ask, rather than simply the concerns that he has, and he assembles remarkable people together as a team and he allows them to each pursue their initiative.

And so Fred has undoubtedly written more books than anyone else at the Institute. Fred has surely given more interviews than anyone else at the Institute, but a great part of what he has accomplished is the set of people that he has brought together at the Institute who have made his work better and who have made enormous contributions to international economic thinking.

Pete Peterson reflects more broadly on the key qualities that have made Fred such a great leader for the Institute:

One thing that's unique about the Institute is its director. . . . Fred Bergsten is a statistical anomaly. . . . It's extremely rare to find in one person at least three qualities that you dream about in a director.

First, you want someone who is very good about defining policy issues and implementing them and selling them and reaching out and telling the world about them. I think Fred is one of the best in that area.

Second, you want an executive director who can attract top talent. And I know I may be called prejudiced, but I know quite a lot about a lot of think tanks; I think it's the best group of economists in the world I've ever seen.

And third, . . . we use the euphemism "development" . . . for reaching deep into other people's pockets. I've got to tell you, every time I see Bergsten, I put both hands in both pockets, but somehow he reaches down and finds the money anyway.

Jessica Einhorn, the dean of Johns Hopkins University's School of Advanced International Studies (SAIS) and a long-time friend of Fred Bergsten, holds somewhat different but not inconsistent views:

There are a couple of qualities about Fred that make him the best possible choice to head the Institute. One, I think, is the brilliance and passion that he brings to international economics. . . .

The second one is, and it's only grown with the years, his total sense of security intellectually, which may make him a very strong debater but also only makes him happy if somebody can prove him wrong because what Fred is interested in is learning and then getting the right answers. . . .

And the third great thing about Fred is Jenny. And the fact that we have Jenny as part of the Institute, from the aesthetic touch to the emotional intelligence to the ability to manage Fred in the best possible way, that's another great thing about Fred. He chose a great wife.

Observations: C. Fred Bergsten, the Man and His Institute

"I think the Institute exceeded our expectations. If you're in the grant-making business and you bat .500, which is pretty good baseball, you

think you're doing terrifically. The Institute is a home run. The Institute did exactly what we hoped it would do—that is, provide analysis to policymakers that needed it in a timely fashion.”

—*Frank Loy*

“Has it met our objectives of 25 years ago? I could not have imagined the Institute being this successful. Every time I look at this wonderful building and meet all of the great fellows and spend a few hours there listening to their work, I could not have imagined this kind of aggregation of talent 25 years ago.”

—*Peter G. Peterson*

“I think the Institute certainly exceeds my expectations and the expectations of many people who were involved at the beginning. . . . It met the goals and it went well beyond that. The Institute has established itself much more firmly than I think anyone would have guessed 25 years ago. . . . There's no more laudatory comment on the Institute than the desire today of the Europeans to emulate the Institute for International Economics, and they have just last year created a new institute, Bruegel, which is expressly modeled on the Institute for International Economics.”

—*Richard N. Cooper*

“The Institute, as I always say, is a national treasure.”

—*Jessica Einhorn*

“Fred . . . has a knack of combining a solid economic framework and . . . an obsession about practical policy problems. And his conception of the Institute from the beginning was to combine good economic analysis with practical and timely application to policy problems, and I think on that score you have to say he has been very successful.”

—*Paul Volcker*

“My impression of the Institute over the last 25 years is if it weren't there, somebody would have had to invent it because it's really in the last 25 years that the reality of interdependence, or now more often called globalization, has come home to roost with the policy world. . . . I think we're very lucky that Fred was the one who invented [the Institute].”

—*Marina von Neumann Whitman*

“I don't think there have been many institutions outside the government, if any, that have had the same kind of impact on global economic thinking and, through their impact on global economic thinking, on the global economy as the Institute for International Economics. As an American and as a citizen of the world, I feel we're lucky to have the Institute for International Economics.”

—*Lawrence Summers*

“I think the Institute has been one of the most important factors in shaping US trade policy, and, indeed, I could go beyond that. . . . The Institute is the very best in international economics. It has a stable of scholars and deep thinkers who are number one on anybody’s list across the board, whether it be monetary policy, China, trade policy. The Institute just has the very best, and the work product that they put out is not only persuasive but [also] so well written that people who are not able to do the economic formulae for themselves can understand why trade is a benefit to the national interest.

I give Fred Bergsten huge credit for where the Institute is today. He is thinking about the future of the Institute 24/7, and he brings together diverse points of view. He accepts criticism and he listens carefully. I think he’s just a superb director.”

—*Carla Hills*

“Well, the Institute has helped us in Congress in many, many ways. One is with trade legislation . . . [and with] trade promotion authority. It’s the basic trade legislation we have to have for this government to function in the world. But it’s also . . . trade adjustment assistance [and] lots of other areas where the Institute is providing invaluable service. . . . I’m not exaggerating. I think the Institute is one of the best organizations that we have in this country in terms of helping the government—whether it’s at one end of Pennsylvania Avenue or the other, Republicans or Democrats—[to] better understand trade and international financial policy in a way where we’re making things happen in a positive way.

There are huge challenges out there in the world, huge, and they’re getting more and more challenging. . . . The Institute for International Economics . . . is playing a very vital role, and I think that it will play an even more vital role as these issues become even more important than they already are.”

—*Senator Max Baucus*

“[T]he Institute is enormously influential because it’s a munitions factory. It produces real materiel in the war on ideas. And it will—for an individual like me that is trying to address complicated issues in a nuanced way—IIE has done a remarkable job of giving me options, giving me real research, . . . giving me the building blocks of real policies.”

—*Representative Phil English*

“I think the Institute for International Economics has one of the most seasoned, experienced, and well-recognized staffs of economists in the world, with deep expertise . . . on trade and exchange rates, the economies of China, India. . . . It’s a great resource to have the research that’s being done here as we think through the business of how we do a better job serving those markets.”

—*James Owens*

“[W]e have taken a great deal from the Institute in our own thinking at UTC [United Technologies]. This is our primary source of economic advice outside of our own company. We turn always to Fred, to the Institute. He just spoke at one of our conferences a couple of days ago. His thinking is influential for us looking at the two- to three-year time period ahead. . . . It covers the full range of topics, and I think the Institute could be even broader.”

—George David

“There’s no institute anywhere in the world, in my opinion, that comes close to having the broad impact that the Institute for International Economics does in capitals across the world in their economic thinking, in trying to promote an open trade environment, sound exchange rate policies, domestic economic reforms. It’s really quite a remarkable impact, and there simply is no institute that comes close to it. If this Institute didn’t exist, we’d have to create it overnight because it has filled such a vacuum and filled it so well that it really has become an essential part of policy-making all over the world.”

—Stuart Eizenstat

“Twenty-five years from now, Fred Bergsten will even be more renowned as director of the IIE than he is today.”

—Leslie Gelb

Amen!