

Open access

2,284 3  
Views

1  
CrossRef citations to date Altmetric

Listen

Original Articles

# American think tank networks and expert debates around the Global Financial Crisis: Keynesian insurgents against austerity defenders

Alejandra Salas-Porras

Pages 243-259 | Published online: 06 Nov 2017

Cite this article <https://doi.org/10.1080/14494035.2017.1397393>

Check for updates

Full Article

Figures & data

References

Citations

Metrics

Licensing

Reprints & Permissions

View PDF

## We Care About Your Privacy

We and our 848 partners store and/or access information on a device, such as unique IDs in cookies to process personal data. You may accept or manage your choices by clicking below, including your right to object where legitimate interest is used, or at any time in the privacy policy page. These choices will be signaled to our partners and will not affect browsing data. [Privacy Policy](#)

We and our partners process data to provide:

Use precise geolocation data. Actively scan device characteristics for identification. Store and/or access information on a device. Personalised advertising and content, advertising and content measurement, audience research and services development.

List of Partners (vendors)

I Accept

Essential Only

Show Purpose



Abstract

This article discusses the role of American think tanks in the debate around the Global Financial Crisis of 2007-2009. It explores how these networks have replaced Keynesian insurgents with austerity defenders, and how this has affected policy-making in those fields that have not been reached in these domains.

standing of the Global Financial Crisis. It explores how these networks have replaced Keynesian insurgents with austerity defenders, and how this has affected policy-making in those fields that have not been reached in these domains.

Keyword

In this article



# Highlights

## Introduction

- Interlocking activity in the American think tank network is highly concentrated in a few think tanks and experts.

## Theoretical framework

- Think tanks' most visible experts circulate through various fields of power mobilising policy ideas, contesting or defending policy discourses.

## Circulation of experts between different fields of power

- After de Financial Crisis of 2007-2009, no consensus has been reached among think tank experts, and the policy communities remain divided around monetary and

## Discussion

## Notes on contributor

## Disclosure statement

## Acknowledgements

After decades of mobilising neoliberal ideas through the media, universities, national and international organisations, right-wing think tanks in the US contributed to bring

about in the 1980s a policy consensus around a set of policies broadly in line with a free-market, neoliberal ideology (Cockett, [1994](#); Marchak, [1991](#)). In the 1990s, this shift triggered a wave of free trade agreements and substantially reduced the regulation of big business and financial institutions, privatised multiple activities formerly carried out by the state and increased tax cuts for large corporations (Burriss, [2008](#); Wrenn, [2015](#)).

The 'common sense' underlying the neoliberal policy paradigm has also had an enduring

diminish and cut

which underpin

depe

pp. 40-4


institutio



had become extremely unstable. Deregulation of financial markets encouraged, inter alia, by neoliberal think tanks in the years leading up to the crisis had led to speculation with increasingly risky financial instruments, especially in the housing markets. These then led to bank failures and subsequent tax-financed 'bailouts' to rescue 'too big to fail' banking and other financial institutions, and to a massive redistribution of wealth (Crotty, 2009).

In the wake of the crisis, a search for new policy ideas ensued. Among its consequences was a resurgence of Keynesianism among policy-makers and economists. In the US, new proposals in the closely related fiscal and monetary domains entailed a paradigm shift towards Keynesian demand-side economics (e.g. reduction of interest rates, buying public and private assets by the Federal Reserve Bank and later expansionary fiscal policies). When near zero interest rates proved insufficient to stimulate growth, new expansionary policies such as increases in government spending and tax cuts to boost job creation and consumption began to be explored. While Keynesianism was moving towards the 'mainstream' again, it did so not unopposed. Experts affiliated with neoliberal think tanks argued against government spending because they saw deficit and debt reduction as the key to getting out of the Great Recession which had followed the financial collapse. They engaged in an ideological debate to challenge Keynesian policies (Lachman, 2016; Young, 2013), recommending a much greater commitment to fiscal austerity programmes.

Thus, even if the Keynesian revival did not last long in the US, no consensus has been reached in the policy community around austerity programmes and the struggle to define a



Research  
The stru  
mob  
think tan  
from the  
general,  
But how  
In this article

ense  
notably  
y experts  
ic opinion in  
aking



Abstract  
Highlights  
Introduction  
Research questions and methodological framework  
Theoretical framework  
The American economic policy network  
Circulation of experts between different fields of power  
Ideological cleavages in the American think tank network  
Discussion

Other organisations from inside and outside the state apparatus can emerge from the composition of the boards of directors or trustees, from how research teams are put together and from how research programmes are determined with the involvement of external stakeholders. The resultant web of interactions can be examined with the help of network analytical tools to answer different questions, but four are especially relevant for following the mobilisation of ideas and knowledge: (1) Do think tanks interlock according to their policy orientation? (2) What are the characteristics of the most central think tanks in the network, that is, those having greater capacity to connect, transfer ideas and shape policies? (3) What other public and private agencies are involved in the network producing connections between the think tank field and other fields of power? And lastly (4) What are the main ideological struggles in the network to define a new policy consensus?

