

R.D. Reuka



PRG Report

Newsletter of the Presidency Research Group

The American Political Science Association

Spring 1992

Spreading APT

Research Using Presidential Archives

Terry Sullivan

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

For decades, everyone has criticized presidency research for depending too heavily on an "anecdotal" rather than an empirical research agenda (e.g., Hecho 1977). Relying on anecdotal accounts biases professional research towards judging the merits of particular presidents and it creates "stylized facts." Yet, the anecdotal agenda survives. The first of a two part series, this paper proposes a simple explanation for why the subfield has made so little headway. It also suggests how the subfield can develop a reliance upon systematic empirical analysis. It proposes a

continued on page 4

Chief Clerk's Report

Martha Kumar mercifully fails to mention in the minutes of last year's business meeting (see page 2) that I, smitten by euphoria upon assuming the gavel, promised to resuscitate the newsletter. After several false starts in recruiting an editor, I now find myself, more soberly, confronting "the buck." Obviously, my father's observation was correct that my studies were providing me with no practical knowledge.

I hope you find the contents agreeable. Of course, there is plenty of room for improvement. I look forward to receiving your suggestions. And hopefully, some of you will decide to take matters in your own hands and submit contributions.

With this issue, I'm introducing a regular column, *Obiter Dicta*, in which members are invited to share their favorite research artifacts: perhaps an insightful memo buried among the detritus of some archive, a survey finding that elegantly confirms or denies conventional wisdom, or an excerpt from an engaging interview. (Remember to obtain permissions

continued on page 9

Inside	Minutes of PRG Business Meeting	2
	Neustadt Award	2
	"Where Is the Rest of Me?"	3
This	Announcements	11
Issue	<i>Obiter Dicta</i> : James Rowe Reports to FDR	12
	1992 APSA Presidency Panels	13
	E-Mail Comes to PRG	15

Minutes of 1991 Business Meeting

Martha Kumar

The annual meeting of the Presidency Research Group took place at the Washington Hilton during the American Political Science Association convention. It was called to order by Jim Young, the current president shortly after 12:30 on Friday. The agenda called for John Fawcett to speak after business is conducted. Fawcett heads the Presidential Library division of the National Archives.

Mark Petracca headed the committee for the best paper. Bartholomew H. Sparrow: "Raising Taxes and Going into Debt: A Resource Dependence Model of U.S. Public Finance in the 1940s." On the committee were Mark Petracca, Margaret Wyszomirski, and Robert Strong; Mark read a citation that will accompany the award. As it worked out, Sparrow also received the award from the association for the best paper, the Franklin Burdett award. Peri Arnold headed the committee for the Richard Neustadt award. The winner was Harold Koh for his book, *The National Security Constitution*. Arnold spoke of how broad and powerful the books on the presidency have become. All three members of the committee found the book special for its intellectual rigor. It gives both constitutional and institutional analysis. Professor Koh, who teaches law at Yale, accepted the award. The book, he said, was part of the journey from political science to law and now back to political science. The study originated with his work in the Justice Department during the Reagan years. It is an honor to receive the Neustadt Award, he said.

The secretary-treasurer, Martha Kumar, gave her report on the status of the treasury. We currently have a balance in our checking and savings accounts of \$845.65. The money was perched in accounts in the First American Bank, which, as luck would have it, is controlled by B.C.C.I. Kumar reported that the money would soon be moved to higher ground. (It has subsequently been moved to a solid bank in Delaware.) The money reflects what we receive from the association in dues. Our share being \$4.00 out of the \$7.00 taken from each member to sign up with our group. Our only expense for the year was the cost of the newsletter, which generally runs about \$500 an issue. While the newsletter has in the past come out twice a year, in 1991, it came out only in the winter. There was no spring issue.

Michael Nelson's report was read by Jim Young. Mike chaired the program for the association. Under a trial plan, we send in three names of people to organize the presidency panels for the convention. The association then chooses one from among those we have sub-

Neustadt Prize Goes To Harold Hongju Koh

Peri E. Arnold

The members of the Richard Neustadt Prize Committee for 1991 are R.W. Apple, Jr., Richard Pious, and myself. Besides free books, the benefit of serving on this committee is the appreciation one gains for the scope and quality of presidency research. However, choosing the book that is most deserving of the Neustadt Prize is no small task. Not only did we have to read a large number of books in a short time, we had to choose from among a number of very good books. Fortunately, we had a work of real distinction and originality to help us make that choice. My colleagues and I are very pleased to award the Neustadt Prize for 1991 to *The National Security Constitution* by Harold Hongju Koh of the Yale Law School.

In *The National Security Constitution* Professor Koh conducts an analysis of the changing allocation of authority and functions regarding national security decision making within the American system. This book undertakes five related tasks. First, Professor Koh explores the Iran-Contra affair to argue that what occurred there must be understood as an expression of a fundamental orientation of authority in our system, rather than being

continued on page 10

continued on page 11

"Where's The Rest of Me?"

Presidential Scholars and The Reagan Library

Michael A. Genovese
Loyala Marymount University

On November 4, 1991, a typically beautiful California day, in front of five presidents, six first ladies, a list of dignitaries and celebrities larger than a federal budget deficit, and 4,200 friends and donors (and a few Democrats who happened to sneak in), the Ronald Reagan Presidential Library was dedicated.

This beautiful facility, the first presidential library without any university affiliation or historic association between the site and the president or his family, sits on 100 acres of donated land in the rolling foothills northwest of Los Angeles. Reagan biographer Lou Cannon said of the location, "This setting is...like Reagan, it's vast, it's a little empty, and it's something that catches the eye." The building itself, a lovely Spanish style structure, covers 153,000 square feet, and carries a \$56.8 million price tag, making it the largest and most expensive of the nine presidential libraries in the National Archives system (the Nixon "library" in Yorba Linda, California is not under the control of the National Archives, and does not contain a full set of presidential documents). Located at 40 Presidential Drive, in Simi Valley, California, 93065, (805) 522-8444, the Library is just off the 101 freeway, midway between Los Angeles and Santa Barbara.

