

# Extension of Remarks



Legislative Studies Section



American Political Science Association



July 2005, Vol. 28, No. 2

## Using Archival Sources in Legislative Research: Choosing the Road Less Traveled

- ✚ **Editor's Note**, Sean Kelly, *Niagara University*
- ✚ **Recovering History and Discovering Data in the Archives: An Alternative 'Mode of Research' for Congress Scholars**, Douglas B. Harris, *Loyola College in Maryland*
- ✚ **How Research in Congressional Archives Allowed Me to Salvage a Lost History and Test a Well-known Hypothesis**, David M. Barrett, *Villanova University*
- ✚ **Congressional Collections: Where the Mundane Becomes Compelling**, Frank Mackaman, *Dirksen Congressional Center*
- ✚ **My Congressional History, and Ours**, Ronald M. Peters, Jr., *University of Oklahoma*
- ✚ **Five Reasons Why to Consider Taking the Road Less Traveled**, Scott A. Frisch, *California State University*, and Sean Q Kelly, *Niagara University*
- ✚ **Archival Collections and Research for Politics and Policy: It's a Movement**, Rebecca Melvin Johnson, *University of Delaware*
- ✚ **Political Papers, the Archivist, and You**, Linda Whitaker, *Arizona Historical Foundation*
- ✚ **The Records of Congress at the Center for Legislative Archives**, Ida Brudnick and Jessica Kratz, *Center for Legislative Records National Archives and Records Administration*
- ✚ **Teaching with Primary Source Materials: A Challenging, Yet Satisfying, Experience**, Marian Matyn, *Central Michigan University*

## Editor's Note

*Sean Kelly*  
*Niagara University*

This issue of *Extension of Remarks* focuses on the use of archival sources in legislative studies. The archived papers of former members of Congress represent a significant, but underexploited, research resource for legislative scholars and students of American politics. Political science does not have a strong archival research tradition despite the fact that archives contain important material and data that could illuminate many of the central concerns of legislative scholars. Developing such a tradition is hindered by at least three factors: 1) A lack of understanding about the rich data that are available in paper collections; 2) A lack of training in the use of archival materials, and; 3) Uncertainty about potential funding and publication opportunities.

Over the last few years my frequent coauthor Scott Frisch and I have had the opportunity to interact with dozens of archivists and found them to be delightful and helpful people. More recently we have sought to begin building a bridge between the archival and political science disciplines. Not surprisingly we found willing and enthusiastic partners in the archival world, several of which are contributors to this issue. Our combined efforts have focused on three objectives:

✚ **Advocacy.** Promoting the use of congressional papers by political scientists in their research through cross-disciplinary dialogue between political scientists and archivists. A roundtable at the 2004 Northeastern Political Science Association meeting in Boston united political scientists and archivists in a discussion of the promise, challenges, and logistics of archival research.

✚ **Networking.** Promoting disciplinary and cross disciplinary communication as a means of improving the ability of researchers to exploit paper collection in their research. Political scientists have participated in the meetings of the Association of Centers for the Study of Congress, and the Western Regional meeting of the Society of American Archivists. In these meetings political scientists provided perspective on the types of information included in congressional papers that are important to preserve; archivists have been very receptive to the suggestions made by political scientists.

✚ **Training.** Helping to prepare political scientists to do archival research that enriches research and teaching about Congress. Political scientists and archivists are partnering to provide some instruction on archival research strategies.

The publication of this issue is aimed at the third objective. It is timed to correspond with a Short Course on archival research strategies at the annual meeting of the 2005 American Political Science Association in Washington, DC. The Short Course is cosponsored by the APSA Legislative Studies Section, Congressional Papers Roundtable of the Society of American Archivists, and the National Archives and Records Administration. These original essays, many of which were written by Short Course panelists, are aimed at both advocating for the use of archival research strategies and provide some insight into the logistics of archival research. We are fortunate to have the contributions of a number of archivists in this issue, once again proving their willingness to work with political science and political scientists to improve our research.

At the end of this issue you will find a description of the Short Course. If you are interested in attending please contact me via email ([sqkelly@niagara.edu](mailto:sqkelly@niagara.edu)).

# Recovering History and Discovering Data in the Archives: An Alternative 'Mode of Research' for Congress Scholars

Douglas B. Harris  
*Loyola College in Maryland*

"We are not talking here about a theory of politics. We are talking about a mode of research. But it is a mode of research which can – potentially at least – inform, enrich, and guide theories of politics." (Fenno 1986, p. 4)

The fundamental test of any research approach in political science should be its ability to illuminate important empirical and theoretical questions about politics in ways that other research approaches cannot. Consider, for example, the unique descriptive and analytical contributions of the participant-observation "mode of research." As the pre-eminent practitioner of this anthropological approach, Richard Fenno's fieldwork and "thick descriptions" of congressional politics provide scholars a mountain of anecdotes, descriptions, and data to better understand the politics, processes, and culture of the U.S. Congress (Fenno 1973, 1978). Moreover, (likely because his "mode of research" afforded him such an abundance of empirical information) Fenno's work also is unusually rich theoretically: not only did it open the U.S. Congress as a new empirical front to the Rochester School's rational choice theorizing, but it also brought such parsimonious theorizing into contact with the more interpretive and, in important ways, deeper and more enriching theories from across the social sciences.<sup>1</sup>

Recent scholarly interest in using archival methods to conduct research on

Congress has opened the door to new sources of descriptive information and systematic data on topics as diverse as the organization and development of congressional campaign committees (Kolodny 1998), the contributions of notable figures in congressional history (Zelizer 1998), congressional committee assignments (Frisch and Kelly 2004; Lawrence, Maltzman, and Wahlbeck 2001), and congressional reform (Zelizer 2004). My own use of the archival method has been focused on two projects concerning congressional party leadership. The first, a study of House party leaders' uses of mass media strategies of legislative leadership, examines legislative leaders' most public and highly visible acts. The second, by contrast, analyzes the internal dynamics of intra-party races for elective leadership posts, which because they are conducted by secret ballot, are among the most private and ostensibly personal choices legislators make (Polsby 1969; Peabody 1976). In light of the inherent differences between studying both party leaders' most public and highly visible acts as well as the most insular choices legislators make, this essay is a recommendation to colleagues in the study of Congress of the value of archival research as another "mode of research" that, like participant-observation, can address a broad range of questions, uncover new and illuminating descriptive information to expand our empirical understanding of Congress, and provides new opportunities for theory testing and refinement that only these kinds of empirical "finds" can allow.

## Recovering the History of Congressional Media Politics

My archival research into House party leaders' media strategies has been set in the papers of

---

<sup>1</sup> In addition to exploring the three goals of Members of Congress, Fenno's approach mirrored that of anthropologist Clifford Geertz (1973) and his analysis of legislators' interactions with their constituencies drew on sociologist Erving Goffman's (1959) concept of the "presentation of self" to portray legislators acting in complex inter-subjective human contexts.

every Speaker of the House since Sam Rayburn.<sup>2</sup> Having completed my Ph.D. dissertation on the development of the public Speakership and public congressional leadership without the benefit of archival research, in revising and expanding the project's scope, I planned to employ archival research methods to supplement existing data sources, refine the theoretical perspective, and fill in gaps that remained. Little did I realize the extent to which recovering the history and uses of congressional party communications would lead to a comprehensive revision of the work with better examples, deeper insights, and a more fulsome understanding of not simply congressional media politics but congressional party leadership more generally.<sup>3</sup>

Given both my substantive concern with the under-researched topic of congressional party communications as well as theoretical questions regarding the causes and nature of

---

<sup>2</sup> This seems an appropriate place to express my gratitude to the Caterpillar Foundation and the Everett McKinley Dirksen Congressional Research Center, the Carl Albert Research Center at the University of Oklahoma, and the Department of Political Science, the Committee on Faculty Development and the College of Arts and Sciences at Loyola College in Maryland. All of these organizations and the individuals who run them supported the research travel necessary to conduct research in the papers of the Honorable John W. McCormack, Special Collections, Boston University; The Carl Albert Collection, Carl Albert Congressional Research Center, University of Oklahoma; Thomas P. O'Neill Papers, Special Collections, John J. Burns Library, Boston College; Jim Wright Collection, Mary Couts Burnett Library, Texas Christian University; Papers of Thomas S. Foley, Special Collections, Washington State University, Pullman, Washington; and the Papers of Representative Newt Gingrich, Special Collections, University of West Georgia. In addition, the papers of Minority Leader Robert H. Michel at the Dirksen Congressional Research Center and former Majority Whip John B. Brademas at Special Collections, New York University have been invaluable in fleshing out the development of public congressional leadership.

<sup>3</sup> The original research was based on a mix of secondary sources, systematic quantitative data on House party leaders' television appearances, and evidence of leadership staff allocations to press and communications responsibilities (see Harris 1998). This is not to discount nor disclaim that original research, the conclusions of which, I believe, largely have withstood this deeper look at the question; rather it is to point out that a better, more useful, and fulsome explanation of the subject could be found in the archives.

institutional change over time, the first step toward better explaining the causes and consequences of the public Speakership and public congressional leadership was to recover the history of its behavioral and organizational development that, due to the tendencies of political scientists and historians, was largely lacking in both scholarly literatures. Even historically-oriented political scientists are more likely to zero in on pivotal moments for analysis or to pick and choose in American history for opportunities to test synchronic theories than to engage in research that is truly diachronic and developmental.<sup>4</sup> By the same token, because many historians are otherwise occupied with social and non-elite histories and where those that are interested in government and politics tend to search out every last nuance of the lives and careers of Presidents, the history of the First Branch has received considerably less attention (see Zelizer 2000).

Fortunately, important aspects of the history of congressional party communications were recoverable in archives. Minutes and notes from meetings, transcripts of leaders' press conferences and other media appearances, planning documents, poll and focus group reports, and party talking points and message material were among the data used to shed unique light on how congressional leaders make the party messages that are so central to their influence in the contemporary Congress.

First, archival materials revealed how traditional House party organizations adapted to the new media imperatives of contemporary American politics. Evidence of ongoing, behind the scenes media efforts of (and increasingly formalized division of labor on media matters between) the Speaker's office, the floor leaders and whips, the Democratic Caucus and Republican Conference were uncovered as were

---

<sup>4</sup> For example, it is not too much of an exaggeration to say that political scientists have devoted more attention to the three days in March 1910 that culminated in the revolt against Speaker Joseph Cannon than to the twenty years of congressional history that followed. On diachronic analysis, its aims and uses, see Cooper and Brady 1981.

the histories of the development of the Democratic Message Board and the Republicans' Theme Team and CommStrat as some of the more formalized extensions of party communications efforts in the House party hierarchy. If the documents cannot reveal a comprehensive history of all of the media activities of these party organizations, they nevertheless portray a congressional party leadership fundamentally transformed by media considerations and duties.

Second, the organization and activities of the litany of ad hoc media working groups from the last quarter century of House history have also left a paper trail. Such informal organizations – including an Information Task Force headed by Chief Deputy Whip John Brademas (D-IN) in the 94<sup>th</sup> Congress, a series of Leadership Campaign Meetings in the 97<sup>th</sup> Congress, a leadership-directed Media Group in headed by Representative Don Edwards (D-CA) in the 99<sup>th</sup> Congress, informal media planning groups under Minority Leader Bob Michel (that have been largely ignored by scholars drawing sharp contrasts between the styles of Michel and Gingrich) and Newt Gingrich's Conservative Opportunity Society, his communications-oriented "Strategy Whip" operation as Minority Whip, and his various media advisory teams and groups when Speaker – have played key roles in organizing and implementing many of House parties' media campaigns. In my dissertation research, I had seen mere mentions in secondary sources of informal party organizations and regular planning sessions in which leaders developed party messages, made strategy for press outreach, and coordinated members' talk, but it was not until the subsequent archival research and the discovery of documents such as membership lists and meeting minutes from these organizations that my suspicion was confirmed that these rare outsider glimpses revealed public relations efforts that were increasingly routine in congressional leadership circles and pervasive of most of House leaders' activities.

Finally, pulling back the curtain, archival documents reveal that there is much artifice in congressional media politics: leaders choreograph floor politics and stage "pseudo-events" (sometimes even intra-party disagreements are staged for public consumption); they falsely deny in public the use of polls and media strategies; they disclaim efforts to politicize an issue but work themselves behind the scenes to propel partisanship; and, they covertly delegate to other members or friendly outsiders certain messages that they would not themselves carry in public. Understanding that the history of congressional media politics is not only obscure because of a lack of scholarly attention but also because politicians often hide their attempts to manipulate press coverage and public opinion, uncovering documentary evidence of such behaviors provides insights that perhaps no other research approach could.<sup>5</sup>

Taken collectively, these documentary "finds" reveal both the remarkable similarities in the public relations aims and efforts of Democrats and Republicans throughout the 1980s and 1990s and that the elements of "public congressional leadership" that were institutionalized during the O'Neill Speakership had important antecedents in the 1970s.<sup>6</sup> Moreover, the closer look at the leader-

---

<sup>5</sup> This may be an instance where archival research might produce better descriptive information than interviews with political elites who may be reluctant to reveal such efforts or may, in the case of media politics, continue to repeat party talking points. Notably, among the best studies of presidential use of media and public opinion politics are based on intensive archival research; see, for example, Maltese 1994, Eisinger 2003, Jacobs and Shapiro 1995, 2000, Heith 1998.

<sup>6</sup> The three aspects of public congressional leadership – enhancing leaders' media visibility, increasing access to political information (media expertise and polling), and coordinating messages emanating from party members date to the Brademas Task Force in the mid-1970s. An outline of the activities of the Task Force revealed three chief intended functions; the group was to: "I. PROVIDE FOCAL POINT FOR INFORMATION ... II. PROMOTE EXPOSURE OF LEADERSHIP ... III. COORDINATE EFFORTS TO GET INFORMATION TO MEMBERS." Undated [likely late 1975] outline of Information Task Force functions, Folder "Information Task Force" Leadership Files, John Brademas Papers, Office of University Archives, Elmer Holmes Bobst

follower relationship that archival research affords suggests that, like presidents, leaders “go public” to increase their leverage over their colleagues exerting more autonomous influence than many theories suggest. The aims, if not the effects, of their media efforts are to change press coverage and public opinion in ways that pressure and, to a degree, manipulate their colleagues.

### Uncovering the Insular Congress

My interest in a second project, examining the internal dynamics intra-party leadership races, dates to my first days in graduate school when, as research assistant to Bob Peabody, I was deployed to “keep an eye on” emerging leadership races in the House and Senate. Too eager to realize that Peabody was telling me that he really had nothing for me to do and that I should instead focus on my first-year studies, I sought out every political science examination of leadership races and, through this research and innumerable conversations with Peabody, I became (and continue to be) intrigued by the choices legislators make at these key moments in congressional history. Still, because of the secret ballot in leadership elections (Polsby 1969), further analysis into the bases of support for particular leadership candidates, their campaigns, and the decisions of individual members to support one candidate over another has been stifled. As Peabody (1976) observed, “most of the variables [studies of leadership races] do not lend themselves to clear-cut isolation, easy operationalization, assignment of weights, or sophisticated causal orderings” (470).

Taking these lessons to heart, I held out little hope that any of the puzzles and questions remaining from Peabody’s classic participant-observation study of the topic could be uncovered.<sup>7</sup> Nevertheless, whenever I ventured to a party leader’s archive for the

media study, I would also scour the collection’s finding aid for any information on their leadership ambitions, races, and opponents. To my surprise, I found what I regard as new and important evidence on the concerns, strategies and tactics candidates for leadership posts employ. Expanding my purview to examine the papers of not only the winners but also their competitors and sometimes their campaign managers uncovered candidates’ letters soliciting support (as well as responses from colleagues), written campaign plans and notes on strategy, and candidates’ notes on conversations with colleagues. Most notably, in some instances archival work yields candidates’ internal counts and tallies of supporters which, although they must be used with care, represent the best available sources of information we have on the coalitions of support for individual leadership candidates and individual legislator decision-making in such leadership campaigns.<sup>8</sup>

This highlights a second potential use of archival materials: they can provide a window on a whole range of legislative behaviors about which scholars have little to no information. If in congressional studies, there is no scarcity of data on Members’ official positions and acts – committee assignments and leadership posts, their speeches, bills introduced, amendments offered, and roll calls taken – which are meticulously recorded for posterity and available for analysis, it is nevertheless true that there are other kinds of behaviors, less observable from the outside, about which we know very little. But simply because this behavior is more difficult to observe is not to

---

Library, New York University, JB.

<sup>7</sup> Notably, the one study that had sought to get around these difficulties also employed documentary evidence; see Kelly 1995.

---

<sup>8</sup> In addition to the archival resources cited in Footnote 2, information on leadership races has been garnered from examination of the papers of the House Democratic Caucus at the Library of Congress, the papers of Eddie Boland at Boston College, James G. O’Hara at the University of Michigan, the papers of Sam Gibbons at the University of South Florida, and the papers of Frank Thompson at Princeton University. This research has been conducted in collaboration with Professors Anthony Champagne, Jim Riddlesperger, and Garrison Nelson. Collectively we have examined dozens of archival collections the historical scope of which date from the late 19<sup>th</sup> century to the late 20<sup>th</sup> century.

say that it is less important historically or less relevant for theories of politics. In the case of intra-party leadership races, we can choose either to remain in the dark or we can seek out and analyze, with due caution and in appropriate context, the best information available. Indeed, in these and other instances, evidence of such unofficial behavior is all the data we will ever have of key moments in congressional history. Consider Terry Sullivan's (1998) analysis of Democratic whip counts on whether or not to impeach Richard Nixon. Because Nixon's resignation precluded a floor vote on his impeachment, Sullivan's (1998) analysis represents the best available, systematic information on how Democrats might have voted in what was an undeniably important moment in American political history.