Notes on contributor  
Disclosure statement  
Acknowledgements  
Footnotes  
References

The research strategy followed several steps to answer these questions. First, a sample was assembled that included only those think tanks from the US ranked by McGann's (2014) lists as the top economic policy think tanks. McGann's lists include the most important think tanks in the world, according to country and issue (see introduction to this thematic issue for a discussion of his rankings). A total of 35 US think tanks was found in these lists, although only 33 with sufficient information available to discover their connections (Table 1 registers these think tanks, their assets, the number of links they generate among themselves and their ideological orientation).

Table 1. Most important US think tanks in the economic domain.

Download



Second, ... directors  
of the bo ...  
organ ...  
or pa ...  
based on ...  
debates ...  
Third, fo ...  
relatio ...  
In this article

Abstract the database was converted into matrices which were processed to discover different patterns of interlocking, particularly: (a) centrality of think tanks and think tankers.

Highlights Centrality is defined as the number of connections they produce and the speed, or distance, at which they can connect with the rest of think tanks and think tankers; and


Introduction (b) the intensity of connections, and the degree to which it corresponds to the ideologies they espouse. However, only individuals with two or more positions effect links, having greater capacity to transfer ideas and information between organisations and generate consensus. Only these linkers were included in the network analysis.

The American economic policy network Circulation of experts between different fields of power Fourth, once the main members of the network with two or more positions were identified, the biographies of these experts were examined in order to establish how they have moved throughout their careers between different fields of power, in particular academic, government agencies (ministries, advisory committees and

Discussion councils), national and global corporations and financial institutions, national and international policy-making organisations and the media. This circulation between fields of power (the so-called revolving door) entails mobilisation of (and competition between) policy ideas, as Crotty (2009, pp. 577, 578) documents in the case of financial institutions.

Notes on contributor Footnotes Last, but not least, after briefly mapping the ideological orientation of American think tanks following the characterisation of Inside Government and FAIR, an analysis of coincidences and rifts between think tanks' experts around monetary and fiscal policies was carried out.<sup>2</sup> Inside Government is a government website that offers information about campaign finance and elections, government spending, think tanks and other issues and

With the that many of the neol and after the Glob bank network; that thin ed policy agen me of these organ ade respons Obama; and that economic policy de





theory can in addition account for the struggles within policy networks to define what knowledge is acceptable and how this knowledge flows in different directions.

Highlights

Following Medvetz' application of Bourdieu's field theory, this article analyses, first, the characteristics of the field of think tanks in the US, using network analysis tools.

Second, it examines the interaction of the field of think tanks with other fields. Third, the struggles between think tanks and experts to construct a consensus around a new

policy discourse are studied. In the next section, I describe the main characteristics of the network, in terms of concentration of interlocks, centrality of think tanks and

experts, intensity of connections and the degree to which these indicators evince

similarities and differences in political orientation.

Discussion

Notes on contributor

## The American economic policy network

Disclosure statement

The group of 33 think tanks included in the sample has produced a complex set of

connections among themselves and, as shown in the next section, with other public

and private agencies. To analyse these connections, all the members of the governing structures - boards of directors/trustees - and the research staff, fellows and

researchers listed on their web sites were included. The main criterion to build the database was not to leave out anybody with the potential of generating interlocks since a member of the board in one think tank may be an expert affiliated with another.

Given the focus of the article, in the case of think tanks pursuing research in many policy fields (e.g. Brookings, Heritage, CATO, NBER), only experts dealing with

economic policy (and not other policy areas) were included (see also the list of think tanks).

This means that the sample includes all the members of the governing structures (and not just the NBER), a

total of 83 individuals. The database also includes all the research staff, fellows and

436 were included. The database also includes all the research staff, fellows and

436 were included. The database also includes all the research staff, fellows and

436 were included. The database also includes all the research staff, fellows and

436 were included. The database also includes all the research staff, fellows and

436 were included. The database also includes all the research staff, fellows and

436 were included. The database also includes all the research staff, fellows and

436 were included. The database also includes all the research staff, fellows and

436 were included. The database also includes all the research staff, fellows and

In this article



Abstract  
According to this network analysis, interlocking is highly concentrated – a few think tanks are extremely well connected whilst the majority are not. A total of 5075 positions are held by 4836 individuals in the 33 think tanks of the database. Out of these, only 209 (4.3%) simultaneously hold two or more positions, 187 hold only two, 15 hold three, 6 individuals hold four and only 1 (Lawrence Summers) holds five. Out of the 33 think tanks in the database, three – Economic Policy Institute (EPI), Global Policy Forum (GPF) and Linktank – are not linked to the network. The 209 think tankers (directors and experts) who have two or more positions generate 13,400 interlocks; only 20 think tankers (less than 10%) generate 2248 (almost 17%). Going beyond the level of the individual and onto the level of the think tank as an institution, [Table 1](#) shows that, out the 448 interlocks generated by the 30 think tanks connected in the network, five (less than 20%) concentrate more than 50% of the interlocking activity.