Supporters of President Reagan will likely see the facility as a fitting tribute to their beloved leader; critics will likely see it as a shrine to the selective memory of the Reagan years. Of course, all presidential libraries are, in a way, tributes to the memory of the president. As Ralph C. Bledsoe, the library's director said, "A presidential library is a place where you can see history through the eyes of the President." Richard Norton Smith, director of the Hoover Presidential Library said that "The popular notion is that the libraries are built as monuments to the egos of presidents. That's not true. They are built as monuments to the rich friends and White House staffs."

The first presidential library to go under the control of the National Archives was the Franklin D. Roosevelt Presidential Library, although Rutherford B. Hayes set up a "Presidential Center" in Fremont, Ohio in 1916. Since that time, eight other presidential libraries have come under the control of the National Archives. Prior to the establishment of these libraries the disposition of presidential papers was a personal decision for the president or his descendants to make, and very little in the way of systematic preservation took place. Most of the documents of the eighteenth century presidents were lost, dispersed, or otherwise purged by friends and family members. The Reagan Library's museum

continued on page 8

PRG Officers

President

Samuel Kernell, University of California, San Diego

Vice President

Larry Berman, University of California, Davis

Secretary-Treasurer

Martha Kumar, Towson State University

Steering Committee

Peri Arnold, University of Notre Dame

Ralph Bledsoe, Ronald Reagan Presidential Library

Bruce Buchanan III, University of Texas, Austin

Colin Campbell, Georgetown University

Erwin Hargrove, Vanderbilt University

Matthew Holden, Jr., University of Virginia

Gary King, Harvard University

Benjamin Page, Northwestern University

James P. Pfiffner, George Mason University

Lyn Ragdale, University of Arizona

Donald L. Robinson, Smith College

Robert Spitzer, State University of New York

Mary Stuckey, University of Mississippi

Terry Sullivan, University of North Carolina

Margaret J. Wyzomirski, National Endowment for the Arts

1992 Program Chair

Bert Rockman, University of Pittsburgh and Brookings

1993 Program Chair

Stephen Wayne, Georgetown University

new model of research methodology (the "APt") and illustrates some APt analysis. Most of the illustrations derive from my own research agenda following the sagely advice, "Don't tell others what to do, *show* them." A second submission describes how to encourage the APt agenda.

The APt Approach

The empirical agenda has failed not because both the scholarly and popular consuming publics find individual presidencies fascinating. Nor has it failed because journalists, biographers, and historians do a better job. Rather, the empirical agenda has failed because the institution inherently minimizes the potential for empirical research. First, currently available data cannot support an empirical strategy. Because presidents make decisions in private, researchers cannot obtain useful, systematic information by merely observing an administration's public activity. Even when its influence on Congress is great, members seldom publicly acknowledge when they yield to presidential pressure. Instead they prefer to portray themselves either as steady presidential supporters or as single-mindedly pursuing constituent interests. Therefore, presidential leadership takes place inside this "black box," hidden from systematic observation. Moreover, the participant information, provided either through leaks or interviews, often confounds analysis

by supplying "mis-information." Thus, for important topics (strategy, influence, agenda control, timing) the observable outcomes (press releases, policy proposals, floor debates, votes) mask rather than reveal the subject.

This pattern of inaccessibility mirrors more clearly than in many subfields the dichotomy between "the participant as observer" and "objective observation." Despite its many advantages few scholars have had the opportunity to work as a presidential participant observer. In congressional studies, of course, the American Political Science Association has long recognized the importance of these observations. In the past decade alone, APSA congressional fellows have contributed a great deal. For example, two fellows (Lawrence C. Dodd and Bruce Oppenheimer) have produced an important series entitled *Congress Reconsidered* [1977, 1981, 1985, 1989]. Recently, other fellows have obtained extraordinary opportunities, serving with party leaders. Their research on leadership [Sinclair 1983] and committees [e.g., Smith and Ray 1983 or Smith and Deering 1984] provides an excellent example of useful institutional analysis. In the presidency, only the policy actors themselves become participant observers. Their memoirs represent the only available primary analyses. Within this environment, journalists staying "on station" in the press room do a better job than political scientists.

To counter the appeal of the anecdotal agenda, successful empirical research depends upon discovering a venue that mirrors the participant's access while

generating the data necessary for systematic analysis. Since the presidency of Herbert Hoover, the National Archives has maintained detailed documentary evidence about presidential decision-making. Archival files include those memoranda, reports, and other documents that the participants used during the decision-making process. Once the analyst transforms this information into systematic data, the archival files serve to open a window on that process. Through this window, the objective observer becomes a special kind of ("participant") observer. The analyst becomes an *archival participant* (or "APt" for short).

As with the participant observer, the APt shares access to insider information and the feel for the decision making process(es). The APt reads what the participant reads, but with four advantages. First, the APt can read the many other materials to which the participant did not have access (maybe did not even know existed). Second, the APt does not face the same kinds of constraints (particularly time) that the participant observer must. Third, an APt may develop an exposure ranging across time periods and building a comparative analysis of decision-making. Thus, APt analysis extends the advantages of the participant observer both "longitudinally" and "cross-sectionally." Finally, the APt can amass and analyze data in the same way, using many of the same tools, that the objective observer does.

Some APt Examples

Political scientists have begun using archival materials, analyzing single presidencies [Greenstein 1982]. APt research also has developed some comparative analyses, concentrating mostly on very basic questions. For example, Sullivan focuses on influence and bargaining [Sullivan 1987, 1988a, 1990b, 1991a, 1991b, 1991c], Covington [1987] studies strategic objective selection, they both study the nature of proto-coalitions [Sullivan 1988b; Covington 1988], etc. Some even have successfully set APt research within broader, constitutional frameworks [Kernell 1986; Kellerman 1984]. This section describes some other applications.

Bargaining. In assessing presidential bargaining APt promises a good deal. Useful archival materials, for example, include data on member pre-voting commitments. Using such data APts can describe how commitments turn into floor voting coalitions. They can assess whether commitments remain firm, which forces affect conversion, does presidential influence play a role, *et cetera* [Sullivan 1987 and 1990a]. Clausen [1973] and Poole and Rosenthal [1985] argue that the members' policy positions remain stable over time. Longitudinal headcount data could provide information not only on whether members' initial commitments mirror the stability of voting decisions but from where does this stability originate.