### **History for its Own Sake?**

Am I advocating that political scientists study history for its own sake? Given the lack of political science and historical attention to Congress, what really would be wrong with that? It seems reasonable to encourage scholars of Congress to mine, recover, and produce new data sources that improve our understanding of the way Congress actually works. Setting aside broader debates on the value of counter-factual analysis, failing to recover the history or discover behaviors simply because they are more difficult to observe runs the risk of engaging in a kind of counter-factual analysis that no one would defend: that of making one's case unaware that the claims are, indeed, counter-factual.

Although it is tempting to rest on this first response, ultimately, I too am advocating the recovery of congressional history for the sake of theories of politics. For example, historical institutionalists and others who study Congress diachronically will find much evidence to feed their theories in archives. As it stands, historical institutionalists are just as likely to use the work of historians as they are to do their own historical work thus subjecting

our analyses to the trends and dispositions of historiography (Lustick 1996). To minimize such difficulties and especially given the lack of attention to all but a few key moments in congressional history, to the extent that we want to model development in Congress or test for the effects of institutional changes or reforms, we must do a much of the historical work ourselves.<sup>9</sup> My experience suggests that historical-institutional theories informed by original research in the archives will produce models of institutional change that emphasize the importance of individual actors, the uncertainty of (and the importance of learning by) those actors, and their responses to multiple causes and stimuli promoting institutional change. As such, archival research likely will reveal that, far from being efficient and functional, institutional change is the product of many failed attempts and false starts (see also Zelizer 2004).

In addition to improving models of institutional change, archival discoveries might also find empirical answers to questions that previously have been argued on a theoretical rather than an empirical basis. For example, archival research into the behind-the-scenes activities of party organizations have illuminated debates over whether parties "matter" in legislative decision-making. My archival research of party efforts to coordinate members' floor speeches demonstrated significant party effects on what was previously considered one of the more independent behaviors of members. Whereas those skeptical of the importance of party organizations might contend that the confluence of members' speeches on a topic might simply reflect the similar dispositions of fellow partisans, evidence of party leaders' planning of such message campaigns and members' post-hoc

---

<sup>9</sup> To the extent that historical institutionalists (see Skocpol 1984) are correct that political scientists cannot (and in some instances need not) do their own historical work, it is nevertheless true that in those instances where we can (not to mention those where we must) our own historical work may well be worth the effort.

responses lends empirical support to the theoretical view that the efforts of party leaders and organizations matter (Harris 2005). Similarly, using the minutes of Republican Conference and Democratic Caucus meetings, Richard Forgette (2004) has demonstrated that party coordination efforts affect party unity. And, we will surely gain deeper insights into party influence when C. Lawrence Evans' archival research allows scholars to compare uncovered party whip counts on legislation to the stances members actually took on roll call votes.

More specifically, archival research can help solve puzzles related to our principal-agent models of congressional party leadership. Principal-agent models of congressional leadership often are concerned with the reciprocal influence between leaders and followers; who is leading whom? In making such arguments, Congress scholars frequently make inferences and assumptions about the goals and perspectives of leaders and followers and the sequence of events crucial to teasing out these theoretical differences but which our dominant research methods leave us far too remote from our subject to gauge. Though it is by no means perfect in this regard, archival research can get us a bit closer to the subject matter and improve our understanding of the timing and sequence of key events and ultimately the complexities of the leader-follower relationship. For example, my research on media strategies exposed a pattern of House leaders' poll use dating back to the early 1980s whereby, like Newt Gingrich and the Republicans in the 1990s, House Democratic leaders too made frequent and sophisticated use of public opinion polls and focus group methods. In addition to correcting some mistaken impressions about Democrats' poll use, this study also shed light on the causes of this change in leadership style and the motivations of leaders' behavior. Whereas I had begun the project expecting to find evidence that leaders' media activities (and, by extension, poll use) would fit the model of

conditional party government and leaders would "go public" when the condition of intra-party agreement is met, I found that other factors such as inter-branch conflict with the White House and congressional recruitment patterns need also be considered to explain these changes in leadership style. Moreover, by pushing more deeply into the complexities of this inter-play between congressional leaders and followers, archives also revealed a potentially much stronger role for congressional party leadership organizations than is appreciated by most theories of leadership; rather than merely trying to manipulate the range of preferences in Congress as reflective of district-based preferences, leaders framed media messages in attempts to change preferences of the public and, in turn, their colleagues in Congress (Harris, forthcoming).

If our research agendas quite naturally show a bias toward analyzing behaviors that are easily observed, archival research yields a behind-the-scenes look at congressional politics that can help us account for biases and omissions in contemporary congressional research. For example, due to our focus on official sources, we see more the "end products" of politics than we do politics in the making. This likely produces a bias in favor of assuming a clarity of purpose in political behavior and a certainty in politicians' actions. By the same token, our understanding of all manner of legislative choices will likely be enhanced by greater insight into the multiple considerations that go into legislator decision-making, how legislators' preferences change over time, and the choices they make in the context of the alternatives they considered but did not select. For example, we will surely know more about the politics of legislative committee assignments when we know not only the committees to which members were assigned but also the committee assignments they requested but did not receive (Frisch and Kelly 2004; Lawrence, Maltzman, and Wahlbeck 2001).



## Cautions and Conclusions

Political scientists using archival research methods may often feel caught between the historians whose research approach we appropriate and the norms of our own discipline. First, given the practical limitations inherent in archival research, most notably the massive amounts of material in congressional papers, theory must guide the difficult choices political scientists make about where to look for evidence and what opportunities to forego. Historians may object that our research, being driven by social science theories, is too narrowly focused to fully capture the context and nuance of the events and individuals we study. Although we are not historians, political scientists' studies would be enriched by, at the very least, acknowledging our limitations in this regard. And, political scientists should take care that their theoretical assumptions do not guide their choices in the archives too closely so as to preclude the possibility that their expectations will be disconfirmed. Though time-consuming and even frustrating at times, casting a wide net in the archives allows for better context for understanding data and increases the possibility of serendipitous finds that might just as well open doors to new theoretical insights.

By the same token, many political scientists will object to the necessarily interpretive nature of archival research. The more you conduct archival research, the more you are struck by the unevenness and omissions in the archival record, especially as you move from one collection to the next.<sup>10</sup> And, sometimes doing archival research

---

<sup>10</sup> But inasmuch as archival researchers are subject to the record keeping of the politicians we study, their tendencies to put things on paper, the systematization of the processes we study, as well as the choices made in maintaining and organizing the archival collection it is also true that scholars who analyze public opinion polls are subject to the frequency with which polling organizations ask a particular question and change its wording just as those who conduct roll call analyses are subject to whether a particular issue comes up for a floor vote, if that vote is recorded, and the differences between the frequency of recorded votes in the "textbook" and post-reform Congresses.

resembles Clifford Geertz's (1973) description of "doing ethnography:" it "is like trying to read (in the sense of 'construct a reading of') a manuscript – foreign, faded, full of ellipses, incoherencies, suspicious emendations, and tendentious commentaries" (p. 10). But if archival research makes scholars more aware of the interpretive nature of their research, it is not to say that scholars using other approaches are spared such choices in interpretation. As with participant-observation, roll call studies, or any empirical analysis, scholars of archival research must be careful not to over-interpret the data that come their way. But we should note that it is when data are scarce and lacking in context that we are most likely to over-interpret them; this then seems as much a prescription for more, certainly not less, archival research. And, to universalize the point: inasmuch as archival researchers would be prudent to marshal their archival finds in tandem with other sources of qualitative and quantitative evidence, participant-observers and those doing more quantitative empirical studies would just as likely benefit from consulting documentary evidence in congressional archives.

## Bibliography

- Cooper, Joseph and David W. Brady. 1981. "Toward a Diachronic Analysis of Congress" *American Political Science Review* 75: 988-1006.
- Eisinger, Robert M. 2003. *The Evolution of Presidential Polling*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Fenno, Richard F., Jr. 1973. *Congressmen in Committees*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- 1978. *Home Style: House Members in Their Districts*. Harper Collins.
- 1986. "Observation, Context, and Sequence in the Study of Politics." *American Political Science Review* 80:1: 3-15.
- Forgette, Richard. 2004. "Party Caucuses and Coordination: Assessing Caucus Activity and Party Effects" *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 29 (August): 407-30.
- Frisch, Scott A. and Sean Q. Kelly. 2003. "Don't

- Have the Data? Make Them Up!  
Congressional Archives as Untapped  
Data Sources." *P.S.: Political Science and  
Politics* 36 (2): 221-4.
- , 2004. "Self-Selection Reconsidered: House  
Committee Assignment Requests and  
Constituency Characteristics" *Political  
Research Quarterly* 57:2 (June): 325-36.
- Geertz, Clifford. 1973. *The Interpretation of  
Cultures*. New York: Basic Books.
- Goffman, Erving. 1959. *The Presentation of Self in  
Everyday Life*. New York: Doubleday.
- Harris, Douglas B. 1998. "The Rise of the Public  
Speakership" *Political Science Quarterly*  
113:2 (Summer): 193-212.
- , 2005. "Orchestrating Party Talk: A Party-  
Based View of One-Minute Speeches in  
the House of Representatives" *Legislative  
Studies Quarterly* 30:1 (February): 127-  
141.
- , (forthcoming). "House Majority Party  
Leaders' Uses of Public Opinion  
Information." *Congress & the Presidency*.
- Heith, Diane J. 1998. "Staffing the White House  
Public Opinion Apparatus, 1969-1988." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 62 (Summer):  
165-189.
- Jacobs, Lawrence R. and Robert Y. Shapiro.  
1995. "The Rise of Presidential Polling:  
The Nixon White House in Historical  
Perspective." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 59  
(Summer): 163-95.
- , 2000. *Politicians Don't Pander: Political  
Manipulation and the Loss of Democratic  
Responsiveness*. Chicago, IL: University of  
Chicago Press.
- Kelly, Sean Q. 1995. "Generational Change and  
the Selection of Senate Democratic  
Leader in the 104<sup>th</sup> Congress." Paper  
presented at the Annual Meeting of the  
Southern Political Science Association,  
Tampa, Florida.
- Kolodny, Robin. 1998. *Pursuing Majorities:  
Congressional Committees in American  
Politics*. Norman, OK: University of  
Oklahoma Press.
- Lawrence, Eric D., Forrest Maltzman, and Paul  
J. Wahlbeck. 2001. "The Politics of  
Speaker Cannon's Committee  
Assignments" *American Journal of Political  
Science* 45:3 (July): 551-62.
- Lustick, Ian. 1996. "History, Historiography,  
and Political Science: Multiple Historical  
Records and the Problem of Selection  
Bias" *American Political Science Review* 90:  
3 (September): 605-18.
- Maltese, John Anthony. 1994. *Spin Control: The  
White House Office of Communications and  
the Management of Presidential News* 2<sup>nd</sup>  
edition revised. Chapel Hill: University  
of North Carolina Press.
- Peabody, Robert L. 1976. *Leadership in Congress:  
Stability, Succession, Change*. Boston: Little  
Brown.
- Polsby, Nelson W. 1969. "Two Strategies of  
Influence: Choosing a Majority Leader."  
In *New Perspectives on the House of  
Representatives* 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, eds., Robert L.  
Peabody and Nelson W. Polsby. Chicago:  
Rand McNally.
- Skocpol, Theda. 1984. "Emerging Agendas and  
Recurrent Strategies." In Theda Skocpol,  
ed., *Vision and Method in Historical  
Sociology*. Cambridge: Cambridge  
University Press.
- Sullivan, Terry. 1998. "Impeachment Practice in  
the Era of Lethal Conflict" *Congress & the  
Presidency* 25:2 (Autumn): 117-28.
- Zelizer, Julian E. 1998. *Taxing America: Wilbur  
D. Mills, Congress, and the State, 1945-  
1975*. Cambridge University Press.
- , 2000. "Introduction to Roundtable: The  
U.S. Congress in the Twentieth Century" *Social Science History* 24:2 (Summer): 307-  
16.
- , 2004. *On Capitol Hill: The Struggle to Reform  
Congress and Its Consequences, 1948-2000*.  
Cambridge University Press.

# How Research in Congressional Archives Allowed Me to Salvage a Lost History and Test a Well-known Hypothesis

David M. Barrett,  
*Villanova University*

Over a decade ago, while examining the papers of the late Senator Richard Russell (D-GA) in order to understand his influence with President Lyndon Johnson on the Vietnam War, I learned that, as chair of the Armed Services Committee and a leader of Appropriations, Russell knew more of CIA's secrets than any other senator during the 1950s and 1960s. Intrigued, I returned to the archive later on to explore the familiar question: "What did he know and when did he know it?" Further, I wanted to know if Russell had actually *affected* CIA's functioning, or if he was a paper tiger.

In many ways my experience there foreshadowed what I would discover at other archives with congressional papers--there were only scattered documents relating to CIA. Still, what was there fascinated me: a John F. Kennedy-Russell conversation transcript, calendars showing Russell's meetings with CIA leaders, the occasional handwritten note to himself about something relating to CIA, and memoranda from staffers to Russell about the Agency.<sup>1</sup> Using these, plus the *Congressional Record* and a few memoirs and histories, I presented a paper on Russell and CIA at an APSA meeting and published an article (appropriately titled, "Glimpses of a Hidden History") in an intelligence studies journal (Barrett 1998).

I was hooked, wanting to know: What had Congress done in relation to CIA in its early years? The secrecy surrounding the topic made it all the more attractive to me, but I also came to believe (thanks to the work of many scholars) that congressional oversight of executive branch agencies *mattered* (Ogul 1976). When Congress looked into a failed U.S. Army

battle with an Indian nation early in George Washington's presidency, it was exercising its constitutionally-implied right to do so. After all, Congress provided the money for military operations, just as it does two centuries later.

The very limited literature on Congress and CIA in the early Cold War era concluded that Capitol Hill had been irresponsibly hands-off in neglecting the Agency (Holt 1995). Still, I had the impression from my research at the Russell Library that, on occasion, the Senator had been inquisitive. His questions had sometimes shaped what CIA leaders (or a president, the Agency's boss) did.

My goal became clear: I would write a book on congressional oversight of CIA in the early Cold War years. Could such a book be written? I had no idea! Despite the assertion in a few publications that Russell had been *the* congressional overseer of CIA for a couple of decades, I doubted that this could have been true. I assumed (more or less correctly) that there were archives scattered around the nation holding papers of other deceased legislators--heads of the Senate and House Armed Services and Appropriations committees who had interacted with Agency heads. I was humbled, though, by the fact that, while I had long known the name of Richard B. Russell, I had no idea even of the names of the other powerful legislators on the four committees. Styles Bridges, John Taber, Clarence Cannon, Millard Tydings? Never heard of them.

Gratefully, I discovered the website "Biographical Directory of the United States Congress, 1774-Present" (at <http://bioguide.congress.gov/biosearch/biosearch.asp>) which, among other things, guides researchers to appropriate archives. And I read many good, if inevitably incomplete,

---

<sup>1</sup> Richard B. Russell Library, University of Georgia.

histories of CIA (e.g., Powers 1979; Ranelagh 1986). The multi-volume report of the famous Church Committee of the mid-1970s was also a valuable (if sometimes overly critical) primer on what Congress had done and failed to do regarding CIA in the early Cold War era (U. S. Senate, 1976). Scholars of U.S. intelligence, especially Harry Howe Ransom (1959) and Loch Johnson (1985)--who worked on the staff of the Church Committee--provided me a much-needed education in the functioning and problems related to CIA in the post-WWII decades.

Thus, there *was* a good and fairly substantial literature on CIA, itself, and goodness knows there were many excellent treatments of Congress in the 1940-1960s by scholars and journalists (e.g., Fenno, 1966; White, 1957). Still, there was precious little on Congress *and* the CIA. Beginning to think about research, I learned that the National Archives in Washington, D.C. has useful but fragmentary records of committees which interacted with the Agency, and National Archives II in College Park, Maryland has similarly incomplete but valuable CIA records. Presidential libraries (in my case, primarily the Truman and Eisenhower libraries) have reasonably good records relating to CIA and congressional relations. But I knew that the make-or-break dimension of my research would be what was available or non-existent in archives with papers of once-powerful but mostly forgotten and now-deceased legislators.

I soon learned that some Congress members had destroyed some or all of their papers. Carl Vinson (D-GA), whose service on Capitol Hill began during the Wilson presidency, and who headed the House Armed Services Committee in the early Cold War decades, destroyed all of them! For many decades, the office of Gerald Ford (R-MI), who served on the House Appropriations subcommittee on CIA, destroyed most records that were more than a few years old. (So had some committees: At National Archives, there are no papers of the House Appropriations

Committee from this era; House Armed Services' papers are so limited as to be almost worthless.) Also, it became obvious to me that some legislators, or their staff or heirs, had removed CIA-related documents from their collections of hundreds of boxes of documents. Two Appropriations chairs (Clarence Cannon [D-MO] in the House, and Carl Hayden [D-AZ] in the Senate) have papers in archives, but those collections are of limited value for studying oversight of CIA.<sup>2</sup> In Hayden's case, this may be mainly because he monitored the Agency so sporadically, but Cannon was a demanding, if erratic, overseer of the Agency.