Notes on contributor  
Three think tanks have the highest centrality, meaning they can interact more rapidly not only among themselves but with the rest of the network. By far the most central is NBER, producing a total of 85 links. This organisation, which has been characterised as ‘non-partisan’ (Dolny, [2013](#)), brings together prestigious left-, centre- and right-leaning experts. It has a far-reaching web of connections with think tanks of different ideological preferences, but mainly with those classified as centrist and conservative.

On the right, it shares 18 experts with AEI – i.e. these experts appear simultaneously as researchers for both think tanks – 14 with HOOVER and 2 with CATO; in the centre, it shares 25 experts with the Peterson Institute of International Economics (PIIE), 11 with Brookings, 10 with the Center for Global Development (CGD), 5 with the Council of Foreign Relations (CFR), 2 with the New American Foundation (NAF) and the Levy

Economic Center for the Americas (CEA). The network exhibits a thickness of the lines of connection between think tanks, with the

Graph 1  
proc





Abstract

Highlights

Introduction

Research questions and methodological framework

Theoretical framework

The American economic policy network

Circulation of experts between different fields of power

Display full size

Ideological cleavages in the American think tank network

AEI, widely considered a conservative (Dolny, 2013; McGann, 2007) or right-wing (Burris, 2008) think tank, has 43 connections in the network. Besides those effected

with NBER (18), AEI has generated seven interlocks with HOOVER, six with the Manhattan Institute (MI), three with CATO, Heartland and WINEP and two with

ATLANTIC, ATLAS and CSIS. This means the most intense connections of AEI are effected with other conservative think tanks. A similar picture emerges with PIIE,

coming next with a total of 41 interlocks. This think tank, classified as both centrist and non-partisan, tends to interlock with similar organisations. It shares eight links with

CGD, seven with CFR, four with Brookings and three with Atlantic, all of them centrist or non-partisan. Both NBER and BROOKINGS function as policy brokers, linking think tanks on the right, centre and left and, as shown below, facilitating advocacy coalition building, as Weible and Sabatier (2006) would anticipate.

Thus, cl...  
particula...  
at least...  
not gene...  
political...  
) mig...  
circul...



Circul...


In this article



Network building is among the most important mechanisms to set a policy agenda in the economic policy domain and transfer ideas within policy communities. But networks are compounded by other mechanisms that play an equally important role in mobilising ideas, connecting knowledge with power and building consensus. These mechanisms include the revolving door, ad hoc discussions, hearings before Congress Committees, joint projects bringing together experts from different think tanks with policy-makers and journalists, among others (Abelson, 2004, pp. 228, 229). This article shall concentrate on the revolving door – that is, on the circulation of experts between different positions of power in other fields.

To discover how experts of the think tank network travel between different fields, moving – and in practice implementing – policy ideas and to gauge the scope of this mechanism, I examined the biographies of all members of the 30 think tanks having two or more positions in the network. The aim was to identify the positions they have held throughout their careers in other fields, particularly in government, universities, corporations and financial institutions, national and international organisations and the media.

As Table 2 shows, out of the 209 members of the network, at least 127 have been professors or fellows in one of the most prestigious US universities; 50 have been members of the boards or high executives of large corporations and 35 of financial institutions; 51 have held positions in national and international organisations – either intergovernmental, such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF), or private, such as the Trilateral Commission, the World Economic Forum, the Bilderberg



Table



There is... positions... tempora... or corpo... boards and... certain... ve, at least... ganisations... universities

In this article



Abstract  
scholars grants or fellowships to carry out research projects in the fields these

organisations are most interested in.

Highlights

Introduction  
For some individuals, think tanks are springboards for high positions in the public

service, as well as places to return to upon leaving public office. Thus, at least 28 of the

Research questions and methodological framework

209 members with two or more positions in the network have held a senior status in

Theoretical framework

the President's Council of Economic Advisors, 13 of them presided over this Council and

in 2015 were affiliated with NBER as research fellows. This is perhaps the most obvious

The American economic policy network

way to link knowledge with power, but also to look at policy ideas from different

Circulation of experts between different fields of power

standpoints.

Ideological cleavages in the American think tank network

The connections of American think tanks with top university professors not only mean -

Discussion  
as Medvetz (2012) contends - academic prestige and credentials. They also nurture a

Notes on contributor  
common language that validates the knowledge produced by these organisations and

attests argumentative authority. Thus, at least 30 of the experts in the network have

Disclosure statement

held academic positions at Harvard, 10 at Columbia and 7 at MIT, among other

Acknowledgments  
universities.

