

**So, You Might Want to do Public Policy Research:
Lessons from Working in Lent Upson's Long Shadow**

**Earl Ryan, President
Citizens Research Council of Michigan**

**10th Annual Lent Upson Lecture
Graduate Program in Public Administration
Wayne State University
May 12, 2009**

[Introduce staff, Bob Queller; Thank Earhart]

My favorite composer is Johannes Brahms who, for his entire career felt that he was working in the shadow of Ludwig van Beethoven, always striving but never quite meeting Beethoven's standards. I have a little sense of what Brahms must have felt when I consider the legacy of Lent Upson. The man for whom this lecture series is named has cast a very long shadow down through the years, influencing many governmental researchers all across the country, often without their realization, and setting a very high bar for those who came after him.

Upson founded the Detroit Bureau of Governmental Research, which later became the Citizens Research Council of Michigan, in 1916, when he was only 29 years old, and spent the next 28 years as its head. And while Upson has been gone from us for 60 years as of 3 days ago, the principles he espoused still guide CRC. He believed that the cause of good government is advanced by producing high quality, factual research and analysis, although he had no illusions about the slow pace of governmental reform.

Upson had a long association with Wayne as the first dean of the public administration school, mentoring countless students. And at one time, the offices of the Detroit Bureau were located at 5135 Cass, essentially where State Hall is located today. CRC has continued to have close ties with Wayne and I expect them to continue into the future.

Despite the fact that I never knew Lent Upson (although I have talked about him with an individual who worked for him in the early 1940s), I still feel a connection with a person who was legitimately called a giant in his field and I harbor this fond hope that my career in general, and with CRC specifically, would have met with his approval.

I was first conscious of CRC when I was in grad school at Wayne State in 1965. My thesis adviser was a very bright guy by the name of Allan Hyman, whose day job was research coordinator for the Metropolitan Fund, which was engaged in fostering the policy research that led to the creation of the Southeast Michigan Council of Governments. He kept showing me these really neat papers on regional government by an outfit called the Citizens Research Council. I told myself that CRC looked like a place I might like to work if the chance arose.

The chance arose two years later when I started with CRC in its Lansing office. I learned quickly that my higher education proved only that I was teachable, not that I actually knew very

much. I found that state government is a maze of statutory provisions, rules, formulas, appropriations boilerplate, and other expressions of public policy that made it plain to me why an organization that devotes full time attention to state and local affairs is so critical.

As difficult as it was negotiating my way through the intricacies of state government, I had a couple of mentors at CRC, whose gentle and patient guidance made all the difference then and throughout my career. The executive director was Bob Pickup, who overcame a devastating bout with polio as a teenager, to make for himself a distinguished career in governmental research in Rhode Island, Pennsylvania, and finally, Michigan. Bob was a Yankee gentleman with a strong New England accent, who certainly let you know when you screwed up, but did it in such a way that your ego remained intact.

The research director was Bob Queller, who, in contrast to Bob Pickup, who had run three governmental research organizations, spent his entire professional career, 43 years, with CRC. Bob was the consummate researcher, who had this amazing ability to point out problems and issues that seemed obvious when he identified them, but somehow eluded other people. Bob was meticulous and expected equal care from his researchers. He wanted CRC to be the gold standard of accuracy and objectivity and, because of his efforts, his expectation was realized.

CRC introduced me to the real world of state and local government, but I wanted to experience it from the inside, so in 1970 I went to work for what was then the Michigan Department of Social Services as a budget analyst. While at DSS, I applied the analytical skills I had learned at CRC to start the ball rolling toward elimination of the Michigan Industries for the Blind in Saginaw, whose sole product was corn brooms made on equipment that even then was antique. It was an anachronism, which had long outlived any conceivable justification for its existence, and was finally put to rest in 1978.