The APt can analyze specific bargaining strategies [Sullivan 1987]. For example, analyzing the

Nixon impeachment, Sullivan 1992 suggests that the administration "stonewalled" for good reasons. Because the impeachment question became encapsulated in Nixon's otherwise appealing domestic policy agenda, the Democratic majority's support for impeachment sputtered over time rather than solidified.

Other APts can detail specific member bargaining positions. For example, Sullivan 1988a, 1989a, and 1990b detail positions during the Johnson administration:

Tom Rees, Calif. -- Will likely but very reluctantly vote for the bill. He was very critical of the president and the administration for failing to send the tax reform package. He wants no cuts in "people" programs, and feels that military spending could be curtailed [Memo, Raymond Colley to Barefoot Sanders, 7 May 1968, Personal Papers of Harold "Barefoot" Sanders, Box 24, LBJ Library].

Wendell Wyatt-- I would like to vote for this thing. I feel it is necessary, but politically explosive. If the administration could get my opponent to make a statement to the effect that he would vote for the tax bill if he were in Congress, it would insure my vote. [Memo, Stuart Udall to Barefoot Sanders, 14 June 1968, Personal Papers of Harold "Barefoot" Sanders, Box 24, LBJ Library].

Bill Hathaway (Maine) He says he is going to oppose the bill. He is really trying to trade

his vote for some support on the Dickey-Lincoln project. I have given the message back very flatly that we are not trading anything on this bill, that the President has already come out four-square for the Dickey-Lincoln project, and that he is apt to end up as the only New Englander opposing the tax bill [Memo, Charles Roche to Barefoot Sanders, 18 June 1968, Personal Papers of Harold "Barefoot" Sanders, Box 24, LBJ Library].

Transformed into data, these memoranda afford a window on bargaining strategy never before permitted. From that vantage, researchers can consider how often members bluff or which members have a bargaining advantage.

Do Procedural Maneuvers Yield Advantage? The modern literature on congressional procedure suggests that rule manipulation yields advantages -- it may even generate an equilibrium where none existed [Shepsle, 1987]. Memoranda discuss controlling amendments, scheduling, and affecting the structure of committees. Except in extraordinary circumstances, however, analysts have no data to support the claims that procedure makes policy [excepting Sullivan 1984]. With headcount data however, an APt can estimate the administration's chances of success before and following procedural maneuvers. Such a simple analysis could easily provide interesting insights into the president's

continued on next page

influence.

What Does the President Do All Day? A good example of APt research would assess oval office access. Most believe that presidents lose touch with the country over their tenures. Yet the discipline has no systematic evidence one way or the other about presidential access. Every administration's staff details the president's activities. Therefore, archives house some important data that could address how much time presidents dedicate to different activities. Some have begun the arduous task of compiling and coding the data necessary to assess contact patterns, most notably Carl Cavalli [1991] and Robert Thompson [1991]. These data *might* reveal, for example, that while presidents continue meeting the same numbers they tend to meet them in larger groups rather than in individual meetings. They might reveal, for example, the president's distribution of time shifts to concentrate on contact with White House staff and other officers of the Administration. Or they might just as easily suggest that presidents spend about the same amount of time over their tenure and spend it with the same numbers of people. In short, it may demonstrate that little evidence supports this stylized fact.

Do Staffing Patterns Matter? Analysts have often noted the various organizational styles presidents adopt. Some have devised models (e.g., George 1981) emphasizing their

hierarchical or non-hierarchical character. These analyses generally arrange modern presidents in terms of how strict a hierarchy the administration maintains. They suggest that differing organizations lead to different information handling. Analysts suspect, for example, that non-hierarchical organizational models (sometimes called "hubs") lead to information overload, while they afford the president maximum flexibility in decision-making. Yet despite these interesting and often appealing suspicions, the discipline has no systematic empirical information undergirding them. APt analysis can assess the White House paper flow. With the appropriate sample, an APt could trace where documents originated, their destination, and where they went. With such data, an APt could determine if organizational structure affected the flow of White House information. In addition, each presidential library maintains a "handwriting" file containing those documents on which the president wrote something. Obviously, somewhat restricted, these collections *do* provide the APt with a picture of what the President saw and noted. An APt might easily trace how those documents found their way to the president during different administrations with differing organizational structures. With these data, an APt could test many of the hypotheses about hierarchy information flow.

How Does the President's Agenda Matter? In large part, modern presidential power rests not simply with the power to bargain but with the power to

shape. A number of popular theories discuss the administration's transition, its agenda, whether to strike rapidly or build a base, the importance of timing, etc. Yet, the discipline has almost no evidence one way or the other about any of these issues. In some cases, the discipline now possesses some very useful techniques for identifying agenda elements or some intriguing notions of how to assess compromises (e.g., Mark Peterson's work on compromises [1990]). No doubt these methodologies, most prominently Mouw and MacKuen's algorithm [1990] or the Poole-Rosenthal [1985] *NOMINATE* procedure, offer wonderful opportunities to assess the nature of agenda control. Yet, the discipline has no advanced data sets with which to identify the agenda setter's actual agenda [see Covington 1987].

How Does the President's Agenda Come About? Analysts have often discussed the importance of understanding where the President's agenda comes from and how it matures [Sundquist 1968, Fishel 1986]. Yet to date, no analyst has traced out that development process from the White House perspective. Two books have broken ground in a useful way. First, Paul Light's *Presidential Agenda* addresses the shape of that agenda. It does not, however, assess what the administration considered as policy options or how it selected its final agenda. Second, Bruce Oudes' collection of Nixon memoranda [Oudes 1989] provides some ground work for assessing the president's role in policy initiative. His book contains

several memos relevant to understanding how an administration come to grips with its agenda and Executive agencies' priorities. One very useful way to attack this question of agenda formation examines the options presented to President in decision memoranda. Knowing what arrived for the President's decision, an APt researcher could trace backwards through the process identifying which options fell out and when. In this regard, the archives' "handwriting files" pose an exciting prospect. An APt researcher studying the effects of White House organizational models, presumably would also assess those effects by referring to how an agenda item gets into the Oval Office.