Footnotes

Not fewer than 35 of the experts have an active presence in print and electronic media,

References  
where they write columns and broadcast their views. Often, the 209 experts mix

academic and journalist activities, as in the cases of Larry Summers, Kenneth Rogoff,

Joseph Stiglitz, Paul Krugman, Dani Rodrik and Martin Feldstein, all of whom hold a high

position in the ranking of Ideas, which is assembled considering the number of citations

in RePec.<sup>4</sup> And although number of citations does not necessarily mean recognition, it

shows they are part of the main debates

Overlaps

dissemin

held by

and from

with the

Bilde



Some ex

interesti

of think

member

In this article



and generating 105 connections with other members of the network (see [Table 3](#)). Stiglitz, Nobel Prize in Economics (2001), has circulated through all fields but the corporate field. His positions have included membership on the advisory board of the Center for Economic and Policy Research (CEPR), a progressive think tank whose board includes Walden Bello and Robert Solow, a professorship at Columbia University, the office of chief economist at the World Bank and Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers. In the last 15 years, Stiglitz has adopted a very critical view of IMF, World Bank and laissez faire economists in general (Stiglitz, [2015](#)).

Circulation of experts between different fields of power

Ideological cleavages in the American think tank network

### Table 3. Top ranking economists in the think tank network.




[Download CSV](#) [Display Table](#)

Notes on contributor

Kenneth Rogoff (eighth in the 2016 list of most cited economists) is affiliated with four think tanks (all centrist and/or non-partisan), generating 118 interlocks in the network. He has circulated through the IMF, the academic and media fields (see [Table 3](#)). He is a professor at Harvard and writes a monthly column on global economic issues reproduced in over 50 countries with Project Syndicate. He defends free trade (including the TPP), a flat tax and anti-deficit policies.

Paul Krugman (24th in the 2016 list of most cited economists) is affiliated with NBER and PIIE. He was awarded in 2008 the Nobel Prize in Economics and has been a professor at Stanford, Yale, London School of Economics and Princeton. Since the



Bliley Act, allowing the incorporation of investment and commercial banks. During the Obama administration, he became influential in the response to the Great Recession while presiding over the National Economic Council. In the discussions for the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) – approved by the House and the Senate in early 2009 – he advocated tax cuts, while other economists (in particular De Fazio, Stiglitz and Krugman) argued in favour of more spending in infrastructure, education, health and policies to create jobs. In the academic field, Summers was a professor and president of Harvard University. In the field of international organisations, he was the Chief Economist of the World Bank (1991–1993) and member of the Bilderberg Group. In the corporate field, he was the director of Citigroup and in the media, a columnist for the Financial Times and the New York Times.

Martin Feldstein (13th in the 2016 list of most cited economists) produces 126 interlocks in the network and has revolved through all of the studied fields. In academia, he has been a professor at Harvard University. In the public administration, he presided over the Council of Economic Advisers during the Reagan Administration, where he was widely considered a ‘deficit hawk’, calling for painful measures to reduce the deficit. He has been active in the corporate field too, as director of AIG, JP Morgan, Eli Lilly and TRW. Internationally, he is affiliated with the Trilateral Commission and has attended several of the Conferences organised by the Bilderberg Group.

These five economists have held central positions in the network (see Table 3) and have revolved through different fields, although only Summers and Feldstein (both austerians) have held positions in the corporate field. Besides, Stiglitz and Krugman



Abstract  
Highlights  
Introduction  
way, he is part of what Krugman calls the 'confidence fairy' approach (that is, the idea that if fiscal deficit and debt are contained, confidence will stimulate investment) even if, as Krugman (2015b) contends 'the benefits of improved confidence failed to make their promised appearance'.

Research questions and methodological framework  
Stiglitz framework  
The American economic policy network  
Circulation of experts between different fields of power  
Ideological cleavages in the American think tank network  
Discussion  
Notes on contributor  
Both Stiglitz and Krugman have also been involved in heated debates with Rogoff. After Stiglitz criticised the IMF for its response to the Asian financial crisis (in his 2002 book *Globalization and its discontents*), Rogoff, who was then serving as economist in this organisation, addressed in 2002 an open letter to Stiglitz where he justifies the strategies followed in the region (Reinhart & Rogoff, 2013). Later, Krugman challenged austerians over the debt threshold thesis, according to which economies falter when debt surpasses 90% of GDP. Krugman accused them of withholding data and never dispelling the confusion provoked by a paper that seemed to justify austerity policies in the US and Europe. Moreover, he argued in *The Guardian*

Disclosure statement  
Acknowledgements  
Footnotes  
References  
[...] all of the economic research that allegedly supported the austerity push has been discredited. Widely touted statistical results were, it turned out, based on highly dubious assumptions and procedures – plus a few outright mistakes – and evaporated under closer scrutiny. (Krugman, 2015b)

In his blog, *the Conscience of a Liberal*,<sup>5</sup> Krugman has pointed out time and again to the inconsistencies of Feldstein's policy proposals. He strongly opposed expansionary monetary policies, as they would produce runaway inflation. Feldstein's arguments against quantitative easing – Krugman said – were built on the grounds of inflation fears, even when inflation remained at its lowest

The circ... Sometimes  
think tar... es they  
elaborat... propagating,  
legitimis... eral experts  
(Young... esurgence.  
Keyn... es.  
Accordin... y push has  
every  
y suffer, with



Abstract the depth of the suffering closely related to the harshness of the austerity.