A year into my career with the State of Michigan, I joined up with a fellow Wayne State and CRC alumnus by the name of Mike Meagher and he and I spent the next 6 years harassing state agencies through the vehicle of program evaluation, first in the Governor's Office and then in the House Fiscal Agency, which at that time was relatively young and looking to create more of an impact. They took a chance and created the Legislative Program Evaluation Review unit-LPER-somewhat affectionately known as "leper," which Mike and I staffed.

One of the things that Mike and I learned first hand was that, while public officials profess to value objective assessment of public programs, they tend to be selective in which programs they want to see evaluated. When you have spilled political blood

getting a program funded, it isn't always easy to see it criticized and it is often easier to blame the messenger for the bad news he brings.

This became a crisis for us in 1977 when the chairmanship of the House Appropriations Committee changed from Bill Copeland, who had brought the House Fiscal Agency into being and who had at least tolerated our program evaluation, to Dominic Jacobetti, who could best be described as a legislative thug and who was probably as responsible as anyone for the adoption of term limits in Michigan. Jacobetti fired the executive director of the fiscal agency, Wes Beadling, and replaced him with one of the HFA analysts, John Morberg, who viewed his job as doing Jacobetti's bidding and who had no evident interest in good policy analysis.

It was clear that the new regime was not buying what Mike and I were selling and we disbanded LPER, probably only days before we would have been closed down. Mike went to the Department of Labor and I took advantage of a life preserver thrown to me by Bob Pickup and Bob Queller to return to CRC, this time in Detroit, which turned out to be a turning point in my career.

Parenthetically, let me take you forward 16 years. I was running the Indiana Fiscal Policy Institute at the time and I started to get Detroit News articles from my friends in Michigan detailing a scandal at the House Fiscal Agency, which involved embezzlements, kickbacks, tax evasion, unauthorized bonuses, payments to Morberg's live-in girlfriend, payments to consultants that didn't consult, and reported use of Fiscal Agency funds to finance the sale of AK-47s to Croatia. It ultimately added up to nearly \$2 million in misspent funds and remains the biggest scandal in State of Michigan history. I got a call from one of the reporters who broke the story. He knew that I had once worked for the House Fiscal Agency and asked if I was surprised by any of this. I told him that the only thing that surprised me was that it took 15 years to catch them. Morberg was sentenced to 6 ½ years in federal prison and others received prison time as well.

At CRC, I resumed my relationship with Bob Pickup and Bob Queller and learned what I could about the workings of a governmental research organization. When Bob Pickup retired to Florida in 1979, Bob Queller became executive director and I succeeded him as research director. My years from 1977 to 1984 were professionally very satisfying, dealing with local government budgeting procedures, state budget problems during the recession of the early 80s, and helping to usher in a charter for Wayne County. Although things were going well, in 1983, the head of our counterpart organization in Louisiana announced his retirement and I decided to see if I had it in me to actually run one of these organizations.

I suppose the best thing I can say about my 2 ½ years at the Public Affairs Research Council of Louisiana (PAR) was that it was a learning experience. Advocating good government in the home of Huey and Earl Long and Edwin Edwards meant that you were not going to be met with universal approval. But, contrary to my expectations going in, some of the finest elected officials I have ever known I found in Louisiana. Having said that, there were many others that helped to bolster Louisiana's sordid reputation.

I concluded that Louisiana's big problem was a result of the populist legacy of Huey Long. The total tax burden in Louisiana, while not particularly low is skewed heavily toward business, which in many cases is there only because of Louisiana's natural resources: gas, oil, and timber. Taxes on individuals, except for the sales tax, are very low. As a consequence, Louisianans tend not to be invested in the decisions of their governments—they view government and elections as entertainment and place more value on the ability of a candidate or office holder to titillate them, with humor, scandal, or both. And a whiff of scandal isn't always the worst thing that can happen to a Louisiana public official, especially if it can be spun to make it look as though the embezzlement somehow actually hurt business or rich people.