On Becoming APt

Obviously, becoming APt offers a number of advantages and moves the subfield away from an anecdotal agenda without sacrificing the participant's vantage. It requires, however, considerably more use of archives. To expand our archival usage, the discipline must overcome two kinds of hurdles. First, researchers need to become more familiar with the workings of archives to use them efficiently. Second, the discipline must develop an institutional commitment to APt research in much the way it has developed institutional commitments to congressional research and election studies. The next segment in this series describes both of these developments.

References

- Cavalli, Carl. 1991. Plotting the President's Day. Paper delivered at the Southern Political Science Association meetings.
- Clausen, Aage. 1973. *How Congressmen Decide*. St. Martin's.
- Covington, Cary. 1987. Mobilizing Congressional Support for the President: Insights from the 1960s, *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, 22: 77-95.
- Covington, Cary. 1988. Building Presidential Coalitions Among Cross-Pressured Members of Congress, *Western Political Quarterly*, 41: 47-62.
- Dodd, Lawrence C. and Bruce Oppenheimer, eds. 1977. *Congress Reconsidered*. Praeger.
- Dodd, Lawrence C. and Bruce Oppenheimer, eds. 1981. *Congress Reconsidered*, 2nd ed. Congressional Quarterly Press.
- Dodd, Lawrence C. and Bruce Oppenheimer, eds. 1985. *Congress Reconsidered*, 3rd ed. Congressional Quarterly Press.
- Dodd, Lawrence C. and Bruce Oppenheimer, eds. 1989. *Congress Reconsidered*, 4th ed. Congressional Quarterly Press.
- Fishel, Jeff. 1986. *Presidents and Promises: From Campaign Pledge to Presidential Performance*. Congressional Quarterly Press.
- George, Alexander. 1980. *Presidential Decisionmaking in Foreign Policy: The Effective Use of Information and Advice*. Westview.
- Greenstein, Fred. 1982. *The Hidden Hand Presidency*. Basic Books.
- Hecl, Hugh. 1977. *Studying the Presidency*. Ford Foundation.
- Kellerman, Barbara. 1984. *The Political Presidency: Practice of Leadership from Kennedy through Reagan*. Oxford University Press.
- Kernell, Samuel. 1986. *Going Public: New Strategies of Presidential Leadership*. Congressional Quarterly Press.
- Mouw, Calvin and Michael MacKuen. 1990. The Strategic Agenda in Legislative Politics. Mimeographed: University of Missouri at St. Louis.
- Oudes, Bruce. 1989. *From: the President, Richard Nixons Seiles*. Harper and Row.
- Peterson, Mark. *Legislating Together The White House and Capitol Hill from Eisenhower to Reagan*. Harvard University Press.
- Poole, Keith and Howard Rosenthal. 1985. A Spatial Model of Legislative Roll Call Analysis, *American Journal of Political Science*, 29: 357-68.
- Shepsle, Kenneth. 1987. Institutional Arrangements and Equilibrium in Multidimensional Voting Models, in Mathew McCubbins and Terry Sullivan, eds., *Congress: Structure and Policy*, 346-75.
- Sinclair, Barbara. 1983. *Majority Party Leadership in the U.S. House*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Smith, Steven S. and Christopher Deering. 1984. *Committees in Congress*. Congressional Quarterly Press.
- Smith, Steven S. and Bruce A. Ray. 1983. The Impact of Congressional Reform: House Democratic Committee Assignments, *Congress and the Presidency*, 10: 219-40.
- Sullivan, Terry. 1984. *Procedural Structure: Success and Influence in the House*. Praeger.
- Sullivan, Terry. 1987. Presidential Leadership in Congress: Securing Commitments, in *Congress: Structure and Policy*, Mathew McCubbins and Terry Sullivan, eds. Cambridge University Press.
- Sullivan, Terry. 1988a. The Bargaining Approach to Presidential Leadership, *Presidential Research*, 10:12-22.
- Sullivan, Terry. 1988b. Expectations, Headcounts, and Presidential Coalitions in Congress, *American Journal of Political Science*, 32:567-89.
- Sullivan, Terry. 1989a. Developing APt: Archival Resources and Congressional Research. *Extensions*, Fall: 46ff.
- Sullivan, Terry. 1990a. Explaining Why Presidents Count: Signaling and Information. *Journal of Politics*, 52: 939-62.
- Sullivan, Terry. 1990b. Bargaining with the President: A Simple Game and New Evidence, *American Political Science Review* 84: 1167-96.
- Sullivan, Terry. 1991a. The Bank Account Presidency: A New Measure and Evidence on the Temporal Path of

Presidential Influence. *American Journal of Political Science*, 35: 686-723.

Sullivan, Terry. 1991b. A Matter of Fact: The Two Presidencies Thesis Revitalized, in Stephen Shull, ed. *The Two Presidencies: A Quarter Century of Analysis*. Nelson-Hall, 143-57.

Sullivan, Terry. 1991c. Wrong Questions, Legitimate Questions, Reasoned Answers: Affirming the Study of Temporal Paths. *American Journal of Political Science*, 35: 730-37.

Sullivan, Terry. 1992. Domestic Legislative Coalitions and Impeachment, in Leon Friedman and William Leventrosser, eds. *Watergate and Afterward: The Legacy of Richard Nixon*. Greenwood Press, [forthcoming].

Sundquist, James. 1968. *Politics and Policy: The Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson Years*. Brookings.

Thompson, Robert J. 1991. Contrasting Models of White House Staff Organizations: The Eisenhower, Ford and Carter Experiences. Paper presented to the American Political Science Association meetings, Washington, D. C.