I have often sent my heartfelt thanks to certain late legislators for not having their papers "sanitized." For whatever reason, the papers of Bridges (R-NH), Taber (R-NY), Russell, George Mahon (D-TX), and some others have valuable and sometimes still "classified" records of their interactions with CIA leaders.<sup>3</sup>

Early on, in my own university's library, and before I understood who Styles Bridges was, I came across a finding aid to his papers in New Hampshire. Examining it, I saw notations of "Top Secret--CIA budget", and so I had my graduate assistant (conveniently heading home to New England) copy everything in that folder and report back to me. What she obtained was letters and detailed documentation of CIA's budget for 1955--amounts, categories of spending, places in the Defense Department's budget where CIA accounts were hidden, etc. Common sense indicates that such information would have been of no use to Saddam Hussein or Osama bin Laden, but the U.S. government absurdly keeps old Agency budgets and

---

<sup>2</sup> The one value of their papers for my research topic is the constituent correspondence. Cannon's papers are at the Western Historical Manuscript Collection, the University of Missouri, and Hayden's are at the Hayden Library, Arizona State University.

<sup>3</sup> Bridges' papers are at the New Hampshire State Archives, Taber's are at the Kroch Library at Cornell University, and Mahon's are at the Southwest Collection, Texas Tech University.

innumerable other early Cold War documents secret. This one file folder in Bridges' papers was immensely useful to my project. Similarly, in Mahon's and Taber's papers, I found handwritten notes of some meetings with CIA leaders.

\*\*\*

What can archives with papers of legislators provide? Two things are obvious: (1) the chance to engage in what Clifford Geertz (1973) famously called "thick description" of human cultures, and (2)--of great interest to many political scientists--the opportunity to *count*.

First: although my experience with archival research has often been frustrating (due to the secrecy surrounding CIA), I occasionally discovered intelligence-related memoranda between legislators and their staffers. (Also, at Archives II, I found many memoranda about the Agency legislative liaisons' interactions on Capitol Hill). This permitted me to add both color and nuance to my descriptions, for example, of a Congress member's anger at CIA. It is one thing to say that Senator Stuart Symington (D-MO) distrusted CIA, directed by Allen Dulles under President Eisenhower, for the way that it counted Soviet missiles; it is another to be able to quote from a CIA staffer's memo on his encounter with Symington at a barbecue. The Senator was furious that Dulles had gone on television and said there was no "gap" between U.S. and Soviet missile capabilities. Covert action chief Frank Wisner reported to Dulles:

He was extremely annoyed with your having made certain statements on this television program which you had...refused to make to his committee...that you did not believe that the Russians were ahead of us in the field of intercontinental ballistic missile development....

Stuart then launched into a considerable review of the numerous times and occasions on which he has come to the

defense of the Central Intelligence Agency. He reminded me of how he had stood up against Senator McCarthy in our defense during and before the McCarthy-Army hearings...and he recited other incidents, all of which are, of course, accurate. He said that he had done these things not merely because of his admiration and friendship for you and certain others in the Agency, but because of his belief that the Central Intelligence Agency was entitled to be treated in a special and separate category. However, if it is the policy of this Agency to engage itself on one side or the other of highly controversial political issues, he would have to revise his views (Barrett 2005, pp. 246-47).

Second: Although not a particularly quantitative political scientist, I certainly see the value in counting, especially in the area of legislative studies. In my archival research, I learned that CIA (created in 1947 by Congress and President Truman) had not counted its interactions with Congress until 1958, and then did so imperfectly. But, by drawing on its records and those of legislators, I was able to come up with an approximate count of different types of encounters: CIA appearances at hearings, meetings between Directors of Central Intelligence and individuals legislators, etc.

In a sense, my book is a gigantic test of the hypothesis of Mathew McCubbins and Thomas Schwartz (1984) that the amount and intensity of congressional oversight of executive branch agencies in a given time frame is primarily a function of the political environment: when interest groups, citizens, journalists, or others set off "alarms," Congress then steps up its monitoring of the agency in question.

The counting I did, based on archival research, allowed me to trace the ups and downs of Capitol Hill's oversight of CIA from 1947 to 1961. I judged that such oversight fit the predictions of McCubbins and Schwartz. For example, in 1955, a relatively sleepy year

with few alarms being set off, the DCI testified about 10-12 times. In 1958, American and international politics were more highly charged, following the late-1957 launch of the Soviet's first satellite, the riots that nearly killed Vice President and Mrs. Nixon in Venezuela, and a coup that overthrew a pro-American government of Iraq. These and other events caused citizens, journalists, and legislators to ask many questions about alleged failures at CIA. DCI Dulles testified over two dozen times, and had frequent private sessions with the few members authorized by the Congress to monitor CIA.

Another easily-counted kind of interaction is that occurring between legislators and citizens. When, in the aftermath of the May 1960 Soviet shootdown of an American U-2 spy plane, House Appropriations chairman Cannon detailed and praised the spy flights over the USSR (and also became the first U.S. government official to describe them explicitly as a CIA program), his floor speech was widely praised in government and news media circles. Still, a count of his office mail after the speech is a concrete reminder that many Americans were appalled by the secrecy and lies surrounding the intelligence-gathering operation. Almost half of the 26 citizens writing Cannon berated him for, as one put it, "the same old unimaginative display of jingoism" that had blighted so many recent statements from U.S. and Soviet leaders (Barrett, 2005, p. 398).

\*\*\*

For those considering doing archival research for the first time, I have a few elementary pieces of advice. After consulting the above-mentioned Biographical Dictionary website,

- (1) Give careful thought to what sort of documentation you hope to find, and then contact the archive holding the papers that interest you. Archivists and their assistants are almost always warm and helpful. (This may be less true at large archives with overworked staffs.) They can tell you if a finding aid exists

for the legislator's papers. It may be available on-line, or they might be willing to send you a micro-fiche or printed copy of it. Use this to create a list of boxes of folders that you believe will be most fruitful for exploration. Give the archivists at least a few days' advance notice before your arrival; some archives keep less-used collections off-site, and have to order their delivery to a researchers' room. Inquire about photocopying procedures and costs. Most archives now permit researchers to use scanners and digital cameras to "copy" documents. I use the latter type of a device, and it is a real time-saver at the archive.

- (2) Make written note of the archival location of every document that you copy or take notes from. You'll need this information if you cite the document. Also, keep a list of all boxes you looked at every day at each archive you visit. If you decide six months later that you need to return to an archive, you don't want to be fuzzy on what you've already inspected.
- (3) Don't be surprised if you initially feel a bit overwhelmed at an archive: you've just arrived, the collection of papers that interests you is 350 boxes in size, and that finding aid you examined was pretty vague. I can only advise that you talk to the archivists, ask every question you can think of, and dive in. You'll learn pretty quickly that some boxes you open are irrelevant to your research, and you will move on.
- (4) Treat the documents with great care. Every decent archive's rules require this, and for good reason. I still haven't gotten over my shock at learning that former National Security Adviser Sandy Berger mistreated, stole, and destroyed certain documents at the National Archives (Leonnig 2005). Senator J. William Fulbright's old book title comes

to mind: *The Arrogance of Power*. It is unimaginable to me that any serious scholar would do such a thing.

- (5) Don't be surprised if the archivist says, "The Congressman's papers may not have that information," or "Nobody ever comes to look at Senator Jones' papers." This does not mean that his or her papers won't be valuable to you. Go and see for yourself. Almost no one ever examines the papers of the late Senator H. Alexander Smith (R-NJ), but when I did, I came across his wonderful handwritten diary of life in Washington, D. C.<sup>4</sup>

The fact that others rarely look at congressional papers means that you have the opportunity to do highly original research, analysis, and writing. The book that I was unsure could be written will soon be in print, all 540 pages of it, based primarily on archival research.

### Bibliography

- Barrett, David M. *The CIA and Congress: The Untold Story from Truman to Kennedy*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2005.
- . "Glimpses of a Hidden History: Senator Richard Russell, Congress, and Oversight of the CIA," *International Journal of Intelligence and CounterIntelligence*, vol. 11, no. 3 (Fall 1998), pp. 271-298.
- Fenno, Richard. *The Power of the Purse: Appropriations Politics in Congress*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1966.
- Geertz, Clifford. *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays*. New York: Basic Books, 1973.
- Holt, Pat. *Secret Intelligence and Public Policy: A Dilemma of Democracy*. Washington: Congressional Quarterly Press, 1995.

- Johnson, Loch. *A Season of Inquiry: The Senate Intelligence Investigation*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1985.
- Leonnig, Carol. "Berger is Likely to Face Fine," *Washington Post*, April 2, 2005, p. A8.
- McCubbins, Mathew and Thomas Schwartz. "Congressional Oversight Overlooked: Police Patrols versus Fire Alarms," *American Journal of Political Science*, vol. 28, 1984, pp. 165-79.
- Ogul, Morris. *Congress Overseas the Bureaucracy: Studies in Legislative Supervision*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1976.
- Powers, Thomas. *The Man Who Kept the Secrets: Richard Helms and the CIA*. New York: Knopf, 1979.
- Ranelagh, John. *The Agency: The Rise and Decline of the CIA*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1986.
- Ransom, Harry Howe. *Central Intelligence and National Security*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959.
- United States Senate. Select Committee to Study Governmental Operations with Resepect to Intelligence Activities. *Final Report*. Washington, 1976.
- White, William S. *Citadel: The Story of the U. S. Senate*. New York: Harper, 1957.

---

<sup>4</sup> Smith's papers are at the Mudd Library, Princeton University.

# Congressional Collections: Where the Mundane Becomes Compelling

Frank Mackaman  
*Dirksen Congressional Center*

I have a selfish interest in writing about the uses of archival sources for legislative research. Frankly, The Dirksen Congressional Center is an under-used resource. True, we have our share of historians and hobbyists who consult our collections, but political scientists are a rarer breed. Despite the relevance of our historical materials to studies of Congress, we don't get much use from scholars trained as political scientists. I would hazard a guess that the vast majority of the nearly forty member institutions of the newly formed Association of Centers for the Study of Congress have the same experience.<sup>1</sup>

For the past thirty years, I have immersed myself in the collections of political figures as a graduate student, historian, staff member at The Dirksen Congressional Center, Director of the Gerald R. Ford Library, finally returning to The Center in 1996. I worked my way through graduate school as an archivist. My first boss tried to make the job of pouring through hundreds of boxes of Thomas B. Curtis's Papers (R-MO), page-by-page, attractive by appealing to my academic major: "You will discover a richness in the historical record by actually processing these papers – a perspective that even the most conscientious

researcher can never achieve," she said. And she was right. So this is my bias: the papers of Members of Congress provide unique, verifiable, reliable, even entertaining information about almost all things congressional.

Although I will concentrate on Members' personal collections<sup>2</sup>, there are other archival resources about the host of legislative actors, processes, and outcomes. The universe of documentation about Congress includes committee and institutional records (e.g., the records at the Center for Legislative Archives at the National Archives), government records created by executive and judicial departments (e.g., the White House and executive branch congressional liaison offices), personal collections of those who once served in Congress but whose main career took some other form (e.g. the papers of Gerald R. Ford, a House Member before he became president), and the business records of lobbyists, interest groups, think tanks, law firms, etc. The list is almost endless.

## What Are the Scope and Structure of a Member's Papers?

Variety is the key here. No two congressional collections are alike because no two congressional offices function the same way. A congressional collection is the artifact of the congressional office which, in turn, reflects the personality of the Member, at least to some degree. Archival practice underscores this uniqueness. In processing a collection,

---

<sup>1</sup> Many of these organizations possess the papers of Congress Members. I conducted an informal survey of the ACSC (<http://www.congresscenters.org/>) to determine the extent of political science use of their collections in 2004. The responses confirmed my suspicion. In the case of one repository of the 192 uses of a single congressional collection only 13 "might qualify" as political scientists; this from the most heavily used of the institutions which responded. Typical was this reply:

I can tell you none used ours, only historians. The local political science people claim they are only interested in statistical/graph type stuff (and we do have some things which would help them), so they have convinced themselves that Congressional papers are of no use to them. Very frustrating.

---

<sup>2</sup> For purposes of this article, a Member's papers are defined as "all records, regardless of physical form and characteristics, which are made or received in connection with an individual's career in Congress." When I use the term "archives," I do not mean "data archives."



archivists preserve, to the extent possible, the original nature and order of the collection. We do not file records in some archival equivalent of the Dewey Decimal System.<sup>3</sup>

Having said that, most congressional collections if they are reasonably complete, share common elements. They consist of records relating to a Member's representational role, those relating to law-making, files pertaining to the Member him or herself, and administrative records. In the first category, that of representation, fall issue mail, district or state office files (including grants and projects), casework, VIP correspondence, patronage, campaign and political files, accepted invitations, and a collection of "marketing," (for want of a better term) materials such as speeches, press releases, newsletters, the Web site, and TV and radio files.

Congressional archives house records related to law-making, of course, including legislative working papers, bill files, general reference materials, voting and attendance records, materials related to congressional membership organizations, and leadership files (if applicable). Member-centered records include appointment books and schedules, biographical and personal files, newspaper clippings, and diaries or personal journals (if you're very lucky). Administrative records document office management practices. Staff files, agency and department files, general correspondence, memorabilia, and audiovisual materials are types of records that span all four categories.<sup>4</sup>

Congress Members' collections share something else: diversity in format. Actual

---

<sup>3</sup> The advent of searchable finding aids and the online posting of selected portions of collections compromise the principle of original order to an extent.

<sup>4</sup> In their guidance to senators and representatives, the Senate Historical Office and the House Clerk suggest discarding such files as service academy applications not accepted, routine agency and department records, routine constituent correspondence and casework, certain categories of issue mail, declined invitations, outdated reference information, legislative files not related to the Member's interests, non-substantive office files (including, curiously, financial records), and routine photographs. You are not likely to find these materials in congressional collections.

paper still predominates, but many collections also include still photographs, artifacts, books, film and tape in their multiple formats, and, increasingly, e-based formats.

There are, however, few complete congressional collections.<sup>5</sup> In the case of Everett Dirksen, for example, virtually all of the records from his sixteen years in the House were destroyed. It is an oft-repeated truism: the primary purpose of a congressional office is not to preserve the historical record. Expect substantial gaps in most Members' papers.<sup>6</sup>

### **What Are the Strengths and Weaknesses of Members' Collections?**

The scope and structure of congressional collections pose opportunities and obstacles. The primary strength of congressional collections lies in their uniqueness. I know of no other way to appreciate the life of a politician than to "soak and poke" in their archives. Following them around for a time comes close, but it's not quite the same. I'm reminded of a graduate student in the University of Michigan's School of Business who was conducting research at the Gerald R. Ford Library for a dissertation on organizational change. He called his work "theory-elaborative archival ethnography" (a phrase I've always wanted to work into print). To the extent that a high quality congressional archive can allow a researcher to reconstruct

---

<sup>5</sup> Among the reasons typically cited are these: longevity in office often means that early records "disappear"; a congressional office functions in the moment and discounts the importance of legacy; the Member discourages preserving his record for any number of reasons; congressional offices often close quickly following death or electoral defeat.

<sup>6</sup> The best way to evaluate a congressional collection is to see the finding aid either by going online or by contacting the repository directly. The National Archives maintains a list of congressional repositories at [http://www.archives.gov/records\\_of\\_congress/repository\\_collections/](http://www.archives.gov/records_of_congress/repository_collections/). The best printed sources for locating congressional papers are the *Guide to Research Collections of Former Members of the United States House of Representatives, 1789-1987* (the Clerk of the House is in the process of converting this publication to online - see <http://clerk.house.gov/histHigh/index.html> for details) and the *Guide to Research Collections of Former United States Senators, 1789-1995* (Senate Doc. 103-35, Government Printing Office, 1995).

past events in fine detail, ethnography is an apt word. Any archivist who has worked more than three months in a congressional collection can describe documentary gems that would crown the right research project.

One of my favorite gems from the Dirksen Collection relates to what may have been his most famous speech on the Senate floor (remember, these were the days before C-SPAN). After a record-breaking filibuster stalled passage of a civil rights bill in the Senate in 1964, the time came for the cloture vote. Head counts suggested the vote would be breathtakingly close. Dirksen, described by one journalist as “a collapsed ruin, drawn and gaunt” after weeks of 16-hour days, was to have the last word before the vote on June 10 (MacNeil 1970, 236). Very rarely did Dirksen prepare remarks in advance. This time, however, he and his wife, Louella, spent the late evening of June 9 preparing a 12-page script which Dirksen himself composed on his Royal manual typewriter. The annotations indicate that he reviewed the text at least three times before delivering it. When the cloture vote passed, Dirksen’s remarks were widely credited with the outcome. My point is this: only a close reading of that raw text reveals the importance Dirksen attached to his remarks and the almost painful effort he made to perfect them. He knew what was at stake. He appreciated the power of language, of persuasion, in the legislative setting. Seeing the text in the *Congressional Record* is just not the same. The roll call vote doesn’t do the occasion justice either.