I had some good times in Louisiana, but living there is a little like living in a foreign country and, by the time you have been called a "Yankee" for the 9000th time, you realize that you will never really be a part of the culture. So when I was approached by a group from Indianapolis interested in starting a governmental research organization in Indiana, I was ready to listen.

Starting an organization from scratch is scary, but the thought of doing it was more than I could resist, so on April 1, 1987, in an empty office in downtown Indianapolis, the Indiana Fiscal Policy Institute came into being. I had a kitty of \$200,000 and pledged annual income of \$80,000 to work with. I was told that I had three years to put the Institute on a self-sustaining basis and, as it turned out, it was almost three years to the day that we concluded that our annual expenditures could be supported by our annual income.

When I was asked whether there was an organization that I would try to model the Indiana organization after, I responded without hesitation, "The Citizens Research Council of Michigan." So, the principles of Lent Upson, as taught to me by Bob Pickup and Bob Queller, became the guiding principles of the Indiana Fiscal Policy Institute and they served us well for 7 ½ years.

For an organization, whose annual budget never exceeded \$250,000, we accomplished a reasonable amount. We became the only

independent voice on state budget matters in Indiana; we helped to create a climate within which Indiana's antiquated and, frankly, corrupt, system of property tax assessment could be put on the road to reform; and, perhaps most significantly, we provided the research that led to a constitutional amendment overturning Indiana's 140-year old prohibition against public pension plans owning stocks and the beginning of a plan of advance funding of those plans.

And we did it on a non-partisan basis in a state that is very partisan. When I announced that I was leaving Indiana, the senior member of the capitol press corps asked for an "exit interview." We talked for an hour or so and, when the interview was over, she closed up her notebook and said that she and her fellow reporters had watched me for several years and could not figure out my politics. Would I tell her how I vote? I responded that the only other person who knows how I vote is my wife and I was not about to deprive her of that status.

If IFPI was my "baby," CRC was my professional mother and in 1994, mamma called me home to succeed Bob Queller as president. As much as I looked forward to returning to CRC, it was still an emotionally wrenching experience. Leaving Indianapolis is, without any question, the hardest thing I have ever done, and the time I was there, from April Fool's Day 1987 to Hallowe'en 1994, will always be a special time in my life.

When my wife, Jo, and I moved into our house in Northville Township in early 1995, we found a potted plant and a note from our new next door neighbors. It said "Welcome to the neighborhood. (signed) Jennifer Granholm and Dan Mulhern." I had never heard of Jennifer Granholm at that point, but it quickly became clear that this was no ordinary neighbor. When I realized that she had an interest in public policy, I made sure she got CRC publications, which she actually read. In 2000, CRC identified the structural deficit that has plagued the State of Michigan for the past decade and a year later we projected a billion dollar shortfall in the general fund in Fiscal Year 2003-04 . When I put that analysis in her mailbox, I attached a sticky note that said, "Jennifer, Are you really sure you want to be governor?" Obviously, my gloomy warning had no effect and she now faces the prospect of being the first, and let us hope, only, governor in Michigan history to face a declining job market in every one of her eight years in office.

By 1994, I had been gone from Michigan for 10 years and, on returning, I was struck by the political polarization that had developed, part of it mirroring the ideological divide at the national level, but intensified in Michigan by regional and racial animosities. These kinds of differences weren't absent in Louisiana and Indiana, but Michigan seemed to me to have put an edge on them that made them particularly corrosive. I even found

that, because our offices were located in Southeast Michigan, we were frequently viewed with great suspicion by prospective supporters in west Michigan, regardless of our track record. I think this animosity contributes, to some degree, to Michigan's negative image.

The research products during my tenure as CRC president have varied widely, including mental health funding, transportation funding, interlocal cooperation, corrections policy, revenue sharing, and analyses of a bumper crop of statewide ballot issues.