Rest of Me (from page 3)

galleries are organized chronologically, with nearly 50% of the display devoted to the Reagan presidency. There are of course gaps; one cannot find mention of the huge federal deficits, and there is precious little information dealing with the Iran-Contra scandal. However, the museum was not created to present a balanced view, but to give the viewer a feel for how the Reagan administration wishes to be remembered. On these terms, the exhibit is beautifully done, with a variety of displays which evoke memories of Reagan, the man and his era. Reagan's is the first library to be governed by the Presidential Records Act of 1978, which covers all Reagan's presidential papers (in January of 1994, the Library will be under Freedom of Information Act access rules). But do not expect quick access to the Reagan papers. The research facility will eventually contain approximately 55 million documents, and while there are currently 6.3 million pages open for examination, only very limited amount of material will be of interest to scholars. Supervisory Archivist Rod Soubers admitted that at present there is probably "not enough (material available) to justify a visit." What is now available includes mostly non-controversial papers on the following subjects: Agriculture, Arts, Education, Highways and Bridges, Local Governments, Natural Resources, Parks and Monuments, Recreation and Sports, Safety and Accident Prevention, State Governments, and some news

summaries, press releases, and press clippings. The Library has scheduled releases of more material at 6 month intervals, but it will be nearly 3 years before much "substantive" material becomes available. As Soubers noted, "If the (research) topic involves the need to review the deliberate process, or how decisions are made," scholars will have to wait until the year 2001. Also set for the Reagan Library is the Ronald Reagan Center for Public Affairs, scheduled to open sometime next year. Ralph Bledsoe said that presently, there are "no clear plans" for the Center, but that in the future they are likely to follow the lead of other presidential libraries and hold conferences on political topics. Other than the museum display, some highlights of the Library include, a huge chunk of the Berlin Wall, the Reagan burial grounds on the West Patio (I know what you are thinking...stop it!), the research facility, lovely grounds, and, a true-to-size replica of the Oval Office.

In a wide ranging discussion with the library's director Ralph Bledsoe (a DPA in Public Administration from the University of Southern California, and formerly Director of USC's Public Affairs Center in Washington, D.C., who served the Reagan Administration in the Office of Planning and Evaluation, and was later Executive Secretary of the Domestic Policy Council, and currently serves on the PRG Executive Board), I asked if, buried in the Reagan presidential papers, were many great "surprises". "Some," he responded, and said

that one of the unappreciated aspects of Ronald Reagan's leadership was his skill at negotiation.

I asked Bledsoe if, when scholars have full access to the Reagan record, a revisionist, "hidden-hand presidency" will reveal itself. "That's a hard question to answer," said Bledsoe, "a lot of people didn't see him correctly or fully," adding, "I don't think he has been captured yet." On some issues Reagan was "detached," and on other issues he was "deeply involved," but overall Bledsoe said he did not think a hidden-hand revision will occur.

"How," I asked, "will history judge Ronald Reagan as president?" "Positive, on balance," said Bledsoe, especially when considering the issues of peace and freedom.

Reagan will be the last president who is allowed to build a library privately and have the federal government shoulder the total cost of upkeep. In 1986, Congress, concerned with the escalating costs of maintaining presidential libraries, passed a law requiring all future presidential libraries to set up endowments to help defray the costs of maintenance. Upkeep on the Reagan library is estimated at \$1.5 million per year.

Presidential libraries are an excellent resource for scholars. The National Archives does a very commendable job in trying to maintain access for researchers. With the addition of the Reagan Library, and the new Bush Library, set for the campus of Texas A&M University, access to important presidential documents will be guaranteed.

*Chief Clerk's report
from page 1*

when necessary.)

To launch this column, I am offering my favorite James Rowe memorandum from among the hundreds I've collected for a book on that gentleman's political wisdom. His most famous is the "[Clark] Clifford memo for the 1948 election," but that is another story.

In future issues, we will be launching more new columns. Veep Larry Berman has kindly volunteered one of his students to scan the journals in search of good presidency articles. Assuming he finds some, we will begin his semi-annual canvass of the literature with the next issue.

Beginning next Spring, Terry Sullivan will routinely report on developments at the presidential archives -- the opening of new collections, changes in access and other information critical to APters everywhere. Other regular features of the **Report** might include book and documentary video reviews.

Also, if anyone is interested in assuming responsibility for collecting submissions and obtaining reprint permissions, we might institute an annual competition (perhaps even an annual award) for the best editorial cartoon on those who carry the burdens of the office.

This brings up another matter. In future issues I would like to include photographs and graphics. One way to finance

the added cost this would entail is to sell advertising space in the newsletter. Let me know if you find commercialization unattractive. Let your publisher know if you would like to find your masterpiece marketed in these pages.

The next newsletter will be published shortly after the APSA meetings. Please have any submissions in by September 1. Or give them to me at the business meeting. Follow format directions provided on the back cover.

Finally, I want to call your attention to our effort to institute an e-mail network among presidency scholars. If you have neglected to learn about this efficient and free method of communicating with colleagues anywhere in the world, perhaps the prospect of actually obtaining announcements about upcoming events before they happen will sufficiently motivate you. Let's try to get this off the ground by June.

Respectfully submitted,

Sam Kernell
skernell@UCSD

mitted. We were assigned 10.5 panels for the meeting, which ended up being 12 panels.

Jim wanted us to respond to the panels and give suggestions where warranted. Also he solicited views on whether we should have student members with a lower membership fee. When the group was founded the members were interested in having more panels at the annual meeting. We were an excluded field even if not a new one. Now that we are incorporated into the APSA other sections have found the same thing. We are part of the meat and potatoes of the association meetings. What relationship does the organization now have with the APSA? James Wilson suggested more of an institutional memory. He asked the members to make suggestions to the APSA about short courses relating to our field. Pass the suggestions on through Sam Kernell.

Jim also discussed votes for the length of terms of officers and continuation of the best paper award. No necessity to give a best paper if the committee decides it. Resolution: Resolved that the PRG, on the advice of a jury appointed by the President, confer a special award on that paper given at the annual meeting of the APSA which represents the most outstanding contribution to knowledge about the presidency. Mark Petracca said that the process of considering the papers was fairly easy to do. The panel chairs sent them in.