(Krugman, [2015b](#))

Highlights

In the next section, I map the ideological cleavages in the think tank network and discuss where the most important experts stand on specific policies. Differences and

Research questions and methodological framework

similarities will be sketched by examining the arguments of think tanks' most visible

Experts framework

The American economic policy network

Circulation of experts between different fields of power

## Ideological cleavages in the American think tank network

Ideological cleavages in the American think tank network

According to the classification of Inside Government and/or FAIR of the 33 think tanks in

Discussion

the database, 12 are predominantly conservative, 12 predominantly left-wing (liberal or

Notes on contributor

progressive) and by far the largest number (25) are centrist (non-partisan or centrist)

Disclosure statement

(see Tables 1 and 4). Although not strictly aligned with this classification, Keynesian

economic policies are found among left-wing and centrist think tanks, while neoliberal

Acknowledgements

policies are found among conservative, libertarian and centrist ones. Conservative and

Footnotes

libertarian think tanks are predominantly neoliberal in the economic domain but in the

social and political spheres they support traditional values.

References

Table 4. Ideological orientation of American think tank (Inside Government and FAIR).

Download CSV

Display Table



This und...  
simple le...  
where th...  
article...  
the n...  
the neol...  
expansio...  
commun...  
network

rather...  
reshing out...  
s of this...  
xperts in...  
ntative of...  
ese policy...  
nk tank



**Abstract**  
In the monetary domain, the main divisions roughly align with patterns of interlocking. Advocates of hard currency policies, including those wanting a return to the gold standard, have opposed advocates of different kinds of stimulus packages, such as the Troubled Asset Relief Program (TARP) approved at the end of George W. Bush second term, the Recovery Act passed at the beginning of Barack Obama's Administration and most notably quantitative easing (QE). Adam S. Posen (president of PIIIE and member of CFR and CGD) provided de intellectual foundation for QE and for adapting monetary policy-making and debt management to low interest guidelines throughout many countries. The QE idea quickly spread to most centrist think tanks, which - as shown in Graph 1 - are tightly interlocked. Joseph Stiglitz, Paul Krugman, Dani Rodrik, David Wessel, Joseph Gagnon and other representative experts of centrist think tanks (like PIIIE, CGD, CFR, BROOKINGS, all with a high degree of centrality) actively defended QE policies that in the context of the financial crisis would promote growth. On the right, AEI and CATO strongly opposed QE and favoured hard currency policies. Desdmond Lachman (2016) - affiliated with conservative AEI - believed QE would lead to asset price bubbles, and several experts from MI (conservative) warned it would excessively enlarge FED's balance sheet, increase inflation and weaken the dollar. Lawrence White (2013) - senior fellow at CATO and policy expert at Heartland, strongly interlocked libertarian think tanks - contends that an 'automatic' gold standard would help tie the government's hands against printing money to cover its expenses. In contrast, Krugman (2015a) has argued against this standard, which in his view would further depress the economy.

In the fiscal domain, think tanks' position on tax revenue policies, debt, budget and deficit d... they  
correspo... scal  
responsi... spectrum  
(Grosser... understand  
fiscal res... spending  
which... problem in  
the fa... and Bromund  
(2011),... wth of  
entitlem... id.  
Centrist... debt policies  
(see deb... 660





and progressive think tanks, which argue that to reduce the deficit and increase spending in education, health and infrastructure, the budget should be balanced, increasing tax revenue, particularly from corporations and the wealthy. However, according to Krugman, fear-mongering about the size of the deficit has become a widespread strategy to slur left-wing proposals on government spending and raising corporate taxes. 'Unfortunately, policy-makers won't do the right thing, largely because they keep listening to fiscal scolds - people who insist that public debt is a terrible thing even when borrowing costs almost nothing' (Krugman, [2016](#)). Jared Bernstein ([2016](#)), senior fellow at left-wing CBPP and former Chief Economist, contends the deficit was aggravated by tax cuts during George W. Bush's administration and Obama's first term. In a testimony before the Congressional Budget Office, he insisted 'there is room for significant improvements in our tax code. Especially the business side of the code [...] is riddled with subsidies and loopholes' (Bernstein, [2016](#), p. 10). Thus, defining fiscal responsibility has become the main struggle in this domain.