If these collections are so rich and unique and revealing, what don’t scholars flock to them? Because they are not easy to use. The weakness of these collections is not their content *per se*. The obstacles are primarily external to the individual collections themselves: political science as a discipline does not provide incentives for historically or archivally-grounded research and publication; the collections are spread out all over the country; it is costly to travel to more than a

handful<sup>7</sup>; some repositories do not place a high priority on getting the collections in shape to use (even if their content merits more attention); the uniqueness of collections frustrates a standardized approach to doing research; and on and on.

There is, of course, the problem of large size, which is an inherent quality of many political collections. Volume poses a problem both to archivists who must process the papers and to researchers who want to use them. Volume varies as widely as subject coverage. The Carl Albert Center houses 55 congressional collections ranging in size from one-tenth of a foot to 992 cubic feet for the late Speaker’s collection -- seven collections are larger than 100 cubic feet, not including nine recent accessions which promise to be voluminous, too.<sup>8</sup> Size need not intimidate you. Collection guides and reference archivists can narrow the search. Of course it helps to have a disciplined research strategy, one tailored to the resources available at the repository you visit.<sup>9</sup> It’s difficult for me, for example, to help someone who walks in and “wants to do something on Everett Dirksen.” Do I turn them loose in the 1,600 linear feet of his papers?

### **Why Should You (a Political Scientist) Use Archival Sources In Legislative Research?**

I am now skating on thin ice. Far be it from me to claim expertise in your discipline. My effort here will be to suggest that Members’ collections contain information that will help you answer at least some of the questions your research about Congress addresses.

One of the themes of modern congressional studies is that the career goals and goal-seeking behavior of legislators greatly

---

<sup>7</sup> The Society of American Archivist’s Congressional Papers Roundtable maintains a list of institutions offering research funding at:

<http://www.archivists.org/saagroups/cpr/grants.asp>.

<sup>8</sup><http://www.ou.edu/special/albertctr/archives/collect.htm>. Accessed April 12, 2005.

<sup>9</sup> Two first-person accounts of doing research in political archives are David Michael Ryfe (n.d.) and Scott A. Frisch and Sean Q Kelly (2003).

shape the nature of Congress as an institution. But scholars have difficulty in constructing or reconstructing the nature of careers. One of your colleagues has blamed the discipline's focus on Washington-centered, policy-centered, and increasingly party-centered approaches to research about Congress. Careers, however, are individual and respond to Members' own special needs and circumstances, locally and regionally. "Comprehending the distinctive character of individual careers requires access to data that to many of us might seem almost mundane," Larry Dodd notes, "but such data can have significant implications for our interpretations of Congress as an institution and for careers within it" (Dodd 2004).

What we're really talking about here is congressional biography. Burdett Loomis has made the point that neither historians nor political scientists have produced much in the way of congressional biography. The careful examination of a single individual, Loomis writes, "may tell us as much as a data-rich, assumption-driven piece of analysis." And he issues this challenge to political scientists: "Moreover, the absence of biographies means that we have given up the telling of stories to others, who may well develop more cynical, less understanding studies than those who best understand the legislative branch" (Loomis 2000). In calling "for a return to the art of biography," Betty Koed, Assistant Historian of the U.S. Senate, reminds us that "Looking at the career of a specific Member of Congress can also provide a glimpse into that difficult task of balancing state and national issues, defining political allegiance, and building a national legacy in harmony with local, constituent needs" (Koed 2000, 16). I can't think of one good reason why biography ought to be the exclusive province of historians.

What is it that we want to know about a Congress Member? It seems to me that substantial effort has been made over the past thirty years to refocus attention on the career of Members in their districts away from their role

in Washington. Richard Fenno is largely credited with this shift to a study of "home style," an approach to congressional biography that incorporates what Dodd calls "mundane" data, or innocuous data. This stuff abounds in Members' collections. Travel records, daily meeting schedules, information about local press appearances, lists of district friends (sometimes derived from Christmas card lists), lists of charitable contributions made by Members, records of their membership in local organizations – unfortunately, this mundane data is often discounted in value and weeded from collections. But if Dodd is right about its value, then we archivists have made a mistake. Innocuous data can help us see the real nature of the legislative experience, understand the nature of congressional careers, see Members' close attentiveness to their local districts, and appreciate the role of "home style" in the life of a legislator.

As significant as the study of "home style" has been as a corrective to a Washington-centric view of congressional biography and career, I am intrigued by the possibility of appraising congressional careers, of writing congressional biography, through a different lens, an adaptation of the framework Fred Greenstein (2000) uses to evaluate presidential leadership. He judges presidential success in terms of six factors: organizational capacity, political skill, public communication, cognitive style, vision, and emotional intelligence.

My experience as an archivist suggests that a Member's collection provides vital information about each of these factors and that a compelling congressional biography, or understanding of career, can result from consulting the archives using the Greenstein framework.

An office's personnel files, the office procedures manual, staff memoranda, the files of the chief of staff, even a legislator's correspondence can answer such questions as these: Does the Member select able people? Does he fix what doesn't work in his office?

Does she hold people accountable? Does he direct, delegate, and coordinate appropriately? The answers to such questions reveal a Member's ability to rally his staff and structure their activities effectively, what Greenstein calls "organizational capacity."

How politically skillful is the Member? Does she have good political instincts? Does he grasp political implications? Does she set realistic expectations? Does he get things done? The effectiveness of a Member depends to an important degree on their political skill, i.e., their ability to get elected in the first place and their ability to get things done once elected. The obvious archival sources for the first are the campaign and political files of a Member which contain strategy memos, evaluations by consultants and staff, polling data, and so on. Good sources for the second include clippings files (which document the media's evaluation of political skill), issue mail, personal and general correspondence, and files relating to a Member's performance in ad hoc groups, leadership settings, and committees and subcommittees.

Somewhere along the line, successful Members have to communicate in order to achieve re-election and exercise influence with colleagues, much as Dirksen did in the summer of 1964. Does the Member have command of information? Does she appreciate the power of her position? Does he speak with conviction? Does she possess eloquence? Audiovisual sources in the archives are helpful here. The Dirksen Papers, for example, contain fascinating information about Dirksen's appearances on the "Ev and Charlie" and "Ev and Jerry" shows, press conferences in the 1960s following the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership meetings. Dirksen's performance in these settings elevated him to the national stage, gained him favor among journalists, and provided a woefully outnumbered Republican minority with a disproportionate influence on public policy. Naturally, the press secretary's files, news

clippings, polling data, interview transcripts, speech files, and the like are rich sources, too.

A Member's cognitive style deserves considerable attention. Can the Member get to the central essence of issues? Is she open to new insights? Does he use accurate historical analogies? Does she exhibit intellectual strength across a broad range? What a Member believes about how the world works and why it does so must count for a great deal in congressional biography. Here, the archival sources include family and personal records, correspondence with intimates, speeches and interviews, annotations on or reactions to briefing memos, and evaluations of voting records over time.

Greenstein accounts for vision, too, in evaluating presidents. The same might be applied to Congress Members. Does the Member possess a set of overarching goals? Is he dedicated to the content of policies? Do her convictions set the terms of her interactions with colleagues in policy development? Does he inspire? A strong archival collection, spanning more than a handful of years, can provide evidence of vision. The logical place to start is probably the public remarks a Member makes – they all talk about their convictions, their goals, what inspires them (and ought to inspire you). But the key to learning about consistency lies in the archives. Does the "message" filter down to the staff in terms of how the office is structured, how constituents and colleagues are treated, in the work ethic of the Member?

Finally, and most critically in my view, is emotional intelligence, the Member's ability to manage his emotions and turn them to constructive purposes. Does the Member have self-awareness? Is she able to accept criticism? Is he intellectually honest? Does she exhibit strength of character? I have never seen a person write something that began, "I know I am self-aware because . . ." Answering these questions will take some digging. One measure of a person's ability to accept criticism might be staff turnover. Character is tested in

legislative battles, e.g., did the Member have the courage of her convictions? A Member who actively seeks contrary views, who is comfortable with dissent in the office, who is decisive – congressional collections document these qualities.

Using archival materials created by a Member to answer the questions I have posed will not only tell the story of a life and career, it will, as Barbara Tuchman once explained, be a “vehicle for exhibiting an age.”<sup>10</sup> Members of Congress don’t exist in isolation any more than data do.

Here is a final reason to enliven political science research and writing about Congress by using archival sources. Political science journals publish prolifically the fruits of aggregate quantitative work and math modeling. Since I don’t understand that research, I’m not in a position to discount it. But I will pose this final question, “Which of the following two examples stands a better chance of being read by people outside the discipline?

Example 1. The following appeared as part of an analysis of legislative bargaining.<sup>11</sup>

$$v_B = p \sum_{\sigma_B, \beta_B} \mu_B[\sigma_B, \beta_B] (1 - \sigma_B x_S - \beta_B x_B) + (p - p) \sum_{\sigma_B, \beta_B} \mu_B[\sigma_B, \beta_B] \frac{\beta_B}{b-1} x_B + q \sum_{\sigma_S, \beta_S} \mu_S[\sigma_S, \beta_S] \frac{\beta_S}{b} x_B$$

Example 2. Robert H. Michel, just elected leader of the House Republicans in December 1980 after a hard-fought contest with Guy Vander Jagt, spoke these words to his colleagues:

12/8/80

MR. CHAIRMAN, MY COLLEAGUES AND GUESTS OF THE CONFERENCE /

I COULD JUST ABOUT BREAK OUT INTO SONG! / IF I DID, IT WOULD HAVE TO BE “*Thanks Be To God*” / FOR MY FATHER TOLD ME MANY TIMES AS A YOUNG MAN THAT WHEN ~~ONE~~ *the Lord* LOOKS WITH SUCH GOOD FAVOR UPON ME AS HE HAS HERE TODAY, I SHOULD FIRST PAUSE / ACKNOWLEDGE ~~him~~ *himself*, GIVE THANKS AND THEN ~~GO FORTH WALK~~ HUMBLY IN HIS SIGHT /

THAT IS WHERE I HAVE TO BEGIN MY STEWARDSHIP AS YOUR NEWLY ELECTED LEADER /

<sup>10</sup> Quoted by Koed (Koed 2000, 17).

<sup>11</sup> It is not important who published this equation only that it represents a popular method of publishing research that is at odds with my preference.

He continued:

How do I perceive my Leadership role?

... I do not personally crave the spotlight of public attention. What I am interested in is seeking to it that the spotlight is focused on the vast array of individual talent we have assembled in this room. My job is to orchestrate your many talents in such a way as to give us the best possible overall performance rating.

To use the symphonic analogy, I know some of you prefer speaking softly as strings, others more vocally as woodwinds, some very loudly as brass and finally those boisterous ones for percussion, but in any event, the measure of our success will be how well we harmonize and work together.

Legislative bargaining or leadership style, the topic is almost irrelevant. The plain language of the historical record speaks more compellingly to me.

## **Bibliography**

- Dodd, Lawrence C. 2004. "Political Science and the Study of Congress: Trends and New Trajectories," <http://www.congresscenters.org/dodd2004.htm>. Accessed April 14, 2005.
- Frisch, Scott A. and Sean Q Kelly. 2003. "Don't Have the Data? Make Them Up! Congressional Archives as Untapped Data Sources." *P.S.: Political Science and Politics* 36 (2): 221-4.
- Greenstein, Fred I. 2000. *The Presidential Difference: Leadership Style from FDR to Clinton* (New York: The Free Press).
- Koed, Betty K. 2000. "The Usefulness of Political Biographies," *Extension of Remarks*, 23(1) January.
- Loomis, Burdett A. 2000. "Editorial Note" *Extension of Remarks*, 23(1) January.
- MacNeil, Neil. 1970. *Dirksen: Portrait of a Public Man* (New York: The World Publishing Company).
- Ryfe, David M. n.d. "Visiting the Scene of the Crime, Or How to Interrogate a Presidential Archives," *PRG Report*.

# My Congressional History, and Ours

Ronald M. Peters, Jr.  
*University of Oklahoma*

When I embarked upon my study of the speakership of the U.S. House of Representatives in 1979, I aimed to produce a book entitled "The Modern Speakership," which would focus on the speakerships of Carl Albert and Tip O'Neill. I planned to draw on material in Speaker Albert's papers and spend a sabbatical year on the staff of the Democratic Steering and Policy Committee, not doing much beyond an occasional speech for the speaker. I had received a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities to support my research, and during my year in Washington (1981-82) I had a team of research assistants working diligently to cull from among the 1000 linear feet of the Albert Collection such materials as might seem most useful to me in understanding the speakership. More about this below.

During my sabbatical year the confluence of two discoveries led to a fundamental redirection in my approach to the topic. I became aware that Don Kennon was compiling a comprehensive bibliography on House speakers under the auspices of the Capitol Historical Society. And, I learned that as a member of the speaker's staff I could send over requests to the Library of Congress and have books delivered to me at my office in the late Tip O'Neill building (both the building and Tip are now deceased – as Joni Mitchell says, they paved paradise and put up a parking lot.) Don was kind enough to allow me to rummage through his bibliographic card files, from which I compiled an extensive list of sources on individual speakers. I would then fetch the books from LC, and spend a good part of each day reading about speakers past.

This led me to want to write a book on the speakership that would lend to it some degree of historical perspective. Don had also tracked down the locations, where known, of

the papers of speakers, and so an option that I considered was to embark on the extensive travel necessary to do an archive-based historical narrative. I had this possibility in mind throughout that year. As I was becoming more historically immersed in the speakership, I was also gaining valuable ground by participant observation, sitting in on weekly whip meetings and the occasional meeting of the DSPC, and conducting dozens of interviews with members and staff members.

When I arrived back on campus at the University of Oklahoma in the Fall of 1982, I found awaiting me the work of my student research team. I had charged them to cull from among Speaker Albert's papers every substantive letter between the speaker and members, all material related to legislation upon which the speaker's active involvement could be identified, all files relating to major political, legislative, or institutional controversies, any communication between the speaker and the Senate majority leader or other senators on matters of substance, and anything dealing with the speaker's relationship with interest groups. I also indicated that they should pull anything else that looked at all interesting.

The result of this effort comprised several standard file boxes of material that eventually filled a full filing cabinet. It became my task then to review this material and fit it into my developing conception of the book. I found the speaker's papers to vary considerably in the depth of coverage of events that I knew to have taken place. In some instances, material was abundant. I think, for example, of files dealing with the Bolling committee reform effort or the development of the Budget and Impoundment Control Act. In other cases, the material was less robust. While the speaker's legislative files were

extensive, they were derivative of material flowing from the committees and often did not say much about the speaker's actual involvement. By far the most valuable material was a series of memos written by John Barriere, the executive director of the Democratic Steering and Policy Committee to Speaker Albert. Steering and Policy had been moved off site during Albert's speakership, and so Barriere was officed in the O'Neill building (then called House Annex #1). He would have his memoranda sent by courier to the speaker's office, retaining a file copy. In general, Speaker Albert chose to file the Barriere memos in a single file rather than to disperse them by topic. Later, Barriere donated his set of files to the Center, enabling us to round out the set with some memos that had not been retained in Speaker Albert's papers.

The Barriere memos were most often presented in bullet form, and summarized both Barriere's activities (meetings, phone calls, strategy sessions, etc.), his analysis of legislation and legislative strategy, and recommendations to the speaker for action. He was Albert's eyes and ears on the legislative process, especially with respect to significant legislation. The memos provided useful background and insight into dynamics of the legislative process from the speaker's perspective.

Ari Weiss succeeded John Barriere as the executive director of Steering and Policy when Tip O'Neill became speaker. Ari was something of a prodigy, completing his law degree at Georgetown Law School while serving as the speaker's primary policy advisor. Ari felt that proximity to O'Neill was crucial, and so he occupied a desk in H-209, the Speaker's suite of offices just off the House floor. He was in constant direct contact with Speaker O'Neill, and I do not believe that he often communicated with O'Neill by memo. Thus, much of the texture of the O'Neill speakership had to be unearthed or later recovered by oral interviews.

In the end I decided against spending years trucking around to archives in search of tidbits from the papers of former speakers. Even though I wanted to take an historical perspective on the speakership, I did not conceive of my task as writing the definitive and detailed shelf reference that a professionally trained historian might have undertaken. Instead, I wanted to write a book that would trace the broad contours of the office's evolution, with particular focus on its most recent rendition. I did not feel that plowing through the letters of former speakers was essential to this task.

But, I must confess that another factor contributed to this decision. Here I had at my disposal the full and most comprehensive set of papers of a former speaker at that time (exceeding in volume even the Rayburn collection); and yet by the time I sat down to write about Carl Albert's speakership I had reduced the relevant material to the contents of a single Hollinger file box. Within that box there were, indeed, very useful materials, without which I could not have captured Albert's speakership to the extent that I did. I have no doubt that I might have culled from among the papers of other former speakers useful information that might have enabled me to present their tenures in a more tactile way. But I doubt very seriously that my basic take on the speakership and its evolution would have been any different.