But he likes every other year as only 6-7 come in at a time. The language of the resolution allows for the award to be given either every year or two years. The resolution was seconded and the vote was unanimous. The next resolution calls for: "Resolved that the by-laws be amended to provide for two-year terms for the President, the Vice-President, the President-elect and the Secretary-Treasurer of the organization." It is extremely difficult to get things done in one year. The president chairs only one business meeting. The two year terms would be effective immediately. This resolution would not affect the steering committee, which turns over with five members every year. It is for the slate you vote on today. Motion for adoption. Unanimous in favor, no abstentions or nays.

Young turned the meeting over to the incoming president, Sam Kernell. Sam asked for, and enthusiastically received, a call for appreciation for the work of Jim Young. The vote on the slate of candidates for offices took place. The incoming president nominates people for the three vacancies, secretary-treasurer, vice-president, newsletter editor, and steering committee. Ben Paige, Terry Sullivan, Bob Spitzer, Ralph Bledsoe, and Mary Stuckey were nominated to serve on the steering committee. The other nominations offered were Larry Berman for Vice President and Martha Kumar for Secretary-Treasurer. Larry has several books on topics on the presidency ranging from the bud-

get to Lyndon Johnson and the Vietnam war. The vote for the slate was unanimous. There is one other office to fill and that is the newsletter editor, a post that Sam wanted to recruit for. He wants us to give him names. Publishers have been interested in taking out ads in our newsletter, which may allow us to have a desktop publishing operation.

Kernell introduced the head of the presidential libraries, John Fawcett, as a friend to presidency scholars and to the organization. He has been concerned with the reading rooms in the presidential libraries and their value to us as scholars. Harry Middleton, who heads the Lyndon Johnson library, accompanied Fawcett. Fawcett reported that one of the first developments to report is that the Reagan library is opening soon with the museum. They plan to open with papers after the dedication in November. It is the first library covered by the Presidential Records Act. A president can restrict more--objective disclosure part--that is of a confidential nature. The Archives could negotiate with the president to try to loosen the provision and put more on it. There is an effort to locate the Bush library at Texas A&M. Bush should be commended for locating it early. Declassification of materials; a bureaucratic solution is needed to declassification. Gerald Ford and Jimmy Carter are discussing going together to discuss with Bush the early declassification of national security documents.

Bush has sent over personal notes with meetings with Gorbachev. The National Archives, as part of its World War II materials, is trying to declassify all of WW II documents. Johnson tried to get documents declassified and now it has been far ahead of other subject matter areas. Reagan's memoirs help to declassify as the principals are discussing these subject areas. In the Nixon library, the final segment of tapes is being released.

Announcements...

Project on Historical Congressional Statistics

Frustrated by the current lack of long-range data on Congress? We would like your help on a project that would redress this need.

Our project would provide individual and aggregate level data, from about 1789 to the 1950s where possible, on the congressional dimensions listed below. Although most data will be collected and automated for the first time, the project would also include substantial revisions of existing ICPSR databases. Data on the different dimensions will be structured to allow merging. We will archive the database with ICPSR, and produce a book of summary data.

What data would be collected? To make that decision, we need your input. While each of us plans to use this data in research projects, we are also interested in how others might apply

it. In addition, please let us know if you have collected data you might like to see incorporated in the project.

The following is a brief list of our tentative collection plans and the individuals coordinating the effort. For general information, contact Elaine K. Swift at the Dept. of Pol. Sci., UNC-CH, Chapel Hill, NC 27599-3265; PH: (919) 942-8335; BITNET: ESWIFT@UNC. For additional information, we also invite you to a 1992 APSA roundtable on the project.

CAREERS: John Hibbing, Dept. of Pol. Sci., U. of Neb.-Lincoln, Lincoln, NE 68588. PH: (402) 472-2341 BITNET PSCI0003@UNLVM

COMMITTEES: David T. Canon, Dept. of Pol. Sci., U. of Wis.-Madison, 110 North Hall, Madison, WI 53706. PH: (608) 263-2283 BITNET: DCANON@WISCGPS.BITNET

ELECTIONS: Kenneth C. Martis, Dept. of Geology and Geography, W. Va. U., Morgantown, WV 26506. PH: (304) 293-5603

EXECUTIVE-LEGISLATIVE RELATIONS: Michael J. Malbin, Ctr. for Legislative Studies, Rockefeller Institute of Gov., 411 State St., Albany, NY 12203. PH: (518) 443-5256

PARTIES AND ROLL CALL VOTING: Keith Poole, Div. of Humanities and Soc. Sci. 228-77, Cal. Tech., Pasadena, CA 91125. PH: (818) 356-4569 BITNET: Poole@Romeo.CalTech.EDU

WORKLOAD: Evelyn Fink or Brian Humes, Dept. of Pol. Sci., U. of Neb.-Lincoln, Lincoln, NE 68588. PH: (402) 472-3224 or 8854 BITNET: PSCIO36@UNLVM

This project is funded by NSF grant SES-9109335.

merely a scandalous misuse of power. Second, Koh defines a traditional conception of national security authority in the American system which engaged both the presidency and Congress in the decision process. He takes the expression of that model to be the majority opinions in *Youngstown v Sawyer*. Third, Professor Koh describes the modern conception which underlies the Iran-Contra affair. This is a view that takes the president's authority in national security affairs as essentially unchecked. The foundation of that view is *U.S. v Curtiss-Wright*. Fourth, Professor Koh offers a critique of the courts and Congress as they contribute to maintaining the modern, autonomous presidential conception of national security authority. Fifth, Koh ends the book with a proposal for legislation and judicial activism designed to promote a revival of a national security constitution incorporating checks and balances.

The National Security Constitution is a contribution to both our scholarly understanding of the presidency and to public debate about the allocation of authority in the American regime. It is the work of a political analyst addressing authority and function in the national security system. It is also the work of a constitutionalist who has the nerve and vision to propose a framework to achieve a distribution of authority preferable to the one he has critiqued so ably.

Obiter Dicta...

Editors note: The following memorandum was written by James Rowe to Francis Biddle on April 1, 1943. Source: Rowe papers, FDR Library.