A close look at Graph 1 shows that, except for SPN, all think tanks classified as libertarian (see [Table 1](#)) are a tightly knit group located in the far right of Graph 1; conservative think tanks (mainly HOOVER, MI, AEI and HERITAGE) also make up a group in the middle right; centrist think tanks are located towards the left side, showing less tightly knit patterns of interlocking. However, centrist think tanks focusing primarily on economic policies (PIIE, CGD, NBER and BROOKINGS) are also tightly interlocked. And last, liberal and progressive think tanks are more loosely interlocked among themselves and with the network as a whole. These patterns of interlocking facilitated ideological alignments in both the monetary and fiscal domains, which played a key role in the

aftermath of the 2008 financial crisis. The network of think tanks is characterized by a high degree of interlocking around several key nodes, particularly around the conservative think tanks (HOOVER, MI, AEI and HERITAGE) and the liberal think tanks (BROOKINGS, PIIE, CGD, NBER). This network structure has facilitated ideological alignments in both the monetary and fiscal domains, which played a key role in the aftermath of the 2008 financial crisis. The network of think tanks is characterized by a high degree of interlocking around several key nodes, particularly around the conservative think tanks (HOOVER, MI, AEI and HERITAGE) and the liberal think tanks (BROOKINGS, PIIE, CGD, NBER). This network structure has facilitated ideological alignments in both the monetary and fiscal domains, which played a key role in the aftermath of the 2008 financial crisis.



cutting back spending in Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security (Heritage, [2008](#)).

Second, a coalition including experts affiliated with CBPP, CEPR, BROOKINGS and AEI

opposed this proposal because it '[...] could jeopardize the health and economic

security of the poor, the elderly, and people with serious disabilities' (Aaron & Schultze, 2008)

Research questions and methodological framework

Theoretical framework

The American economic policy network

## Discussion

Circulation of experts between different fields of power

American think tanks and experts have constructed a tightly knit network that

Ideological cleavages in the American think tank network

encompasses the most important think tanks at the left, centre and right of the

ideological spectrum. Interlocking activity is highly concentrated in a few organisations

and experts, denoting higher concentrations of social and cultural capital and greater

Notes on contributor

capacity to mobilise policy knowledge.

Disclosure statement

Ideological differences between think tanks affect the patterns of interlocking, and vice

Acknowledgements

versa. Conservative and libertarian think tanks connect more intensely among

themselves; so do centrist and non-partisan ones, but they also connect with

conservative think tanks and only marginally with libertarian, liberal and progressive

Footnotes

ones. The intensity of connections means sharing common spaces within think tanks

where ideas and knowledge can be transmitted, validated or revised.

These patterns of connections reveal a heterogeneous integration into the field of think

tanks, where right and centrist organisations have become intensely intertwined,

whereas

only bec

and con

think tan

active p

could be



The m

importan

through

commur

experts



In this article



media to persuade public opinion and challenge their adversaries; and they imbricate all these different fields, as Bourdieu suggests.

Highlights

Disagreements between top economists in the US reveal the struggle of Keynesian insurgents against austerity advocates to gain credibility and to convince policy

communities that their proposals are better suited to overcome the Great Recession.

But they also reveal the efforts by Keynesian experts to redefine the rules that

legitimise policy-making knowledge, one of the main motivations driving think tanks.

These disputes are often accompanied or followed by cooperative efforts and advocacy

coalitions, whereby experts try to reach a consensus. Patterns of competition and

cooperation taking place not only in the media, but in workshops, discussion groups

and congressional hearings could be further analysed with the tools offered by the ACF

to understand more thoroughly the dynamics of the network and the strategies

preferred to influence policy-making.

Disclosure statement

Acknowledgements

## Notes on contributor

Footnotes

Alejandra Salas-Porras is a professor at UNAM. The author's lines of interest include elites and development on the national, regional and global levels, the Political economy of development, business and corporate networks.

References

## Disclosure statement

No poten

Acknow

I am

network

support

criticism

as well a

In this article



ying out the  
valuable  
and  
vig Pautz),



# Notes

## Highlights

<sup>1</sup> Social network analysis has been employed to examine inter-corporate relations

(Mizruchi & Schwartz, 1992). Though a static type of analysis, longitudinal perspectives

add some dynamism. However, it is a powerful instrument to analyse relational data at

particular moments in time, as in the case of this article.

## Theoretical framework

<sup>2</sup> The information for all of these tasks comes from the think tanks' websites in 2015,

biographies of directors, experts and academics (in their own web sites, those of

Circulation of experts between different fields of power

universities and corporations, LinkedIn and Wikipedia).