Having said this, I remain an advocate of archival research especially when it is addressed to more narrowly confined topics. For example, two years ago I undertook a comparison of the House Democratic Caucus and Republican Conference in my quest to establish that there are differences in the cultures of the two parties. We had material in several collections bearing upon this topic, both Republican and Democratic. One conclusion that I was able to buttress based on material found in Speaker Albert's collection was the fragility of party governance under the Democrats as the trend toward stronger party leadership began to emerge in the early 1970s.



One memo, for example, mentioned that Dan Rostenkowski had to dig into his own accounts to pay for the coffee and donuts served at Democratic Caucus meetings as an incentive for members to attend. The very idea of regular caucus meetings was foreign to the culture of the party, and no provision had been made to fund caucus operations. Other memos suggested active resistance to regular meetings of the caucus.

\*\*\*

Let me now switch gears and comment upon the use of archival material from an institutional point of view. The Carl Albert Center houses among the larger congressional archival collections in the country. The Library of Congress has far and away the largest collection of congressional papers, but trailing it there are a handful of fairly large congressional collections located at universities. Our collections are among these. In terms of funding to process and make available collections, we are in good shape among similar repositories. We provide a small grant program to fund travel research to the Center, and we make available our inventories on the internet. So, what are the results?

Data compiled by our archival staff indicate that from 1984 to the present the Center funded 41 scholars with travel grants to visit the Center. This is an average of around two visiting scholars per year. The figures do not, of course, include usage by other researchers not funded through our grant program. These include not only research done in-house by the Center's faculty and graduate students, but also research undertaken by some members of the History Department at OU, other regional scholars, genealogists, and miscellaneous others. We estimate that the Visiting Scholars Program provides less than 5% of the usage of the collections. These scholars have produced a number of significant books. Still, overall usage trails that of presidential libraries substantially. Universities have little incentive to reallocate resources to support congressional

archives. This is why our situation is so unique; we were able to secure state, federal, and private funding to support our activities without taxing the university budget. If the Congress is as concerned about preserving its history as it has been about preserving the legacy of the presidency and former presidents, a relatively modest amount of funding allocated state-by-state to appropriate archival institutions would go a long way.

But why is the scholarly usage not greater than it is? Addressing this question from the perspective here, the following factors appear at play. First, political science turned away from history in the decades after World War II under the influence of the behavioral movement. Beginning in the 1980s, the discipline turned back toward history, as witness the growth of the Politics and History Section and the rise of American Political Development as a field of study. Congressional scholars such as David Brady were at the front edge of this return to historical studies. Yet it remains true that very few congressional scholars undertake archival research. Most historical studies are grounded in the voting and public record of the Congress, and not in an examination of the papers of former members. During the same historical period, historians turned away from politics and government and toward social history, the great trilogy of class, race, and gender. While there are some indications that scholars concerned with the social issues are turning to archival research and in particular to congressional collections, congressional scholars still continue to search for quantifiable data. So, there remains a demand problem.

Second, even were the demand larger, the supply is not easily accessible. Papers of former members are strewn about the country, often in repositories that do not give them high priority. Inventorying practices vary, user aids are often cumbersome and inexact, and physical conditions are often not optimal. The Carl Albert Center still encounters a geographical challenge. Most researchers reside on the coasts; we are in the center of the

country. Here, transparency will help. The more specific information available on the internet, the easier it will be for researchers to identify materials and incorporate archival research into their research designs.

Third, modern congressional collections have become quite plastic. Much of the linear footage is comprised of computer generated correspondence between interest groups and members, often with one computer talking to another. Much information is now both created and stored electronically. This presents a variety of new challenges for archives. The advent of email is a very bad thing for scholars. To take my previous example, the Barriere memos might not have existed had John Barriere had access to email. Congressional email records typically have not been stored for archival purposes, although this may be changing as congressional offices make decisions about how to store their email correspondence.

These factors head my list of challenges facing congressional archives in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. Here is my idea of what needs to happen if the history of the Congress is to be best preserved and historical scholarship on the Congress best promoted and supported. Ideally, Congress would itself fund a set of regional congressional repositories, building upon the existing academic infrastructure wherever possible. These repositories should collect congressional papers from within their regions. They might be managed by the National Archives, as the presidential libraries are, or they might be administered by universities under federal guidelines, as the national laboratories are. A coordinated set of repositories could set professional standards, undertake shared arrangements and activities, and work with members of Congress to set standards for the retention and disposition of records. Attention needs to be given to the preservation of the "older" record of the Congress written on paper, as well as to the "new" history now being created electronically. Congress should consider

funding, via NARA or NEH, an extensive oral history project.

Of course, this will not happen. Congress is already hedging on the presidential libraries. Members of Congress often do not care about the preservation of congressional history, or if they do, they assume that it can be done on the cheap. Members want to neuter their collections so as to avoid later political embarrassment. This problem is becoming greater as members choose to leave Congress in mid-career rather than to be hauled out the door feet first. They also want their papers to go to institutions with which they have some connection, either their alma mater or a leading institution in their state.

The community of congressional scholars has responded to the need for better coordination to some degree. The Society of American Archivists created its Congressional Papers Roundtable a number of years ago that provides a venue for archival professionals to share information and experience. In 2003, the Association of Centers for the Study of Congress was formed. ACSC's mission includes the development of Congressional Archives and best practices. It has a web site at <http://www.congresscenters.org>. The creation of ACSC and the continued and expanding interest in the Congress, its operation, and its history is very encouraging. ACSC is headed by former House Historian Ray Smock. I notice that the House Republican leadership has taken steps to revitalize its history office, and may appoint Robert Remini as the new House historian. The publication of his history of the House will be very welcome.

\*\*\*

I remain both skeptical and optimistic about the future of historical research and the preservation of the record of the Congress. For all of the challenges posed by the new electronic age, there are advantages. Usage of the Carl Albert collections is up quite a bit since we started putting up our inventories on the internet where they can be accessed by a Google search. This sort of transparency will

boost access and usage. As more records are stored electronically, it will become easier for researchers to gain access without traveling, or, if they do travel, they will do so more efficiently by the predetermination of relevant materials. Greater ease of access will encourage more creative research designs using archival records.

So much for optimism. My skepticism relates to the irretrievable loss of historical documentation to which electronic record keeping may give rise, the inundation of collections by artificially promoted correspondence, the tendency of members to avoid preserving the record of their service, and some degree of doubt that political scientists will turn to history or that historians will turn to politics.

# Five Reasons to Consider Taking the Road Less Traveled

Scott A. Frisch  
*California State University Channel Islands*  
Sean Q Kelly  
*Niagara University*

*A political scientist? Really? Hmm...I can't say we've ever had a political scientist come in here; you could be the first one...*

*You want to use which collection?...You may be the first person to ever use this collection.*

*Do you have any suggestions regarding how we can get more political scientists to use our collections?*

These are common reactions to our first appearance in the papers of former members of Congress throughout the country. In fact, we have heard them so often that we cannot attribute the quotes to a particular archivist. While it is clear that we are not the only political scientists who have discovered the value of using archival sources – as evidenced by the other political scientists represented in this issue – our appearance in an archive is interesting enough to elicit such comments from archival staff.

Since 2000 we have used 36 collections composed of the papers of former members of Congress in a combined 39 trips to 14 states. Our data collection has mostly focused on collecting data on the politics of committee organization for our forthcoming book (Frisch and Kelly 2006). In addition, we have worked with local scholars and archivists to extract materials from 9 other collections. In most cases one or the other (or in a couple of cases both) of us personally visited the papers to collect data. We have logged tens of thousands of combined air miles, spent weeks away from our families, and invested some of our personal resources to collect the materials that are the basis of what we believe is a rich data set.

Over the past five years we have discussed frequently why legislative scholars have not discovered archival research strategies (which are more common in presidential studies). One often-quoted theory is the “spatial theory.” Many archival collections are in distant locations.<sup>1</sup> While that is true, a number of important archival collections are in very accessible locales, some of which are proximate to major political science PhD granting institutions (and sometimes even on their campus): the National Archives in Washington, DC (American University, Georgetown, George Washington, University of Maryland); former Speaker Carl Albert’s papers and dozens of other collections are at the Albert Center at the University of Oklahoma in Norman; former Speaker Tip O’Neill’s papers are at Boston College (Harvard, MIT); a number of major collections are held by the University of Texas; and former House Minority Leader Gerald Ford’s papers are in Ann Arbor on the campus of the University of Michigan.<sup>2</sup> For many doctoral students, and even faculty, an important collection may entail little more than a walk across the quad. If distance alone were an explanation political science would have discovered and exploited archival data long ago.

---

<sup>1</sup> Further, many of the collections are in places that would hardly be described as tourist destinations. When distance is combined with a lackluster destination the likelihood of a trip decreases. We refer to this as the “comfort corollary” of the spatial theory.

<sup>2</sup> Ford was House Republican Leader before becoming vice president and then president. Ford’s papers include approximately 1,344,000 pages of documents from his years of service in the House.

Another explanation is the “disiplino-cultural theory:” historically-minded political scientists and historians use archives so there cannot be much of use in there to a political scientist. Many political scientists are quantitatively oriented; that is, they like to count things. This impulse, which we share with many of our colleagues, has caused many a political scientist to reach for the most *convenient* source of data (e.g., roll call votes, bill sponsorship, campaign spending data, and the like) rather than the most *appropriate* data for the question. Archives containing the papers of former members of Congress and the congressional records preserved by the National Archives Center for Legislative Archives are an underutilized source of data *appropriate* for *quantitative* studies that address important research puzzles in legislative studies and American politics.

Unfortunately political science tends to focus on what is easily observable and then call it “data” regardless of whether it addresses the process of interest. Archives provide a portal into process and thereby more useful data. Doug Harris’ account of the evolution of his research in this issue is a good example. Interested in the media strategies of House leaders his dissertation data were collected by counting leaders’ television appearances, something that is easily observable and countable. By turning to the archival record Harris has shown that leadership media strategies are not a contemporary phenomenon but extend back more than a quarter of a century; congressional leaders have used public opinion data on a regular basis for longer than the literature suggested. Archival data provide him with the basis to challenge simple actor-agent models of congressional leadership.

Whatever the reasons, it is clear to us the congressional archives are an underutilized but valuable resource for political scientists. We have become advocates of archival research, and offer the following five reasons (in no particular order) why you should

consider using the papers of former Members of Congress as part of your research strategy.

### **1. A visit to a congressional archive will inform your teaching**

Both of the authors are employed by teaching institutions, where expectations for teaching quality (and quantity!) are high. We have found that our research in the papers of former members of Congress has informed us as teachers as well as scholars, and each trip provides insight into the institution and the individuals who comprise it that goes well beyond our more narrow research focus.

Students often learn best from the tangible, and photocopies of documents provide illustrations of many concepts relating to the legislative institution. For example, while digging (literally) through the as yet unprocessed papers of Representative Bob Livingston (R-LA), we encountered several documents (including one’s from Ralph Reed and Ari Fleischer) proposing communications strategies for Livingston who was at the time the likely successor to House Speaker Newt Gingrich. The one page memo from Fleischer to Livingston provides students with an excellent example of the ideas behind message control that pervade contemporary politics. It is one thing to discuss the emphasis on message control and communications strategy; it is quite another when students see concrete evidence from individuals who are powerful actors in the contemporary political process.

The following paragraph from Fleischer’s memo to Livingston is a gem that conveys a great deal in a few words:<sup>3</sup>

The way to get a message out is to constantly repeat the mantra. In this case

- Education, locally controlled
- Tax cuts

---

<sup>3</sup> Memo from Ari Fleischer to Chairman Livingston & Mark Corallo, November 9, 1998. Livingston Papers, Tulane University, unprocessed. Emphasis in the original.

- A stronger Social Security system
- Economic growth
- Honesty and ethics in government

Literally, this is an eight-second sound bite. I recommend you repeat it *ad nauseum* [sic]; only when you're sick of saying it will anyone have heard it.

For years political scientists have sought to explain how politicians try to control the agenda through a carefully crafted, concise and frequently repeated message. This memo, from a future presidential press secretary to a man who nearly became Speaker of the House, captures the essence of political communication in a frank and unguarded memo that can be shared with students.

Other examples of documents found in congressional papers that can be used in the classroom abound. Students are often curious how members are placed on committees. Copies of letters requesting committee assignments are great ways to illustrate the multiple motivations that members have for pursuing committee assignments. Staff memos can be used to illustrate the important role played by staff as well as the influence of lobbyists and policy analysis in the legislative process; press releases are a great way to illustrate concepts such as credit claiming and position taking, actual pages of a marked up bill can be used when discussing the mark up process. While we can go on and on, the point is that every trip we make to an archive provides additional ideas and resources that can be applied in the classroom.

## **2. You will bring new data to a field that spends too much time looking for new ways to analyze tired old data and not enough time finding new and better data.**

In a previous article (Frisch and Kelly 2003), we used the imagery of a man searching for his keys under the streetlight instead of where he lost them to describe some of what we see in the political science literature. It is a

commonly used story to illustrate how research questions should drive data collection rather than data driving research questions.

As a profession, we seem to be focused more on new and more sophisticated ways to analyze data than we are on finding data appropriate to answer key questions. It seems that article after article published in the leading journals consisting of new ways to look at roll call data, campaign spending data, or NES data. Casual observation suggests that less effort is being placed on efforts to develop better data sets more specifically designed to answer the research questions that are being asked.

## **3. It is less likely that you will encounter faulty or selective memories or problems that confront interview research.**

Each data collection method has advantages and disadvantages. We advocate using multiple methods as a way to overcome the drawbacks of using a single methodology. In our research, for example, we frequently use interviews. Interviews are an extremely valuable method of inquiry in political science. We have conducted dozens of interviews over the years and are currently working on a project involving former Representative Joseph McDade (R-PA) that will rely very heavily on interviews with McDade and those who worked with him. As users of interviews we have come to see the limitations of interviews and see archival research as a way to improve upon the data gathered through personal interviews.

One problem that we frequently encounter with interviews, however, is that memories fade. Members of Congress are extremely busy, and the details of decisions made months if not years before become blurry. In addition members often have motivations to portray their actions in the best possible light, and sitting members may be unwilling to completely frank in any interview for fear that their statements will make their way into the popular media.

The archival record on the other hand, is not subject to this problem. Minutes of meetings typically provide a more accurate picture of what occurred than does a single member's account relayed long after the meeting. Recently we interviewed a member about his committee assignments. When we asked him about his request to be placed on the Budget Committee in the mid 1980s he did not recall that request. The archival record, however, includes significant evidence that the member did in fact request assignment to the Budget Committee. It is possible that he forgot; it is also possible that he did not want to provide the impression that he did not have the political "juice" to warrant an assignment to an important committee.

The argument has sometimes been made to us that the archival record has somehow been sanitized, and that the only documents available for researchers are those that are inoffensive, and of little value. We have found this argument to be wanting. Time and time again we are surprised (shocked) at the level of frankness that we find in the written record. We also know from our interviews that Members and staff are often unaware of the level of depth and sensitivity of the material that is archived. For example, a series of memos to former Senator Dennis DeConcini (D-AZ) from Patty Lynch (Legislative Assistant for Appropriations) is as frank as it is fascinating in the revelations about bureaucratic infighting, unwarranted requests from other Senators and other matters concerning the annual Treasury, Post Office and General Government Appropriations bills. The following excerpt captures the frankness of tone that is common throughout the memos:<sup>4</sup>

General theme: we are concerned that Treasury is not paying sufficient attention to its law enforcement bureaus. As a result, Treasury bureaus are treated as unwanted "stepchildren"

in law enforcement circles, and Justice, DOD, and ONDCP run rough shod over the bureaus...Treasury is never on the Hill, they have no visibility, and leave lobbying matters to the bureaus...Justice, on the other hand, is everywhere and FBI has a very active and effective legislative shop. They show up at our mark-ups and conferences and never miss an opportunity. They get in the door early and make deals before Treasury even knows an issue is on the radar screen...If Treasury wants to be taken seriously, this has got to change.

This series of memos is chock full of the quality of information that would be difficult to elicit in an interview, but sheds light on the interaction of Congress and the agencies of the bureaucracy. For virtually every archive we have visited, there are similar examples of frank and informative documentary evidence.

#### **4. The archival record demonstrates that members of Congress are interested in more than just getting reelected.**

There are no more influential words in the legislative studies field than the famous line from David Mayhew's *Congress: The Electoral Connection*: "For analytical purposes...congressmen will be treated...as if they were single-minded seekers of reelection." Less often quoted is the line that follows: "Whatever else they may seek will be given passing attention, but the analysis will center on the electoral connection" (Mayhew 1974, 17; emphasis added). Mayhew's influential book was a "thought experiment" that began with a theoretical assumption not a statement of fact; notice that he qualifies the famous words ("single-minded seeker of reelection") with two tiny words: as if. Mayhew was not stating that members of Congress are interested only in reelection, he was asking a theoretical question: What if members of Congress were only interested in reelection? How would they behave if that were their only interest? How would the institution develop if that were their

---

<sup>4</sup> Memorandum from Patty Lynch to Senator DeConcini, November 21, 1991. DeConcini papers, University of Arizona. Box 9.

only interest? Furthermore, Mayhew acknowledged in the next line that his assumption did some violence to the facts by further qualifying the assumption by admitting that members of Congress have other interests (whatever else they may seek...).