CONFIDENTIAL - NOT FOR THE FILES

MEMORANDUM FOR THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

I have your note to speak to you about May Ward, whom Earl Harrison wants to get rid of. I cannot speak to you about May Ward because the very name leaves me speechless. It was inevitable that sooner or later Harrison, being a new Commissioner, would find out that May Ward was doing nothing, never had done anything, and never would do anything--and, inevitably, he would decide she should be fired. Everyone sooner or later gets the bright idea that May Ward should be fired--and everyone sooner or later finds out that idea was not so bright after all.

May Ward was once a Democratic politician with some weight in Massachusetts. Being one of the faithful she was properly rewarded as Commissioner of Immigration, in the days when they had District Commissioners. She got along all right because she had nothing to do and people liked her. When the reorganization plans came along, the President quite logically abolished these useless jobs. He soon heard from May on the subject, and since he takes his orders from her just like the rest of us, she was soon back on the pay roll where she has resided happily ever since, with the exception of sporadic efforts by the Department of Justice to get rid of her.

We almost got her once. Schofield fired her, Matt McGuire backed him up and when she got to the White House I backed Matt up. It was a terrifying experience and I still wonder how I had the courage to go through it. You would not understand unless you had been face to face with May. I understand Bob Jackson left town when he heard she was coming. That is merely another indication of his wisdom.

Soon a terrific bombardment descended upon the President, channeled mostly through Mrs. Roosevelt who performed the unpleasant task of

attempting to act as a buffer state for the President against May. This was much like Latvia being a buffer against Russia.

May had all six Democratic Congressmen from Massachusetts working at top-speed for her. She really does not have any political influence because I have carefully checked it. But I can well understand their predicament. It was much easier to push Presidents and Attorneys General around than explain to May that really she shouldn't be on the pay roll if she wouldn't do any work. I recall having the impression that May drove the six Congressmen down Pennsylvania Avenue in tandem, much like a dog team with May cracking the whip.

I have forgotten who was running the Democratic Committee at the time but I do recall they formed a baying Greek chorus for May. She had rehearsed them thoroughly. Such minor matters as national policies were forgotten as May laid siege to Washington. She made Jubal Early look like an amateur.

To be brief and succinct, the President signed a truce of unconditional surrender, May went back on the pay roll and there she stays. If I may respectfully suggest, Sir, for all of me she can stay there.

If, however, you are outraged by the thought that May is battering upon the taxpayers and contributing nothing, I suggest you fire her. Before you do it, I suggest you have the signature of the President, of the esteemed Democratic Chairman, and of your honorable self all on one piece of paper, in the form of a ukase.

One personal boon I crave of you. If you do decide to fire her, please give me advance warning--so I can get out of town.

James Rowe, Jr.

Addendum: My memory has just been jogged by Kitty Gilligan. I have gone back to my own file on May and have extracted the attached, very confidential memorandum, aent May. I hope you now see what you are up against.

Why not fire Earl!? It would be easier.

Rowe enclosed a notefrom the president dated July 25, 1941 in which he wrote, "If you love me you will get this woman a job. If you don't have something for her by Tuesday, I will either have to shoot you or commit suicide. F.D.R."

Presidency Panels for the 1992 APSA Meetings

Bert Rockman, Program Organizer

Panel 7-1

Title: **The American Presidency in Comparative Perspective**
Chair: Bert A. Rockman, University of Pittsburgh, The Brookings Institution (Until 7/1/92)
Papers: "Whoever Said the United States President Was Powerful?" Anthony King, University of Essex
"The United States Presidency: A View from Downing Street" Graham K. Wilson, University of Wisconsin-Madison
"The United States Presidency: A View from the Elysee" Ezra N. Suleiman, Princeton University
"The United States Presidency: A View from the Banks of the Rhine" Stephen Padgett, University of Essex
Discussants: Paul J. Quirk, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Panel 7-2

Title: **Predicting Behavior in the Modern Presidency: Personality, Style, and Performance (A Roundtable)**
Chair: Stephen J. Wayne, Georgetown University
Partic: Betty Glad, University of South Carolina
Fred I. Greenstein, Princeton University
Erwin C. Hargrove, Vanderbilt University
Stephen J. Wayne

Panel 7-3

Title: **Evaluating the Bush Presidency (A Roundtable)**
Chair: George C. Edwards III, Texas A&M University

Partic: Charles O. Jones, University of Wisconsin-Madison
George C. Edwards III, Texas A&M University (See above)
Bert A. Rockman, University of Pittsburgh
Aaron Wildavsky, University of California, Berkeley

Panel 7-4

Title: **What Can Contemporary Presidents Learn From Presidencies of the Distant Past?**
Chair: Richard Ellis, Willamette University
Papers: "Political Science and the Past: Lessons from the Jefferson Presidency" Robert M. Johnstone, Earlham College
"The Rhetorical Presidency Reconsidered: The Case of Woodrow Wilson" Daniel D. Stid, Harvard University
"Mentors from History: Past Role Models for Contemporary Presidents" David M. Barrett, Villanova University
Discussants: Erwin C. Hargrove, Vanderbilt University
James Sterling Young, University of Virginia

Panel 7-5

Title: **Presidents and Congress**
Chair: Roger H. Davidson, University of Maryland
Papers: "Evidence on Presidential Support, Influence, and Its Linkage with Prestige" Kenneth Collier, University of Kansas and Terry Sullivan, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill
"Presidents' Previous Experience as Preparation for Working with Congress" Theresa Marchant-Shapiro, Union College
"Electoral Mandates: Strategy and Inference in Presidential Elections" Patricia D. Conley, Northwestern University
Discussants: Jon R. Bond, Texas A&M University

Morris S. Ogul, University of Pittsburgh

Panel 7-6

Title: **The Presidential Role in Policy Making**

Chair: Robert J. Spitzer, State University of New York College at Cortland

Papers: "Politics and the Federal Reserve: Presidential Input into Monetary Policy Decisions" J. Kevin Corder, Washington University