Speaking of ballot issues, the roots of the Citizens Research Council are in the Progressive Era, a time of woman suffrage, trust-busting, prohibition, and other "reforms," some of which have stood the test of time and some of which have not. One of the ideas from that era, embraced by Lent Upson and the Detroit Bureau, the voter initiative, becomes more and more difficult to defend with each passing election. The initiative was once viewed as a safety valve that would permit direct democracy to remedy the failure of legislative bodies to enact reforms favored by the people, but blocked from becoming law by special interest groups. While an argument can be made that it has actually served that purpose, it is certainly questionable whether it normally does so now, 100 years after it was adopted in Michigan. Instead of thwarting special interests, it has become a vehicle that special interests have used, or tried to use, to visit all manner of insults on the Michigan Constitution. It is no coincidence that in 13 of the 15 states with term limits, the policy was placed in the constitution as a result of voter initiative. In recent years, prohibition of same sex marriages, prohibition of affirmative action by governmental units, and requirement of voter approval of new forms of gambling, even if those new games are the result of administrative action instead of legislation, have become part of the Constitution by means of the initiative. And we came close to voting last year on Reform Michigan Government Now!, a mega-proposal that virtually no voter would ever have read let alone comprehended. The Constitution is becoming filled with law that, even if it is good policy, should be found in statute instead of the state's basic governing document. And, frankly, a lot of it isn't very good law. While it is probably not politically possible to eliminate the initiative, a strong argument exists that it should be more difficult to amend the Michigan Constitution, whether by initiative or by legislative proposal.

While all of these issues were significant, CRC's signature issue in this century to date has been the condition of the state budget. We were the first organization to conclude that, even in a strong economy, the revenue structure of the State of Michigan is inadequate to support the menu of expenditures that we have chosen to support. Our now-retired Director of State Affairs,

Tom Clay, made over 400 presentations around the state on this issue; the media gave the issue good coverage; policy makers and their staffs understood the problem. But, what did they do? They used \$8 billion of nonrecurring resources and accounting gimmicks to paper over the deficit in order to meet the Constitution's balanced budget requirement. Even the incentives that have been created by current economic meltdown to make the necessary fiscal adjustments have been muted by the arrival of federal stimulus dollars, which can be viewed as another, very large, nonrecurring resource.

Michigan is now clearly in its weakest fiscal position, probably since the 1930s. Michigan, which historically has rebounded from recessions more vigorously than the rest of the nation, never recovered from the 2001-02 recession. Now, the national economic meltdown is compounding our problem and state revenues are apparently in free fall. (General Fund revenues in the second quarter of the fiscal year are down 22% from last year.) To make matters worse, the economic problem has been compounded by a governance problem in that decisions that might have made the current situation more manageable by reducing the structural deficit were put off by term-limited public officials, who chose to kick the can down the road instead of making the hard choices on taxing and spending.

I think that Michigan will emerge from the present economic doldrums, but it will be a different Michigan. The need to replace the current fleet of automobiles and the ability of the auto industry to make money at a lower level of sales may well give us some pleasant surprises in a few years. But if Michigan is to regain any semblance of its former economic vigor, it will have to come from different sectors of the economy, such as health care or energy, or perhaps from some currently unforeseen technology or service.

Now, I would like to speak to the students here who might be thinking about a career in policy analysis or even in governmental research. I think I have learned a few things that may be useful, not just in organizations like mine, but across a wider spectrum as well.

First, remember that the job is that of speaking truth to power and power may not like it, but you shouldn't let that put you off. If you have done your work carefully and have not gratuitously offended a public official, you will probably have nothing more to be concerned about than an angry e-mail or telephone call.

My first real experience like this happened when I was in Louisiana and we had released a report that was very mildly critical of a policy of the City of Baton Rouge. The mayor, Pat Screen, who was a local hero from his days as a scrambling

quarterback with LSU, called me, absolutely incensed, demanding to see the list of our members. I told him that producing such a list would be a problem because we had 7,000 members and there was no master list. He said he didn't care, that he was a public servant and had to disclose his supporters and that we should have to do so as well. I told him I would seek advice on our obligation to share our membership list and get back to him, so I called my chairman, a lawyer from Alexandria, Louisiana, who told me that I was obligated to share the list with the IRS and with any member who might request it. I said that was all I needed to know. I called Mayor Screen back, telling him that, if he would like to become a member of PAR, I would be happy to provide him with the list. My ears still ring when I recall his response.