Many studies that have followed Mayhew's important work accepted the theoretical statement as a truism. We have taught it to our students as a truism; the public has accepted it as a truism. Mayhew himself would not be surprised to learn that the archival record demonstrates that members of Congress devote significant time and resources to activities that are aimed at goals other than reelection. Members and their staffs spend a great deal of time analyzing public policies without narrow constituency oriented benefits. This is apparent from looking through the boxes at virtually any congressional archive where there are file after file of studies, analyses and other information about the potential and real impacts of public policies. David Bonior's and Joe Moakley's papers (at Wayne State University and Suffolk University, respectively) reveal significant efforts -- both their own efforts and the efforts of their staff -- on Central American peace initiatives and human rights concerns. It is not clear how attention to an issue like this would promote their reelection; their white working class constituents did not "have a dog in that fight." In point of fact, Bonior received significant amounts of mail from constituents denouncing him as a "communist sympathizer" for contradicting the policies of President Ronald Reagan.

**5. You will find things beyond the scope of your research agenda that will help other scholars and provide future projects for you and or graduate students.**

One of the pure joys of archival research is the unexpected finds, and the materials that spark new research questions and directions. In David Barrett's essay he describes how, while working on a project in the papers of Richard Russell, he discovered material that launched

the research that has culminated in his most recent book. During an early trip to Tom Foley's papers we discovered a large series of whip counts from Foley's time as Democratic Whip; we tucked that information as a possible "next project" (only to discover later that Larry Evans had targeted those data for his own work!). Whip counts for leadership races are very common in the collections of members who sought leadership positions; they are also common in the papers of members who whipped on behalf of their own personal policy initiatives. In Bob Michel's papers we discovered several thousand paper ballots that identified the votes of individual members in the Republican Committee on Committees for individual committee nominees. These data allowed us to conduct an individual-level study of factional conflict within the committee selection process.

\*\*\*

Without question, there are significant barriers facing scholars who would use congressional archives, time and funding constraints chief among them. But the potential benefits of archival research are many. We return from our trips exhausted and glad to see our families again, but also more enthusiastic about our research and more knowledgeable about Congress. The archival experience enriches our teaching as much as it does our research. Researchers will find that potential stories that enliven classroom presentations, provide context, enhance one's credibility as an "authority" on Congress, and help to clarify otherwise abstract theoretical concepts to students abound in these archives.

Congressional archives provide significant new data with which congressional scholars can address significant puzzles in the literature. The archives that we have visited contain data that could significantly advance scholarly understanding of the roles, strategies, and success of party leaders in the House. For many years, this debate has suffered from a lack of high quality data appropriate for addressing theoretical conjecture about the influence of the House leadership (or the lack



thereof) in the policy process. Just because appropriate data are not readily available does not mean that you can't go out and find them! We contend that congressional archives are the perfect place to begin looking for the data that will influence the next generation of American politics research.

### **Bibliography**

Frisch, Scott A. and Sean Q Kelly. 2006. *Committee Assignment Politics in the U.S. House of Representatives*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Frisch, Scott A. and Sean Q Kelly. 2003. "Don't Have the Data? Make Them Up! Congressional Archives as Untapped Data Sources." *P.S.: Political Science and Politics* 36(2): 221-4.

Mayhew, David R. 1974. *Congress: The Electoral Connection*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

# Archival Collections and Research for Politics and Policy: It's a Movement

Rebecca Melvin Johnson  
*University of Delaware*

I am searching for a catchy title for this essay and thinking about how to communicate effectively the enthusiasm for research and other common interests that congressional archivists have with political scientists. I clearly want to say that I appreciate "The Widening Conversation," but I think I'll emphasize instead: "It's a Movement." "Conversation" conveys the notion that people and talk are involved. The "movement" tells you, more importantly, that we have direction and are taking action.

When Sean Kelly (Niagara University) e-mailed me in 2004 with an attachment of his and Scott Frisch's (California State University - Channel Islands) article about archival research in their discipline, he was seeking contact with the professional network of archivists in the Congressional Papers Roundtable (CPR), an interest group of the Society of American Archivists. The roundtable is composed of members of the Society and others who work with or have an interest in the papers of members of Congress and the records of Congress. Through meetings at the annual conference, newsletters and e-mail alerts, and special projects, the roundtable provides a forum for news, for discussion of issues and developments, and for setting standards and advocating action in the preservation and management of congressional papers and records.<sup>1</sup> It was my privilege to serve the Roundtable as chair in 2004 and to respond to Kelly's invitation to join a dialog about the research potential of congressional collections for political science. Outreach and service to

promote collection use are integral to our professional ethics. Unsuspecting Kelly and Frisch could not have known how delighted we were to hear from them; it was as if we had managed to sell the archival farm, lock and stock, without soliciting. I described Kelly's initial inquiry to the CPR steering committee as "the beginning of a beautiful friendship" and urged collaboration across professional organizations in planning programs, conferences, Web sources, workshops, publications, and communications.

In Boston, November 2004, three archivists participated in a panel at *your* roundtable at the Northeastern Political Science Association meeting. Kelly and Frisch convened and moderated the panel, "Congressional Archives as an Untapped Data Source." Archivists Beth Ann Bower (Joe Moakley Archives, Suffolk University), Jessica Kratz (Center for Legislative Archives), and I (University of Delaware Library) joined your colleagues: Douglas Harris (Loyola College, Maryland), Charles Stewart (MIT), and Julian Zelizer (Boston University). In the March 2005 CPR newsletter (available from <http://www.archivists.org/saagroups/cpr/>), I summarized some of the comments from the political scientists for my archival colleagues, so I'll redirect my thinking here and write for our esteemed researchers.

The opportunity to work with political scientists as new players in our expanding field reflects the growth of archival activities to build collections and promote their use. The roundtable was formed in 1984 to foster peer communication and support archivists confronted by the multi-faceted challenges of processing behemoth collections, as so many contemporary (post-1940) political papers may be called. All endeavors of the roundtable are enhanced greatly by the presence of three

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.archivists.org/saagroups/cpr/> The homepage of the Congressional Papers Roundtable provides contact information for leadership, access to newsletters, and links to roundtable projects such as the useful list of repositories granting research funds or the list of *Congressional Collections at Archival Repositories*.

Washington-based *ex-officio* steering committee members who work directly with congressional records and those sitting members of Congress who create the official records and personal papers. These three archivists are from the Center for Legislative Archives ( [CLA] National Archives and Records Administration), the Senate Historical Office (Secretary of the Senate, U.S. Senate), and the Office of History and Preservation (Office of the Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives). In addition to overseeing transfer of official records from each chamber to the CLA, the House and Senate archivists serve as liaisons between members of Congress and archivists at institutional repositories who seek to acquire personal papers of members. There is wide conversation amongst all these players.

There have been several milestones in the work of the roundtable, but especially notable is *The Documentation of Congress: Report of the Congressional Archivists Roundtable Task Force on Congressional Documentation* (S.Pub. 102-20 Senate Historical Office, 1992). Directed by Senate Archivist Karen Dawley Paul, the task force detailed an archival *documentation strategy*, a game plan for *collection development*. This pro-active approach is part of the engaging and enjoyable work that archivists do. Where are the primary sources? Who creates them? How will they be used? What is lacking? What else should we collect? What complementary collections document the range of actions and relationships shaping politics and policy? The opportunity to talk with you, the political scientists who might exploit these resources for new research data, is golden. If you care to follow our plans and our progress in efforts to document Congress and American political history, we welcome your comments and suggestions.

The Boston panel, for example, talked about unsupported collections that have “no home,” such as records of the Democratic Study Group, something for us to consider in terms of documentation strategies. Archivists care not only about what we have at our home

institutions, but where other sources go, or should go. I can imagine archivists and political scientists in a team huddle working on collecting strategies, compiling an ideal want list of collections to preserve. Political scientists can be persuasive partners, too, advising potential donors about the research merits of their papers or collections. The careers of some political scientists take them to staff positions where they have working insight into the research value of overlooked sources. Archivists are interested in the broad spectrum of political papers and policy sources, from individuals to organizations – elected officials, lobbyists, journalists, think tanks, party committees, and government offices. In addition to being able to share information about desirable sources, political scientists may have working relationships with these potential donors, and a special understanding of the finesse required to negotiate collection transfers with those in public and high-profile positions, sometimes known as “seats of power.” Archivists tactfully call this “the art of donor relations.”

The opportunity for like minds to meet, discuss, and dream is supported by the recently established Association of Centers for the Study of Congress (ACSC).<sup>2</sup> At the May 2005 annual meeting, Julian Zelizer (Boston University) chaired a session on congressional history, “The State of the Art,” reviewing trends, predicting new research directions, and generally attesting to the health of the field. Sarah Binder (George Washington University), Joanne Freeman (Yale University), and Paul Milazzo (Ohio University) described their own research, commenting on sources used, those not available, and challenges in getting to dispersed collections. Their comments on desire for detailed description about specific collection contents, rather than interest in access to digitized facsimiles via the Internet, endorsed the archival principles of preserving

---

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.congresscenters.org/> The homepage of the Association of Centers for Study of Congress provides mission information, a list of member institutions, and conference reports.

context and provenance. Archivists respect the traditional, onsite researchers who are willing to explore the depths of primary sources. It is a professional challenge to balance detailed descriptive work with the volume of material that must be described. To hear the call for specificity endorses the effort expended and gives archivists justification they can use with administrators who question staff allocations. Online finding aids and collection descriptions are now available for many archives, and CPR took an early lead in hosting a topically-focused, centralized list to online information about *Congressional Collections at Archival Repositories*.<sup>3</sup> The roundtable and ACSC should be challenged to exploit technology and explore future descriptive collaborations to facilitate centralized searching for primary sources related to congressional history.

Zelizer's session, affording the opportunity to hear from collection users, was the highlight of the May conference. Most of the attendees represent the individuals responsible for building collections to support the study of Congress and the legislative process, or those with programming, education, and outreach responsibilities at research centers. ACSC's interest in hearing from the researchers is so strong that one of the NEH funding ideas discussed in another session actually proposed sending a select group of historians and political scientists on a thinking retreat, with the assignment to compile a research agenda and collection wish list. It is to our benefit to solicit your input.

Whether through a retreat, conferences, or at a workshop, there are other methods to gather the researchers' reactions and suggestions concerning the source material that is available. *Documentation of Congress* (mentioned above) includes Appendix D: *Members' Papers Researcher Questionnaire* and *Legislative Archives Researcher Questionnaire* that were used for a brief period around the time of

the 1992 report. The idea of asking researchers to evaluate the archival sources used could be revisited and the questionnaires improved and expanded. The existing forms ask researchers to rate usefulness of certain record types found in congressional collections, and to describe briefly research topics. Political scientists and archivists may be able to work together to design a better survey and to form a new set of questions. Archivists routinely practice *appraisal* in large contemporary collections, i.e., they make retention decisions based on evaluating the long-term research value of selected material found in bulky collections. Some appraisal decisions are straightforward and without debate – duplicate reports, mailing envelopes, carbons, etc. Other practices are contested and handled variously by different archival repositories. For example, constituent correspondence in a twentieth-century congressional collection can be voluminous, redundant, and problematic for collection management. A repository housing twenty congressional collections might make “extreme” appraisal decisions, deciding to reduce significantly the bulk of (or even eliminate entirely) constituent correspondence series across all of its collections. Another institution with but one or two of these collections, might feel less challenged by the extent of these large series, and commit to keeping it all. Given the interest of political science in quantifying and analyzing data, what are your thoughts about the research value of certain record types? Is there need for comparative data across collections in one state, or several? Are there sampling strategies to apply? In a workshop or on a panel, could archivists and political scientists discuss appraisal criteria and research potential?

Kelly and Frisch wrote about research design and how to integrate archival sources in the search strategy. Archivists, by professional inclination, can be of great help here. As with any library research, we offer a reference interview to find out how we can help connect you with the information you seek. What is your project? Where have you looked and for

---

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.archives.gov/legislative/repository-collections/>  
The website is currently hosted by the Center for Legislative Archives, which brings greater national visibility to their role as a gateway to congressional research.

what sources? Are you aware of complementary collections? We may be – this is part of what we do. In the course of processing a congressional collection, archivists become aware of collegial relationships, committee peers, staff contributions, relations with journalists or other communicators, and the vast network of sources that may provide research leads. We are aware of new acquisitions at other repositories and processing projects currently underway. There are 215 members of the Congressional Papers Roundtable and many of us know each other by name if not in person. The archivists on the Hill and at the CLA are extremely well informed. Archivists enjoy feedback – we want to know what our researchers want and we benefit from their suggestions for acquisitions.

Particularly in the academic setting, remember that librarians and archivists can be peers and partners in research instruction. Integral to the research mission of universities are the rich primary sources collected and preserved in the institution's library. Librarians and archivists can work with faculty to design class projects, provide research orientation, and suggest sources available for student papers. The Association of Centers for the Study Congress is evidence of the essential outreach mission of many archives. The Association seeks to support scholars among the many other interest groups who care to study Congress, legislative process, and public policy.

In areas of documentation strategies and collection development, description, appraisal, and outreach, archivists welcome the opportunity to work with political scientists. Already established, there is a strong archival network with two decades of projects and initiatives to promote archival resources for the study of Congress, legislative history, and public policy. Welcome to the movement.

## Bibliography

Frisch, Scott A. and Sean Q. Kelly. 2003. "Don't Have the Data? Make Them Up! Congressional Archives as Untapped Data Sources." *P.S.: Political Science and Politics* 36 (2): 221-4.

# Political Papers, the Archivist and You

Linda Whitaker

*Arizona Historical Foundation*

Political papers are an acquired taste in the archives world. They pose many problems for the uninitiated - archivist and researcher alike. These collections come with high expectations from the donor, the university administration, and the user. Nationwide, many congressional collections languish unprocessed, hidden, and inaccessible. Many collections are donated to repositories that have neither the expertise nor the resources to support them long-term. Further, high profile political papers create their own politics - competition among the highest bidders, access restrictions, family feuds, and campus turf battles.

Despite the pitfalls, a number of hardy souls actually claim political papers as their specialty. There are over 200 archivists who belong to the Congressional Papers Roundtable.<sup>1</sup> This is an interest group within the Society of American Archivists. They have their own listserv, newsletter, yearly meetings, webpage, workshops and discussions. They share a passion for the material and nothing pleases them more when someone like you shows an interest in their collections.

Never has there been a greater need to make the business of government more transparent and accessible. Never has it been more daunting. What follows is an overview of how archivists critically think and talk about this material -even those who love it! There is a growing movement within the profession to change how we make these collections available. Timing has never been better for political scientists, specialty librarians and archivists to collaborate on what to collect, what to keep, how and where to promote collections, and how to connect with one another.

## Background

The archival literature relating to congressional collections seems to run in cycles - small clusters that re-emerge every 8-10 years. Most of it is driven by data supporting the notion that congressional papers pose an archival crisis. What is remarkable about this relatively small body of work is the call for fundamental changes in archival practice based on comprehensive studies and analyses of the nature of congressional papers. There are several recurring themes: How have these collections changed over time? What is the true value of this information? How can we control an avalanche of material without getting crushed under its weight? Can we process these collections without risking the entire budget or the repository mission?

The crisis is variously described as lack of space, funds, time, and personnel required to process, administer, and support the unprecedented bulk found in congressional collections. In 1984, Patricia Aronsson stated that members of Congress were accruing between 50 and 100 cubic feet of paper each year compared to their predecessors who accumulated that over an entire career. That figure nearly doubled by 1994. The average Senate collection now is 2500 linear feet (or 2500 record boxes) at the time of transfer. The time it takes to fully process a Senate collection currently ranges from 7-10 years. Processing costs have been estimated as high as \$200 per box. That may be conservative depending on the condition of the papers. Downstream expenses calculated for sustaining the collection in perpetuity are largely unknown. Post-processing costs should be factored in if an endowment is being sought.

Will electronic records solve the problem? Not soon. Technology is still evolving but permanence is elusive. In a post

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.archivists.org/saagroups/cpr/index.asp>

September 11<sup>th</sup> world where constituent mail is irradiated and permanently damaged, email is the communication method of choice to and among elected officials. Printing out electronically born documents is still being recommended by many archivists. Consider the archivist who is dealing with 8 million emails in the Clinton Library. Many are looking to him for management solutions.

Several factors contribute to what seems like an exponential growth in congressional papers since 1950: (1) Dramatic increases in constituent correspondence which account for over 50% of most collections, (2) A marked rise in legislative activity – upwards of 25,000 bills introduced in each two-year congressional session – and the fact that the Senate is in now session throughout the year, (3) A significant increase in the quantity, quality and specialization of staff as a result of the first two factors (Lucas 1978). If the elected official is particularly active, ran for President or is the center of controversy, the paper will multiply even faster. Political papers are held up as classic examples of excess in which the data “resembles the noise and distortions of a badly tuned television set” (Ham 1987).

Ham notes the impact political papers have had on backlogs, storage space, and processing costs. Archivists must look for method and meaning in the mess. He insists they think in unconventional ways and be prepared to act. The sheer bulk and redundancy of congressional collections have pushed some archivists and repositories to re-define their policies as well as practice. These are largely interventionist strategies that include pre-archival record inventories, budget impact analyses, de-bulking before transfer, access to unprocessed collections and in some cases, deciding not to accept them at all.