Ideological cleavages in the American think tank network

<sup>3</sup> See: <http://think-tanks.insidegov.com/>, [http://fair.org/extra-online-](http://fair.org/extra-online-articles/fair%E2%80%88study-think-tank-spectrum-2012/)

[articles/fair%E2%80%88study-think-tank-spectrum-2012/](http://fair.org/extra-online-articles/fair%E2%80%88study-think-tank-spectrum-2012/).

## Discussion

Notes on contributor

<sup>4</sup> As of July 2016 (see: [https://ideas.repec.org/top/top\\_person.all.html](https://ideas.repec.org/top/top_person.all.html)). Accessed 30-

Disclosure statement

August 2016.

Acknowledgements

<sup>5</sup> See: <http://krugman.blogs.nytimes.com/>.

Footnotes

References

## Related Research Data

One ... policies

in Fra

Sour

A Co

Inter

Sour

Link



Refer

In this article



1. Aaron, H. J., & Schultze, Ch. L. (2008, July 23). A balanced approach to restoring fiscal

responsibility. Retrieved August 18, 2017, from

[https://www.brookings.edu/research/a-balanced-approach-to-restoring-fiscal-](https://www.brookings.edu/research/a-balanced-approach-to-restoring-fiscal-responsibility/)

[responsibility/](https://www.brookings.edu/research/a-balanced-approach-to-restoring-fiscal-responsibility/)

[Google Scholar](#)

Research questions and methodological framework

Theoretical framework

2. Abelson, D. E. (2004). The business of ideas: The think tank industry in the USA. In D.

Store & A. Denham (Eds.), Think tank traditions. Policy research and the politics of

ideas (pp. 215–231). New York, NY: Manchester University Press.

[Google Scholar](#)

Circulation of experts between different fields of power

Ideological cleavages in the American think tank network

3. Bernstein, J. (2016, February 2). Testimony by Jared Bernstein, center on budget and

policy priorities. Retrieved May 16, 2017, from

[http://www.cbpp.org/economy/testimony-by-jared-bernstein-center-on-budget-and-](http://www.cbpp.org/economy/testimony-by-jared-bernstein-center-on-budget-and-policy-priorities)

[policy-priorities](http://www.cbpp.org/economy/testimony-by-jared-bernstein-center-on-budget-and-policy-priorities)

[Google Scholar](#)

Acknowledgements

Footnotes

4. Boccia, R. (2016, April 19). Congress should enact a responsible budget. Retrieved

August 19, 2017, from [http://www.heritage.org/budget-and-](http://www.heritage.org/budget-and-spending/commentary/congress-should-enact-responsible-budget)

[spending/commentary/congress-should-enact-responsible-budget](http://www.heritage.org/budget-and-spending/commentary/congress-should-enact-responsible-budget)

[Google Scholar](#)

5. Bourdieu, P. (2005). The social structures of the economy. Cambridge, UK: Polity

Press.

[Google Scholar](#)

6. Bromu... responsibility.

Retrie...


spend...

7. Brooki... relative easing:

What... relative-

<https://...>

In this article



8. Brookings. (2015, December 7). A discussion of the key economic issues in election 2016. Retrieved May 3, 2016, from <https://www.brookings.edu/events/a-discussion-of-the-key-economic-issues-in-election-2016/#cancel>

Google Scholar

Research questions and methodological framework

9. Burris, V. (2008). The interlock structure of the policy-planning network and the right turning U.S. state policy. *Research in Political Sociology*, 17, 1-33.

The American economic policy network

Google Scholar

Circulation of experts between different fields of power

10. Campbell, J., & Pederson O. (2014). The national origins of policy ideas. *Knowledge Ideological cleavages in the American think tank network regimes in the United States, France, Germany, and Denmark*. Princeton, NJ:

Princeton University Press.

Google Scholar

Notes on contributor

Disclosure statement

11. Capretta, J. (2016, November 2). Fiscal policy after the election. Retrieved August 19, 2017, from <http://www.aei.org/publication/fiscal-policy-after-the-election/>

Google Scholar

Footnotes

References

12. Cockett, R. (1994). *Thinking the unthinkable: Think-tanks and the economic counter revolution, 1931-1983*. London: Harper Collins.

Google Scholar

13. Crotty, J. (2009). *Structural causes of the Global Financial Crisis: A critical assessment of the 2008-2009 crisis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 63-580.10

14. Croucher, S. (2013). *The American think tank network: A network analysis*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Cambridge. K: Polity



15. Dolny, J. (2013). *The American think tank network: A network analysis*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Cambridge. K: Polity. Hows as the <http://www.polity.org/extra-> online

6. Engdahl, W. (2000, June 23). Why Larry Summers drove Joseph Stiglitz out of the World Bank. *EiR*, 27(25). Retrieved May 18, 2016, from [http://www.larouchepub.com/eiw/public/2000/eirv27n25-20000623/eirv27n25-20000623\\_057-why\\_larry\\_summers\\_drove\\_joseph\\_s.pdf](http://www.larouchepub.com/eiw/public/2000/eirv27n25-20000623/eirv27n25-20000623_057-why_larry_summers_drove_joseph_s.pdf)