"Inside the Beltway, But Out of the Loop? The Decline of Presidential Initiative in the Federal Budgetary Process" Thom Yantek, Kent State University and James J. Best, Kent State University

"The 86th and 100th Congresses: Changing Goals and a New Definition of Success in Presidential Relations" John B. Bader, University of Wisconsin-Madison

Discussants: Paul C. Light, University of Minnesota

Mark A. Peterson, Harvard University

Panel 7-7

Title: **Presidents and the Public**

Chair: Bruce Miroff, State University of New York at Albany

Papers: "Leadership in the Information Age" John G. Geer, Arizona State University
"Television News and Presidential Leadership" Thomas Weko, University of Toledo

"The Inter-marriage of Leadership and Responsiveness: Some New Data on the Presidencies of John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson" Lawrence R. Jacobs, University of Minnesota and Robert Y. Shapiro, Columbia University

Discussants: John H. Kessel, The Ohio State University

Richard Brody, Stanford University

Panel 7-8

Title: **The Presidency and the Executive Branch**

Chair: George Grassmuck, The University of Michigan

Papers: "Presidential Administration and Administrative Efficiency" B. Dan Wood, Texas A&M University

"Systematic Presidential Control Over Regulatory Agencies" Daniel P. Carpenter, University of Chicago

"A Case Survey of Bureaucratic Effectiveness in the U.S. Federal Government" Patrick J. Wolfe, Harvard University

Discussants: Matthew Holden, Jr., University of Virginia

Donald F. Kettl, University of Wisconsin-Madison

Panel 7-9

Title: **Presidential Staffing: Modalities and Performance (A Roundtable)**

Chair: Larry Berman, University of California, Davis

Partic: Colin Campbell, S.J., Georgetown University

Stephen Hess, The Brookings Institution

James P. Pfiffner, George Mason University

Joseph A. Pika III, University of Delaware

Donald H. Rumsfeld, General Instrument Corporation

Panel 7-10

Title: **Leaders and Contexts**

Chair: Norman C. Thomas, University of Cincinnati

Papers: "Executive Leadership in the United States and Canada" Mary E. Stuckey, University of Mississippi

"George Bush's Leadership Style in Presidential Context" Ryan J. Barilleaux, Miami University

"Healing vs. Victimage: The Coalitional Dilemma of the Ford Presidency" Craig Allen Smith, University of North Carolina at Greensboro and Kathy B. Smith, Wake Forest University

"Presidents in (and out of) Context:

"Executive Leadership in North and South

America" Thomas S. Langston, Tulane University and Brian Turner, Tulane University

E-Mail Comes to PRG

Discussants: Michael A. Genovese, Loyola Marymount University
Michael Nelson, Rhodes College

Panel 7-11

Title: **Studying the Presidency**
Chair: Paul J. Quirk, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Papers: "Studying Presidents as Political Executives" Colin Campbell, Georgetown University
Discussants: Lee Sigelman, George Washington University
Louis Fisher, Congressional Research Service
Thomas H. Hammond, Michigan State University
Patricia Lee Sykes, The American University

Panel 7-12

Cosponsored by the Legislative Studies Section.

Title: **Archival Research: A New Look at an Old Tool** (A Roundtable)
Chair: John J. Kornacki, The Dirksen Congressional Center
Partic: Charles O. Jones, University of Wisconsin-Madison
Burdett A. Loomis, University of Kansas
Frank Mackaman, The Gerald R. Ford Library
Michael Gilette, National Archives and Records
Robin Kolodny, Temple University
Larry Berman, University of California, Davis

With the **PRG Report** published only twice a year and with **PS** requiring a longer time horizon than most of us can imagine, much less accommodate, it is time we move to electronic mail. This would allow each of us to announce upcoming events and research opportunities and to query fellow PRGers. It would also give your Chief Clerk a way to communicate fast breaking research opportunities, job listings and other announcements that originate outside our small, thankfully hermetic community. Over time, we might want to expand the uses of the facility to include more substantive stuff: reports on research, book reviews, comments on provocative contents of this newsletter, and the like.

UCSD's American Political Institutions Project and the Social Science Computing Facility will provide the necessary system support. All you need do is establish an address on the Bitnet network and add your name to the **PRG-Mail** address list. Here's what you have to do:

First, if you are not presently signed on to bitnet, check with the staff of your campus computing facility, and be sure to pick up a manual that explains your e-mail protocols and introduces you to a local text editor.

Second, send mail to: PRG-REQUEST@UCSD identifying yourself and your e-mail address. (This address is all you need for the bitnet network. If your university is on internet, add .edu to the end of the address.)

If you get a transmission error message shortly after sending this mail, check first with a local consultant. If you still have a problem, send mail to apip@ucsd (for internet users: apip@ucsd.edu) or call the APIP office at 619- 534-1323.

Third, reply to my congratulatory message by following the simple procedure I'll provide for sending mail to fellow PRGers on the network.



* done
4/26/93

Subscriptions, Change of Address, and Contributions

PRG Report is published twice annually by the membership of the Presidency Research Group of the American Political Science Association. Individual subscriptions are provided with membership. Institutional subscriptions are \$10 annually. Institutional subscribers for the 1990-91 year will receive free subscriptions through the 1992-93 academic year. Make checks payable to the Presidency Research Group, APSA.

Letters, announcements and other submissions for publication should be provided on disk as well as paper. Use any of the following file formats: Wordperfect 4.x or 5.x, Word for Dos, Word for Windows, Wordstar, rich text file (RTF) for McIntosh, and DOS text file format. Please follow **Chicago Manual of Style** guidelines, which means that "president" is capitalized only when there is a name attached. Manuscripts should be single spaced and employ in-text notes and an abbreviated bibliography. (Use Sullivan article in this issue as guideline.) Include full mailing address and e-mail address, if available, after institutional affiliation.

Send subscriptions, address changes and submissions to: Samuel Kernell, APIP (0521), UC San Diego, La Jolla, CA 92093.

PRG Report

American Political Institutions Project (0521)
University of California, San Diego
La Jolla, CA 92093-0521

NON-PROFIT ORG.
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
LA JOLLA, CA
PERMIT NO. 128