Second, stay within the mission and capacities of your organization. Just because you are competent and credible in one area, doesn't mean that that competence is transferable to another area. CRC has had the same mission for 93 years and I believe that we have lasted that long in no small measure because we have not undertaken sociological studies, public opinion surveys, economic development analyses, or any of several other kinds of work that we have been asked to do, but which are really outside of our mission or our sphere of competence. We have carved out a niche and there is enough to do in that niche to keep us busy.

Third, keep the big picture and the details in your head at the same time. Policy analysis involves a lot of focus on details and it is easy to get lost in a forest of statutory provisions, expenditure data, and revenue histories. It is important to remember that these details are only important if they help to define a problem, describe an organization or policy, or prescribe an alternative. At the same time, if one of those details is faulty, you can be sure that it will be seized upon to bring discredit to an analysis that may otherwise be perfectly supportable.

Fourth, be patient. Lent Upson said that a governmental reformer has to have a geologist's sense of time. He knew whereof he spoke. I was involved in providing analysis that was helpful in bringing the Wayne County charter into being in 1981. In doing some background research, I went to the CRC files to see when Wayne County reform was first mentioned by our organization. I found an analysis that almost perfectly fit the problems I was looking at. It was dated February 1921.

There are generally three stages in the adoption of a public policy flowing from a research analysis: First, is the analysis itself. Second, is getting the attention of those necessary to make changes. Finally, is the adoption of the change. It is the second part, getting attention, sparking public debate on the issue, that normally takes the bulk of the time. We first began

talking about how far out of line Michigan corrections spending was in 2002. We called attention to how much Michigan could save if it were to reduce its rate of incarceration over and over during the next five years and it was only last year that things began to move. I believe that serious changes in corrections policy are now on the table, but it took a long time to move the issue this far.

Fifth, remember that elected officials are the people that make democracy work. You may have to repeat this to yourself several times when you watch the Detroit City Council in operation or perhaps your local school board. But, I have never disparaged elected officials, because I respect anyone who would go through the hassle of being elected to a public office, however trivial that office might be. That doesn't mean that an elected official is beyond criticism, but it does mean that a certain deference is owed to the person who has been put into office by his or her fellow citizens.

Sixth, your job is to get ideas out of your head and into the heads of others. This is not always easy and it is impossible if you don't write well. If you have not acquired good communication skills, I strongly advise you to do so because, if you have aspirations of getting into policy analysis, you will live with pain until you can explain sometimes complex issues clearly and concisely.

Seventh, keep in mind that the media, while they are critical to getting out your message and can be your friends, must be kept at arms length. There are several reporters and editorial writers with whom I have cordial, respectful relations, but I never volunteer unsupported opinions or remarks that could embarrass me or the Research Council. Regardless of how friendly they may seem, they have their jobs to do, and if, in a careless moment, you say something that could bring discredit to you or your organization, the only reason they won't publish it is that they don't consider it newsworthy, not because they want to protect you from yourself.

Finally, I have a list of "don'ts."

Don't let others define your mission. The easiest way for this to happen is for someone to pay you to do something that is not within your mission. Frequently, they want to use your credibility to advance their own interests. The Indiana Fiscal Policy Institute was offered a considerable amount of money to document the impact on the Indiana economy of the insurance industry. It was a well-intended request and we needed the money, but I turned them down because it really wasn't part of our mission and also because if we had done a good job, we might have generated similar requests that would have diverted us from doing things we were created to do.