### **Political Papers as Hybrids**

Twentieth century congressional collections have evolved into a new breed of archival material. Everything about them challenges physical and intellectual control. This presents

a challenging conceptual framework for arrangement, description and general processing. Traditional formulas do not serve the archivist well for making congressional collections more useful. The message is clear. Archivists should not add to the chaos.

Congressional collections have characteristics of both public records and personal papers. Patricia Aronsson calls them hybrids, neither completely one nor the other. According to the “Basic Glossary” for the Society of American Archivists congressional papers fit both definitions. Personal papers are defined as “formed by or around an individual or family.” Records are the “cumulation of a corporate entity.” It is a mistake to process congressional collections strictly adhering to either methodology.

Many archivists treat congressional papers as personal papers and process them as they would manuscript collections. They examine collections at the item level, discard little, and re-folder most of the material. This mindset significantly contributes to cost and delays access. More importantly, it adds nothing towards the understanding or the value of the materials. When bulk is the largest prohibiting factor for use, the archivist must be ready to de-bulk, often on a grand scale.

A straight records management, one-size-fits all approach is no better. Each office revolves around a unique personality, the needs of a particular state, and the interests of the office holder. Files therefore will reflect a full range of activities and idiosyncrasies. Retention schedules like those listed in the *Records Management Handbook for United States Senators and Their Archival Repositories* work best if a senator’s office adopts all the management recommendations during the first term and stays with them. In an informal survey among archivists taking a congressional papers workshop in 2002, none of the collections they were working on reflected the filing recommendations made in this manual. That will change over time. Meanwhile, most

of the processed and unprocessed congressional papers reflect wide variations in arrangement and descriptions schemes. This results in highly variable finding aids.

### **The Utility Problem**

There is a growing perception that these collections have a limited shelf life for the serious researcher. Historians and archivists alike have suggested that their value may not justify the expense (Aronsson 1984; Greene 1994). In 1978 Lydia Lucas, processor of political papers at the Minnesota Historical Society and author of Chapter VIII in *Records Management Handbook for United States Senators and Their Archival Repositories* wrote the following:

It has now become a truism that modern congressional collections are massive, low in individual content value, filled with accumulated miscellany that have no direct connection with the member's own activities, and largely devoid of substantive insights into the internal workings of Congress...The communications which have suffered the most lamented decline have been the substantive and thoughtful personal letters and memos of the years when a member of Congress developed opinions and positions and articulated them to friends, colleagues, and constituents with minimal reliance on briefing papers, staff writers, telephones, news releases, and robo replies.

Gerald Ham calls this the death of intimate recorded communication. It is a pervasive phenomenon that results in missing data. Invariably, these records reveal little about the creator, his thought processes, or life style - the very elements that piqué both the serious researcher and the public.

Research use of congressional papers has been in a free fall for quite some time. This trend, noted 25 years ago when collections were significantly smaller, continues today. It

was then estimated that it would take 10 years to examine every document in an average size Senate collection (Aronsson 1984). Historians, biographers, and political scientists - perceived as the biggest users of these collections - cite other problems. Their sheer bulk makes it difficult to locate particular pieces of information for anyone with limited time and funding. Barely 20% of contemporary congressional collections are deemed of substantive research value (McKay 1978). It has been estimated that a single researcher, self-financed, would have to handle 2,000 case files to get a reliable probability sample. A dissertation or faculty research project with better funding would need upwards of 20,000 files.

According to Richard A. Baker, Senate Historian, former senators think that as much 80 or 90% of their materials is of marginal value. (It should be noted that donors rarely have a realistic appraisal of their papers.) What is significant here is that if the Senators or Congressmen undervalue their papers, they become careless or indifferent about where their collections land.

Historians increasingly seek secondary materials such as the *Congressional Record*, executive branch documents, and hearings reports or use oral histories because they yield faster results. Patricia Aronsson flatly states that the current condition of most congressional collections discourages research use. She insists that only by paring down these collections to their unique elements will archivists succeed in making them useful to researchers and manageable for archives. What will the user sacrifice to make this possible? Less description, more access to unprocessed collections, less physical arrangement? A survey was conducted recently asking archivists what they thought users would accept in exchange for quicker access. Results should be reported soon. Look for them on the SAA website.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> [www.archivists.org](http://www.archivists.org)



## **Search Strategies: How to Look, Where to Look, and What to Look For**

So what are these unique elements? Senate collections are generally divided into six basic series: Personal and Political, Administrative, Constituent Service, Legislative, Media Files, Artifacts and Memorabilia. There may be sub-series. Within series, the arrangement is usually alphabetical and chronologically within. Archivists think in formats (print, film, radio and TV spots, photos, scrapbooks etc.). This accounts for some of the series break down. Mostly, the series reflect the hybrid nature of these collections. Generally, artifacts and memorabilia rank dead last for processing and are kept to a minimum, often to the donor's chagrin. Constituent mail and issue mail are the bane of an archivist's existence. Often these are sampled and kept to a minimum due to their bulk and mind-numbing redundancy, sometimes to a political scientist's chagrin. Rarely is general correspondence arranged by subject.

Finding aids, both online and reading room printouts, should have scope and content notes describing the overall collection and individual series. Finding aids for political papers tend to be voluminous. (Mo Udall's is nearly 500 pages.) Container lists include box numbers and folder labels. Nothing is described at the item level. There is no substitute for a personal visit to a repository reading room. Why? Because you won't know what is in the folder until you look. Further, most repositories limit staff time devoted to searching for documents. No one knows what will work for your project better than you do.

Don't know where to search? "Google it." Click the "advanced search" link. Scroll down the bottom of the page to "government." Click it. Google now turns into the Stars and Stripes and connects you with every government department, repository, the Government Printing Office, census data and

---

much, much more. It will connect you to things you never knew existed.

Make friends with your Government Documents Librarian and your Political Science Librarian. Check out their web pages. It will save you a lot of time. Curiously, none of the 10 or so librarian web pages I checked out had links to their Special Collections departments or to any Congressional Collections. We need to change this.

Once you locate the repository that has the collection, check out the website. Check out the online finding aid if there is one. Don't be surprised if there isn't. Call or email the archivist or librarian, ask questions about the material, make an appointment to discuss your project. Make notes. Archivists want to know your overall themes and date ranges, what you've already researched, they want names, dates, and bill titles. They will decipher language. For example, earmark letters may be filed as "requests" or even under personal correspondence. They will know most of the quirky things about the collection and they will know gaps in the record. At the Arizona Historical Foundation, we pull as much material as we can in advance of your visit. We talk to you before, during and after your visit. Due to the nature of theses, dissertations, and books, we tend to maintain long-term relationships with researchers.

A word about unprocessed collections: Most of these have inventories or container lists. The boxes may be chaotic and the folders disorganized. The good news is that more and more repositories allow access to these collections. They may be kept offsite so allow for extra time for transfer to the reading room. They also invite browsing. Often, the archivist will ask you what you found and will make notes for future reference. Unprocessed collections present some citation problems because there may be no final box number or folder number or even manuscript number to cite.

Archivists use in-house databases, repositories, portals, listservs, and more often

than not, other archivists when they are trying to find something or trying to solve a particular problem. If you are looking for political film footage or TV ads, try the Annenberg Center

<http://www.annenbergpublicpolicycenter.org> or the American Museum of the Moving Image <http://www.movingimage.us/site/site.php>. We also recommend and use the following.

#### **Repositories of Primary Sources:**

<http://www.uidaho.edu/special-collections/Other.Repositories.html> Portal to archives in Western United States and Canada compiled by Terry Abraham, Head of Special Collections at the University of Idaho. The additional links connect to international and specialty archives. The most comprehensive list available. Frequently updated. See Terry Abraham's page for numerous scholarly publications.

#### **Arizona Archives Online:**

<http://aao.lib.asu.edu/index.html> The culmination of a three-year, statewide collaboration of the state's major universities. Lists over 400 finding aids to the special library collections of Arizona State University, University of Arizona, and Northern Arizona University. Excellent source for primary materials relating to Arizona history, literature, culture, and politics. Each finding aid is searchable and available for the first time on the web.

#### **Centers for the Study of Congress:**

<http://www.congresscenters.org/> Founded in 2003, this alliance of institutions and organizations promote the study of Congress and provide a forum for sharing information, ideas, and scholarship. Most members represent archives of political papers from the House and Senate or organizations dealing with public policy. Excellent portal to numerous sites related to Congress.

#### **Congressional Collections at Archival Institutions:**

<http://www.archives.gov/legislative/repository-collections/> A nicely organized portal to Congressional collections originally compiled by Rebecca Johnson Melvin at the University of Delaware now hosted on the NARA site. Includes a comprehensive list of the papers of former Senate and House members indexed by state, institution, and elected official. Very useful tool since congressional collections are scattered throughout the country. If you don't see former members of your Congressional delegation on the list and know where their collections are housed, contact Kate Mollan at [katherine.mollan@nara.gov](mailto:katherine.mollan@nara.gov). She'll add them to the list.

#### **Congressional Papers Roundtable:**

<http://www.archivists.org/saagroups/cpr/index.asp> Lively group of SAA members and other information professionals working with political papers. Congressional collections are known for their size and complexity. This group provides a forum for problem solving, sharing news and resources.

#### **Political Papers: A Practical Bibliography**

In addition to the sources cited in this essay readers may find some of these other sources useful as they wade into the world of archival research.

Abraham, Terry, Balzarini, Stephen E. and Frantilla, Anne. 1985. "What is Backlog is Prologue: A Measurement of Archival Processing." *The American Archivist*, 48(2): 31-42.

Abraham, Terry. *Practical Processing: Arrangement and Description*. <http://www.uidaho.edu/specialcollections/papers/arrange.htm>

Aronsson, Patricia. 1984. "Appraisal of Twentieth Century Congressional Collections." *Archival Choices*. Ed. Nancy Peace. Lexington MA: Lexington Books, 81-104, 1984.

- \_\_\_\_\_. 1981. "Congressional Records as Archival Sources." *Government Publication Review*, 8: 295-302.
- Baker, Richard A. 1978. "Managing Congressional Papers: A View of the Senate." *The American Archivist*, 41(3): 291-296.
- Chestnut, Paul I. 1985. "Appraising the Papers of State Legislators." *The American Archivist*, vol. 48, no 2 (Spring): 291-196.
- Daniels-Howell, Todd J. 1998. "Reappraisal of Congressional Records at the Minnesota Historical Society: A Case Study." *Archival Issues*, 23(1): 35-40.
- Davidson, Roger H, ed. 1991 *Understanding Congress: Research Perspectives*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Dowler, Lawrence. 1984. "Deaccessioning Collections: A New Perspective on a Continuing Controversy." In *Archival Choices: Managing the Historical Record in an Age of Abundance*. Ed. Nancy E. Peace, 117-132. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Fox, Michael. "Implementing Encoded Archival Description: An Overview of Administrative and Technical Considerations." *The American Archivist* 60 (Summer 1997): 330-343.
- Greene, Mark. 1994. Appraisal of Congressional Records at the Minnesota Historical Society: A Case Study." *Archival Issues*, 19: 31-43.
- Haller, Uli. 1987. "Variations in the Processing Rates on the Magnuson and Jackson Senatorial Papers." *The American Archivist*, 50(1): 100-109.
- Ham, Gerald. 1987. Archival Choices: Managing the Historical Record in an Age of Abundance: *The American Archivist*, 47: 11-22.
- Jackson, William J. 1997. "The 80/20 Archives: A Study of Use and Its Implications." *Archival Issues* vol. 22(2): 133-145.
- Linke, Erika C. 1997. "Digitizing Archival Papers. An Interview with Ed Galloway." *Library Administration and Management*, vol. 11 (Spring): 68-73.
- Lucas, Lydia. 1978. "Managing Congressional Papers: A Repository View." *The American Archivist*, 41(3): 275-280.
- McKay, Eleanor. 1978. "Random Sampling Techniques: A Method of Reducing Large, Homogeneous Series in Congressional Papers." *The American Archivist*, 41(3): 281-289.
- Meissner, Dennis. 1997. "First Things First: Reengineering Finding Aids for Implementation of EAD." *The American Archivist* 60 (Fall): 372-387.
- Moorehead, Joe. 1999. *Introduction to the United States Government Information Sources*, 6<sup>th</sup> ed. Englewood, CO: Libraries Unlimited, Inc..
- Paul, Karen Dawley. 1992. *The Documentation of Congress*. Report of the Congressional Archivists Roundtable Task Force on Congressional Documentation. S. Pub. 102-20.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1992. *Records Management Handbook for United States Senators and Their Archival Repositories*. S. Pub. 102-17, Prepared under the direction of Walter J. Stewart, Secretary of the Senate.
- Pemberton, J. Michael. 1996. U.S. Federal Committees and Commissions and the Emergence of Records Management." *Records Management Quarterly* 30 (April): 63-69.
- Phillips, Faye. 1996. *Congressional Papers Management*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Company.
- Ruth, Janice E. 1997. "Encoded Archival Description: A Structural Overview." *The American Archivist* 60 (Summer): 310-329.
- Severn, Jill Robin. 2001. "Adventures in the Third Dimension: Re-envisioning the Place of Artifacts in Archives." Unpublished. University of Georgia.
- Walters, Tyler O. 1995. "Thinking About Archival Preservation in the 90s and Beyond: Some Recent Publications and

Their Implications for Archivists." *The American Archivist* 58 (Fall): 476-493.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1996. "Contemporary Archival Appraisal Methods and Preservation Decision-Making." *The American Archivist* 59 (Summer): 322-338.

United States Congress. 2002. *Congressional Papers Forum: The Third Report of the Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress, August 29, 2001*. Washington, DC.

# The Records of Congress at the Center for Legislative Archives

Ida Brudnick

Jessica Kratz

*Center for Legislative Records*

*National Archives and Records Administration*

While leaving the National Archives one day after work, we heard a tourist remark that the building was awfully big to hold just a bunch of paper. This incident was prior to the opening of the new, 9,000 square-foot “Public Vaults” exhibit that explains the vast holdings and daily operations of this independent federal agency. We still, however, had to fight the urge to run after the visitor and describe in detail the overflowing stacks, always crowded research rooms, and numerous educational and scholarly publications based on our holdings.<sup>1</sup>

It is doubtful a political scientist, especially a member of the Legislative Studies Section, would share the misunderstanding of this passerby. Yet, many in the field may still wonder what is in the National Archives, and more importantly, how they can locate and utilize original Congressional documents to enhance their own research.

These questions have gained more weight in the past few years, as political scientists have developed a renewed interest in Congressional archival research. This has resulted in recent collaborations across disciplines as archivists have attempted to understand the research needs of political scientists and political scientists have explored the myriad the finding aids, access rules, and accession processes that influence their ability to gather appropriate data. The Center for Legislative Archives has joined this dialogue, participating in recent discussions at meetings of the Congressional Papers Roundtable of the Society of American Archivists<sup>2</sup> and the Northeast Political Science Association

Conference.<sup>3</sup> The Center also hosted the third annual meeting of the Association of Centers for the Study of Congress (ACSC), which has grown to include 42 institutions. The ACSC invited Sarah Binder of the Brookings Institution and the George Washington University and three Congressional historians to share their own experiences in conducting archival research in Congressional collections. The panelists were asked to suggest ways the archives could better serve them, and addressed topics including the need for more web-based finding aids. Additional events, including a short-course at this year’s meeting of the American Political Science Association, are planned to further address this issue.

## Who We Are

The Center for Legislative Archives maintains the official records of the United States House of Representatives and Senate. These records document the history of the legislative branch, beginning with the first Congress in 1789. While the House and Senate retain legal ownership of the records, the Center for Legislative Archives is responsible for preserving the records and making them available to the public. We are part of the National Archives and Records Administration, located in downtown Washington DC.

## What We Have

The Center for Legislative Archives maintains and makes publicly available the official records of the standing, special, select, and joint committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate; Legislative support agencies such as the Government

---

<sup>1</sup> [http://www.archives.gov/records\\_of\\_congress](http://www.archives.gov/records_of_congress)

<sup>2</sup> Society of American Archivists Annual Meeting, Congressional Papers Roundtable, August 2004, Boston, Massachusetts

---

<sup>3</sup> Northeast Political Science Association Annual Meeting, November 2004, Boston, Massachusetts.

Printing Office (GPO) and Government Accountability Office (GAO); and a series of special collections.

The most common types of records housed at the Center are bills, resolutions, committee papers, hearings, private claims, petitions and memorials, presidential messages to Congress, nomination files, and treaty files. The special collections include Congressional oral histories and research interviews, and approximately 2,600 original pen-and-ink drawings by political cartoonist Clifford K. Berryman. In addition, the 9/11 Commission, which closed on August 21, 2004, has transferred legal custody of its records to the Center for Legislative Archives. In accordance with the Federal Records Act, the Commission has established a general restriction from public access on these records until 2009.

### **What We Don't Have**

The Center for Legislative Archives maintains the official records of Congress. Personal papers of Members can be found at the Library of Congress and at numerous archival repositories throughout the United States. To find Members' personal papers, consult the *Guide to Research Collections of Former Members of the United States House of Representatives, 1789-1987* and the *Guide to Research Collections of Former United States Senators, 1789-1995*. On-line resources include the "research collection" section of the on-line biographical directory of the United States Congress, and *Congressional Collections at Archival Institutions* which is maintained by the Center for Legislative Archives.