Google Scholar

Research questions and methodological framework

Theoretical framework

7. Grosser, S. (2010). Fiscal responsibility and misleading rhetoric. Thesis submitted to John Hopkins University for the Degree of Master of Arts. Retrieved August 18, 2017, from [http://advanced.jhu.edu/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/government\\_modelThesisGrosser.pdf](http://advanced.jhu.edu/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/government_modelThesisGrosser.pdf)

Ideological cleavages in the American think tank network

Google Scholar

Discussion

8. Harvey, D. (2007). *A brief history of neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Notes on contributor

Google Scholar

Disclosure statement

9. Heritage (2008, April). Taking back our fiscal future. Retrieved from

Acknowledgments

<http://www.heritage.org/budget-and-spending/report/taking-back-our-fiscal-future>

Footnotes

Google Scholar

References

10. Krugman, P. (2013). *End this depression now*. New York, NY: Norton.

Google Scholar

11. Krugman, P. (2015a, November 13). Republicans' lust for gold. *New York Times*.

Retrie

<http://>

Goog

12. Krugm

aust

ht

delusi

Goog

13. Krugm

10-26

In this article



nl?\_r=0

believe it? The

terity-

ed October

10-26



Highlights  
[Google Scholar](#)

Introduction

24. Lachman, D. (2016, January 22). No more quantitative easing, please. Retrieved

Research questions and methodological framework  
March 24, 2016, from [http://www.aei.org/publication/no-more-quantitative-easing-](http://www.aei.org/publication/no-more-quantitative-easing-please/)

Theoretical framework  
please/  
[Google Scholar](#)

The American economic policy network  
Circulation of experts between different fields of power

25. Marchak, P. (1991). The integrated circus. The new right and the restructuring of

Ideological cleavages in the American think tank network  
global markets. London: McGill-Queen University Press.

Discussion  
[Google Scholar](#)

Notes on contributor

26. McGann, J. (2007). Think tanks and policy advice in the United States. London:

Disclosure statement  
Routledge.

Acknowledgements  
[Google Scholar](#)

Footnotes

27. McGann, J. (2014). Global go to think tanks rankings: The leading public policy

References  
research organizations in the world. Philadelphia, PA: Think Tanks and Civil Societies

Program, University of Pennsylvania.

[Google Scholar](#)

28. Medvetz, T. (2012). Think tanks in America. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago

Press.

29. Mizru... the structural

analysis



30. Pautz, ... cative

netwo



1. Reinhart, C. M., & Rogoff, K. S. (2013). Open letter to Paul Krugman. Retrieved May 19, 2016, from [http://scholar.harvard.edu/files/rogoff/files/krugman\\_letter\\_0.pdf?m=1380305339](http://scholar.harvard.edu/files/rogoff/files/krugman_letter_0.pdf?m=1380305339)

Highlights  
m=1380305339

Introduction  
Google Scholar

Research questions and methodological framework

2. Stiglitz, J. (2009). *Freefall, America, free markets and the sinking of the world economy*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton.

The American economic policy network  
Google Scholar

Circulation of experts between different fields of power

3. Stiglitz, J. (2015, May 13). The secret corporate takeover of trade agreements. *The ideological cleavages in the American think tank network*. *The Guardian*. Retrieved March 12, 2016, from

Discussion  
<https://www.theguardian.com/business/2015/may/13/the-secret-corporate-takeover-of-trade-agreements>

Notes on contributor  
Google Scholar

Disclosure statement

4. Weisberg, C., & Sabatier, P. (2006). A guide to the Advocacy Coalition Framework. In F. Fischer, G. J. Miller, & M. S. Sidney (Eds.), *Handbook of public policy analysis* (pp. 123–136). London: CRC Press.

References  
Google Scholar

5. White, L. (2013). Recent arguments against the gold standard. *Policy Analysis*. No. 728. Retrieved May 13, 2016, from <http://www.cato.org/publications/policy-analysis/recent-arguments-against-gold-standard>

Google

6. Wrenn  
through  
oliberalism

7. Yo  
flimsy  
from h  
ain? The  
il 24, 2016,

Google

# Related research

Introduction

People also read

Recommended articles

Cited by

3

Research questions and methodological framework

Information for

Open access

Authors

Overview

R&D professionals

Open journals

Editors

Open Select

Librarians

Dove Medical Press

Societies

F1000Research

Opportunities

Help and information

Reprints and e-prints

Help and contact

Advertising solutions

Newsroom

Accelerated publication

All journals

Corporate access solutions

Books

## Keep up to date

Register to receive personalised research and resources by email

 Sign up

Copyright

Acc



Registered  
5 Howick Pl

or & Francis Group  
orma business