Don't fall in love with your story. This is an old adage I have borrowed from journalism, but it is equally applicable to policy analysis and governmental research. It is very easy to become entranced by an analysis that seems to explain every aspect of the issue at hand, except that you have to ignore, or worse, suppress one or two little facts that run counter to your elegant hypothesis. You must always challenge every fact and conclusion and be willing to throw over the story for which you have come to have such warm feelings and follow a path that may not be as attractive, but which fits the facts better.

Don't avoid controversy. Several times in my career, I have had board members become concerned about a particular project or conclusion because they felt that it might be controversial. The unspoken assumption, I think, was that there is a tradeoff between controversy and credibility and that to maintain credibility, you must be noncontroversial. I have had two reactions to that: First, if your facts are straight and the conclusions drawn from those facts, however controversial, are reasonable, your credibility will not be threatened. Second, the reason some issues are controversial is that people care about them, and to avoid them is to reduce your organization's research agenda to topics chosen, at least in part, because no one really cares about them.

Don't get misty-eyed about the wisdom of the people. Two concepts that many people never challenge are the innocence of children and the innate wisdom of the people. I am somewhat skeptical of the former and I don't believe the latter at all. I think I am appropriately wary about the mischief that elected legislative bodies can perpetrate. But legislative bodies, for all their problems, provide forums for deliberating public policy and in an ideal world they would be robust and vigorous. And yet one of the unmistakable trends in amending the Michigan Constitution over the last several years is to weaken the legislature through tax limits, earmarking of revenues, expanded voter approval of various issues, and most perniciously, term limits. If neutering the basic institution of representative democracy is your idea of good government, then I invite you to review the performance of the Michigan legislature since term limits went into full effect in 2002.

Does governmental research have a future?

In a couple of months, CRC staff will be going to DC to attend the annual conference of the Governmental Research Association, the national umbrella group for organizations like CRC, and, by the way, another Lent Upson creation. At my first GRA conference, in 1968, there were about 250 participants. This year, we will be happy if there are 1/5 that number. Clearly,

governmental research, as it has been practiced for the last century, has not been a growth industry.

I think the basic reason for this decline is the changing nature of support and governance of our organizations. At their zenith, the outfits that made up the governmental research universe were supported by businesses and professions that were largely home grown. CRC was supported by Hudson's, Crowley's, Gerber, National Bank of Detroit, Detroit Bank and Trust, Michigan National Bank, Burroughs, Wyandotte Chemical, Great Lakes Steel, Motor Wheel, Detroit Edison, and so on and on (I think you get my drift), in addition to Ford, GM, and Chrysler.

These were large firms, but they were run by people who lived in Michigan and who had a concern for state and local government here. Our board of directors was made up heavily of top level corporate executives, frequently CEOs, who could unilaterally determine support for CRC. They supported CRC because they valued sound decisions on the part of governmental units that supplied services to their businesses and to their homes.

With the advance of globalization, the makeup of our supporters and our board began to change. If a local firm was acquired by an out-of-state corporation, the CEO on our board was replaced, if we were lucky, by the local division head or the local public affairs or governmental relations manager. The firms whose headquarters stayed here began to act internationally and, while the CEOs still lived here, Michigan became just one of many locales worldwide that demanded their attention. As a consequence, those entities that continued to support CRC designated lower level employees to participate on our board. This had two consequences: First, it meant that our main contact with the firm was frequently not the decision-maker when it came to our financial support; and, second, our new contact often had a somewhat different view of the value of CRC than the CEO.

I have always believed that the higher you are on the mountain, the broader the view. The CEO, by virtue of his or her position, tends to see the interests of the firm in the context of the community or communities in which it is located and is more willing to support organizations, such as CRC, that may not directly benefit the firm, but which creates a more hospitable environment within which to do business.