### **History of the Records**

Before the creation of the National Archives most of the records of Congress were housed in offices, attics, basements, and storage rooms in the U.S. Capitol building. The records suffered from damage, neglect, and a number of abuses. Many early House records were lost when British troops burned the Capitol building during the War of 1812. Imprecise rules for preservation also contributed to the

loss of records. For example, prior to 1946, Senate rules did not clearly specify which committee documents should be included in the Senate's official files.

In 1936, shortly after the creation of the National Archives as the depository for federal records, the Archives staff began to investigate the records storage practices of the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House. Their findings revealed very poor storage conditions – records were stored on the floor in damp rooms where they were subject to mold and fungi, insect infestation, rodents, dust, exposure to extreme heat and cold, and were accessible for pilfering. The National Archives recommended that all but the most recent of Congressional records be transferred to the new Archives building in Washington DC. Subsequently, in April 1937, the Senate sent approximately 4,000 cubic feet of records to the National Archives.

The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 was the next step in preserving the records of Congress. It required committees to maintain a record of their proceedings, providing for the first time a continuous record of committee votes and hearings. The act also mandated that committee staff and personal staff had to remain separate, thereby reducing intermingling of personal and committee papers. Finally, the act gave the Secretary of the Senate greater authority over all Senate committee records and required the House to transfer all of its records for the first 76 Congresses (1789 – 1941) to the National Archives. The passage of the Federal Records Act of 1950 completed the legal structure that currently governs the records of Congress. This act authorized the Administrator of General Services (authority has since been transferred to the Archivist of the United States) to accept for deposit within the National Archives the official records of Congress that were determined to have sufficient intrinsic and historical value.



### Rules of Access

The House and Senate each determine the rules of access for their records and they are exempt from the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). Access to House records is governed under House Rule VII and is subject to the determination of the Clerk of the House. House Rule VII specifies that records not previously made available to the public by the House remain closed for thirty years. Exceptions to this rule include investigative records that contain personal information relating to a specific living person, personnel records, and records relating to hearings closed under clause 2(g)(2) of rule XI, all of which remain closed for fifty years. Senate records are governed under S. Res. 474 of the 96<sup>th</sup> Congress, which mandates that investigative files relating to individuals, personnel records, and records of executive nominations remain closed for fifty years. Most other Senate records are opened to the public after twenty years.

### Planning Your Visit

Researchers who are using Congressional records should first determine the appropriate chamber and committee. The records are arranged by Congress, so it is also necessary to know the Congress and bill number if applicable. Researchers may find this information by consulting the indexes and text to the *House Journal*, *Senate Journal*, *Annals of Congress*, *Register of Debates*, *Congressional Globe*, and *Congressional Record*. More than any other agency of the Federal Government, Congress publishes an extensive record of its activities. These publications are available in the Library of the National Archives and are also available in Government Depository Libraries located throughout the United States. The Legislative Branch section of [www.gpoaccess.gov](http://www.gpoaccess.gov) also includes number of useful resources.

The *US Serial Set* can also be a valuable tool for locating records held by the Center for Legislative Archives. The *Serial Set* and its precursor *American States Papers*, contain House and Senate documents and reports

dating back to 1789. The reports are usually from Congressional committees dealing with proposed legislation and issues under investigation. The documents include all other papers ordered printed by the House or Senate. Documents cover a wide variety of topics and may include reports of executive departments and independent organizations, reports of special investigations made for Congress, and annual reports of non-governmental organizations. Using citations found in the *Serial Set* researchers can often find unpublished original documents in the record of the House and Senate.

The House and Senate Guides, which are searchable online through the Center's homepage, offer descriptions of the types of records that may be found in each series. The Center also has a number of finding aids available in the reference room which may be useful for researchers trying to grasp the organization and scope of the collection. The Preliminary Inventories (PIs) of the House and Senate allow the researcher to examine the holdings by Congress and request the particular files codes related to a desired committee or administrative office. Some of the more detailed finding aids cover the House Un-American Activities Committee and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, as well as various special and select committees.

It is highly recommended that researchers contact the Center for Legislative Archives prior to visiting. Reference archivists at the Center are able to verify the existence and location of a record – a specific minute book, for example – and discuss any challenges in working with a particular collection. Most importantly, all records that are less than 50 years old require some screening to ensure that they do not contain any of the restrictions listed above. Notifying the Center for Legislative Archives well in advance of your visit helps to ensure that any screening is completed prior to your arrival.

# Teaching with Primary Source Materials: A Challenging, Yet Satisfying, Experience

Marian Matyn  
Central Michigan University

Teaching with primary source materials is something I often do at the Clarke Historical Library, at Central Michigan University (CMU), and at workshops I have conducted for teachers, librarians, and archives staff and volunteers in Michigan. Teaching with primary source materials is an aspect of my job that I really enjoy as it is challenging, and requires planning, experience, and knowledge in understanding the topic/s to be discussed and various issues related to those topic/s. I also need to know which primary and secondary sources on the topic/s that are available in the Clarke are interesting, legible, and document different life experiences and beliefs. The materials I present to the class as I teach are diverse enough to interest and appeal to a wide variety of students. I try to anticipate some of the questions the students or professors will ask, and I make the presentation as interesting as possible. My ultimate goal is to get the students hooked for life on history and using primary source materials.

The art of getting students hooked on history and using primary source materials is something that I learned how to do at my first professional job at the Chester County Archives in West Chester, Pennsylvania. At that time, 1988-1990, first and second graders were required to visit a historical library, archives, or museums annually. To keep their interest during the visit, the staff enlarged an early drawing of West Chester, coloring the river blue. When viewing the drawing, the students would recognize the river and some of the street names. Next, they heard a true story about a man who had a beloved pet cow, which the British stole from him, killed, made into steaks, and ate. This heartrending (and it is indeed heartrending) sworn testimony is in a

manuscript called "The British Deprivations Book," a copy of which is in the archives. The loss of the cow devastated the man. Upon hearing the story, some of the students got mad, while others cried. It made a huge impression. Afterwards, the students might not remember everything we told them, but they remembered that the story of the cow, and other cool stuff, is preserved in the archives. At some point in the future when they need to do some research, they will remember the archives. The lesson I learned is that you have to pick something that your audience will relate to and remember.

In my current work at CMU, I use a wide variety of primary and secondary sources to present Bibliographic Instruction sessions (BIs) to various classes at CMU. I display and discuss examples of the sources we have on various topics of interest to particular classes, as well as discussing various aspects of research using primary and secondary sources.

What I use for each BI session varies depending on the focus of the class and any special requests from the professors. Some of the professors know our collections well, while others do not. Some of the classes I regularly conduct BIs for include: Michigan History (English 638-Historical Editing/Transcription of Nineteenth-century Manuscripts), Indians of the Great Lake Region (History 496), Civil War (History 496), American Immigration Research (History 496), Women's History (History 326/ Women's Studies 328), Teaching Social Studies (Education 640), and Social Studies Methods in Elementary Education (Education 343). I also do BIs for children's literature courses and a class on the history of photography. Obviously, the topics and goals of these classes vary greatly. The classes are composed of either/or graduates and



undergraduates, with a wide variety of majors and interests. Students may take the class because they want to or are required to, or because they need a few credits to graduate.

My experience is that the majority of the members of any given class knows little, sometimes nothing, about the topic they will research, and also that few, if any of them, have conducted research using primary source materials before. Therefore, I try to keep my presentation simple, yet interesting, so they will not become afraid or intimidated before they really get into the research process. Throughout their research experience, the staff works very hard to be as helpful and approachable as possible.

Prior to each BI, I select what I think is an interesting variety of materials for the students to see, sort them by topics onto a couple of book carts, locate some interesting tidbits to read aloud, and plan what I want to say about the materials, creators of the manuscripts, and topics. Sometimes professors want certain items to be included in the BIs, and I always try to accommodate them. Generally, I walk around the Clarke reading room holding the materials, so the students may view them. This method works best for the larger classes.

Each bibliographic session begins with a brief introduction about the history of the Clarke, its founder, and our main areas of collecting: the history of Michigan and the Old Northwest Territories; children's literature; and the CMU Archives. I discuss how and why we have different user rules from the main academic library. The rules are special because if our material, a large part of which is unique and only available at the Clarke, is stolen, lost, or badly damaged, nobody can use the materials ever again. Also, I warn students that they will have to schedule time during the week when the Clarke is open to conduct their research and that they should begin their research as soon as possible. Waiting until the end of the term does not allow them enough time to conduct their research and write their

papers. Then, I show them some of the books I have selected. I begin with books because they have all seen books before and books are far less intimidating to the students than primary sources.

For example, for the American Immigration Research (History 496) class, I select about 30 or so secondary sources, mostly books, on different ethnic groups in Michigan, such as *Greeks in Michigan*, *The Dutch of Grand Rapids*, and "Dearborn Arab-Moslem community: a study of acculturation" (a thesis), and our website bibliographies on African-Americans and Michigan Native Americans (the Anishinabeg), to demonstrate that we document a wide variety of ethnic groups. Some of the books I simply leave on the book carts for the students to peruse after the class is over. For some books, I read what I think are a few particularly interesting citations and note some interesting photographs to whet the students' interest. The stories of immigrants who worked in Michigan for 10 years making \$1 a week so they could sail home and marry a neighbor girl and bring her back to Michigan usually keep their attention, as do the stories of women who had 15 children, half of whom died by the age of 5. These stories, so different from the lives that most of the students live today, really amaze the students.

After briefly reading titles of some of the rest of the books, I then show the students a few books about various religious groups. I do this because traditionally certain ethnic groups often belonged to a specific branch of Christianity or other religion. For example, a published parish history of St. Patrick's Church generally discusses early Catholic Irish settlers, while the centennial history of the Second Reformed Church is usually the story of Dutch Lutherans, who immigrated to Michigan to avoid religious persecution in the Netherlands. These books may include copies of parish records, biographies of early settlers and members, cemetery and committee records, and other information of value to the students,

such as a history of the area. Examples of books here might include *The Amish in Michigan*, centennial histories of different churches, and biographies of early church leaders or missionaries in Michigan. A few examples of published family or community anniversary histories usually complete this section. I always emphasize that the students should read the secondary sources critically and check for bibliographies and citations (signs of a quality, scholarly source) and indexes (which are simply helpful). Determining, if possible, why the book was written, who the intended audience was/is, the author's biases, and if the information is factual or not when compared to other sources, is valuable information for the students.

At the Clarke, we also have ethnic-language newspapers and periodicals, but most of our students cannot read the various languages. In the recent past, however, we have had some of the students bring in aged relatives and friends to help them translate non-English materials.

For general information, I show some examples of city and county histories, directories, and usually a county atlas. Then I explain that the students will likely use similar materials while researching their topic(s). I discuss the types of information these materials usually contain and how the information is organized. Most of the students have never seen these kinds of materials and are amazed that directories existed before there were phones. However, what they really enjoy are the advertisements for obsolete items like corsets and liver pills.

While I discuss the different ethnic groups, I usually show some examples of primary sources. We have a large number of primary sources (diaries, correspondence, family papers, business records, and scrapbooks) predominantly of Western European settlers who immigrated to Michigan, although increasingly of other ethnicities, as well as materials documenting

African Americans, Arab Americans, and the Anishinabeg.

Specific examples of primary sources I might share with the class include *African Americans in Adrian (Mich.) Scrapbook, 1869-1940*, and the *African Americans in Saginaw (Mich.) Scrapbook, 1913-1949* of Mrs. Ethel Barber. Mrs. Barber was a Saginaw (Mich.) African American woman, the wife of a minister, who was very involved with her church and became a nurse after WWII. These scrapbooks include newspaper articles about people, social and church events, photographs, church bulletins, WWII telegrams, correspondence, and v-mail and photographs of African-American soldiers and sailors. Mrs. Geesje Visscher's *Diary of Our Grandmother, 1869-1901*, which includes a transcription, tells of her sailing with Rev. Albertus van Raalte to the settlement that became Holland (Mich.), the deaths of three of her nine children, and the many hardships the religious community encountered. Other correspondence to family members in Michigan from California Gold Rush migrants and some family histories round out the primary sources I share with the students. If I use too many primary sources, the students may feel overwhelmed. I just try to show some examples and explain that there are many more in the Clarke's collections. I describe what I know about the life and major events experienced by the creator of each source, including birth, death, marriage dates, children, travel history, employment, and war service, if any, so the students understand that these were indeed individuals with joys, sorrows, and life experiences. I also talk about why they wrote their diaries or letters, or compiled their scrapbooks or family histories. Some wrote to document their church group traveling to the U.S. and to convince other like-minded believers to visit. Some documented their experiences as missionaries to the local tribes to better prepare other missionaries for their forthcoming experience. Mrs. Visscher wrote to explain to her descendants why her religious group moved to Holland (Mich.) and

to document the history of the first settlers in the area. Some creators wrote or compiled information because they felt what they were experiencing was a major historical event. Others wrote to convince people to migrate west to get rich or to move north to work in the logging camps.

When discussing manuscripts, I also take time to note the physical disintegration of the primary sources. Some of them have crumbling pages or are faded; some volumes have broken spines and loose pages. Sometimes objects (locks of hair, ribbons, really bad poetry, or newspaper clippings) fall out of volumes when I open them. I talk about how historical institutions try to preserve these unique, fragile objects and make them available to future researchers. I also remind the students to be gentle with the materials, particularly the primary source materials, and respect our rules for usage.

Later, when the students have determined their topics of interest and return to do more in-depth research, they will discover, to their shock, that some of the primary sources have not been translated into English. How inconvenient that is! The students soon discover that the “facts” in primary sources often do not agree with those in other primary or secondary sources. To understand this, the students need to engage or develop their higher-level critical-thinking skills. They cannot just accept something as fact; they must find other sources that support that fact or disprove it. This is a real challenge for many of the students who have been taught to accept what someone tells them or what they read in a book. During the initial BI, I mention that this might happen. I do not go into great detail because I do not want to scare them. As they delve deeper into their topics of research and become more interested, they begin to wonder why “facts” do not mesh from one source to another. That is usually the best time to talk about how they will have to extrapolate some data for themselves based on their research and write conclusions that have

not already been published by another writer. This is the point when the student gets to make history.

I hope that this brief essay is helpful to anyone who is or soon will be teaching BIs or classes using primary source materials. If you have questions, or if I can be of any help to you, please do not hesitate to contact me.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> marian.matyn@cmich.edu



## APSA Annual Meeting 2005 Washington, DC

### Short Course

## Using Archival Sources in Legislative Research: Choosing the Road Less Traveled

Legislative archives are rarely used in legislative research. Collections of individual members' papers and committee papers contain valuable *qualitative and quantitative* data but have largely been ignored by legislative scholars. These data have the potential to add descriptive detail to research, redress shortcomings in existing data, and generate new avenues of research. Given the potential wealth of data why have these data sources not been more fully exploited by scholars? One major reason is that political scientists generally receive little if any training in the use of archival resources. This short course is intended to provide an introduction to archival research with a focus on the linkage between research design and archival strategy, and getting the researcher ready for that first foray into archival research. We will also address the use of archival materials in undergraduate and graduate teaching

By the end of the short course participants should understand:

- Some of the ways that archival research can enhance political science research.
- The scope of the U.S. Serial Set and how to perform a basic search.
- The scope and structure of the collections administered by the CLA.
- The strengths and limitations of CLA collections.
- The scope and structure of personal papers of individual members of Congress.
- The strengths and limitations of member collections.
- How to work with archivists to enhance research productivity.
- The structure of a finding aid and how to use it to find materials.
- How to locate collections that may be salient for research or teaching purposes.
- How to work with folders and boxes to locate information.
- The limitations of archival research.
- How to locate potential funding sources to support research.
- How to use archival collections to enhance undergraduate and graduate teaching.

Participants will have an opportunity to consult with Short Course facilitators to explore how archival materials could be used in their current research. The Short Course will conclude with a "behind the scenes tour" of the National Archives.

#### Faculty:

David Barrett, Vanderbilt University  
John Berg, Suffolk University  
Larry Evans, William and Mary  
Scott Frisch, Cal. State Univ., Channel Islands  
Douglas Harris, Loyola University (MD)  
Sean Kelly, Niagara University

Richard Hunt, NARA  
Ida Brudnick, NARA  
Jessica Kratz, NARA  
Richard Baker, Senate Historian's Office  
Beth Bower, Suffolk University  
Ken Kato, House Historian's Office  
Rebecca Johnson Melvin, University of Delaware  
Linda Whitaker, Arizona State University

**Who Should Attend:** Legislative studies scholars interested in innovative data sources; those interested in improving their research by exploiting archival sources; those interested in expanding their knowledge of Congress to improve their teaching.

**When:** August 31, 2005 1:00PM-5:00PM  
**Where:** Center for Legislative Archives  
National Archives and Records Administration  
700 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20408  
**Contact:** To register contact Sean Kelly at [sqkelly@niagara.edu](mailto:sqkelly@niagara.edu)

Cosponsored by the APSA Legislative Studies Section, Congressional Papers Roundtable of the Society of American Archivists, and the National Archives and Records Administration