The governmental affairs manager or tax manager, on the other hand, tends to see career advancement as coming from doing things that benefit the firm, sometimes even at the expense of the community. Public policy is of interest to the extent that the interests of the firm are advanced and not much further. I once even had a tax manager tell me that, while a proposed tax change would reduce his taxes, he might oppose it because it would benefit his competitors as well. These attitudes also shape

their views on supporting nonprofit organizations. If the nonprofit advances the firm's interest in some readily identifiable fashion, the contribution is made. If not—and we are not in the business of advancing the specific interests of our contributors—we get a letter that says that, while CRC provides a valuable function, we get many requests for support and cannot honor all of them. Best wishes for your future success.

In talking to my counterparts in other states, I hear variations on this theme all the time. Fortunately, there are a number of exceptions to this paradigm, but it explains enough that we have seen an erosion of business support for the last three decades. And, given the immediate prospects for the Michigan economy, I don't see a turnaround anytime soon.

So, how can we get Lent Upson's creation to its centennial in 2016? As I see it, we have four choices: 1. Change the mission so that we essentially treat our business supporters as clients; 2. Consult with units of government that want analytical help in addressing problems; 3. Seek grants from funders, primarily foundations, for specific projects; 4. Seek grants from funders, again primarily foundations, for general operating support.

The first option, changing the mission to essentially become a research-oriented chamber of commerce would end Lent Upson's legacy and the citizens of Michigan would lose an independent voice in state and local affairs.

Consulting with units of government would be less problematic, but it means that your research agenda tends to be shaped by government, and governmental units may not wish to pay for projects defined independently rather than by governmental bureaucracies.

Grants for specific projects from foundations can work as long as the mission of the foundation, as expressed through the grant, and the mission of the Research Council coincide. We have done this on numerous occasions. The problems with this approach are 1) that we spend a lot of time, some of it unproductive, seeking the grants, and 2) there is a feast and famine aspect to project funding that requires a good operating reserve or endowment to accommodate.

The gold standard is unrestricted foundation support for general operations. It is also the most difficult to secure, although we have been increasingly successful. Michigan is blessed with a number of large foundations, including Kellogg, Mott, Kresge, Hudson-Webber, McGregor, Fisher, Skillman, and others. They are coming to the realization that public policy is important to their missions and that sound governmental decision-making

complements their decisions. And I am tireless in reminding them that they already have a 501(c)(3) organization that does public policy.

Realistically, I think that a combination of special and general foundation support, perhaps even support from higher education, plus continued support from business and the professions will form the funding base of CRC going forward. We always say that if there were no Research Council, we would have to invent one. I just don't want a time to come when that has to be tested. For what it is worth, this strategy is beginning to show some promise. We expect to take in substantially more revenue this year than we ever have, despite the lousy economy. Admittedly, it is largely due to a \$1 million grant in March from the Kresge Foundation, but it is clear that our supporters realize the importance of CRC and want to ensure that we stay around.

In 1967, when I was hired into this business, Bob Pickup told me that "you are never going to get rich in government research, so you may as well have some fun." I took his advice to heart and, 42 years later, I can honestly say that it has been fun. Maybe not knee-slapping, side splitting fun, but fun that comes from seeing your research translated into public policy and the realization that, if you have done your work right, government will be a little more accountable, a little more efficient, a little more equitable. If that kind of fun appeals to you, all I can say is "Go for it."

If you do choose such a career, I have one strong recommendation: Find a loving, supportive partner. My wife, Jo, and I are pushing 44 years of marriage and she has been with me every step of the way. In nearly 25 years of running these outfits I have had my share of stress, whether because of a research project gone awry, or because of cash flow problems, or because of conflicts with members of my board. Regardless of the problem, I always knew that I would have a refuge at home. I can only imagine what it would have been like if I had had to go from one stressful environment to another. She has been as responsible as I have for whatever success I have had and I'd like you to meet her.

I don't know what I am going to be doing 6 months from now, let alone a year or more down the road, but whatever it is, I know that I will still be indebted to Wayne for helping to shape a long, satisfying career and enriching my life and I want to take this opportunity to say, "thank you."