**The Presidential Library System: A Quiescent Policy Subsystem**

Lynn Scott Cochrane

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy
in
Public Administration and Policy

James F. Wolf, Chair
Elizabeth S. Aversa
John A. Rohr
Gary L. Wamsley
Orion F. White

December 14, 1998
Falls Church, Virginia

Keywords: Presidential Libraries, Policy Subsystems

The Presidential Library System: A Quiescent Policy Subsystem

Lynn Scott Cochrane

(ABSTRACT)

This study examines the Presidential Library System, an agency within the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA), as an example of a  policy subsystem. A policy subsystem may be defined as an informal political coalition of individuals from different parts of a formal policy structure who cooperate to influence policy-making. Actors in a policy subsystem are multifarious, they span both public and private sectors at various levels of government, and may include agency personnel, congressional committee members, interest group participants, citizens of localities affected by the subsystem, and others. A policy subsystem's strength lies in its ability to draw upon bureaucratic expertise, legislative leverage, and interest-group capacities to communicate with the government about the area of public policy it is vitally concerned with. Despite the 60 year existence of the Presidential Library System, its nationwide geographic distribution, and its approximately $30 million/year allocation from the federal  budget, it is not widely recognized as a policy system and it has not been the subject of a detailed, scholarly description.

The Presidential Libraries policy subsystem is described by tracing its development and mapping the richness of the administrative and political processes which support its continuing viability. The specific research questions addressed are:1) how do the administrative and political processes of this policy subsystem unfold, 2) how do these processes provide system maintenance, and 3) who are the players?

Qualitative research techniques, via a case study methodology, were used to address these questions.. In-depth interviews were conducted with the directors of  the ten Presidential Libraries, the staff of the Office of Presidential Libraries at NARA, and key stakeholders in the system. Questions addressed included: what do all of the presidential libraries share?, what is unique about each?, to what extent IS the Presidential Library System a policy subsystem?, and how is government organized to deal with presidential libraries and their mission of  1) preserving and providing researchers access to presidential papers and historical materials, and 2) providing museums and educational programming designed to give the general public a better understanding of  the individual Presidents, the institution of the Presidency, and the American political system as a whole?

Dedication

With profound gratitude and enduring love, this project is dedicated to

**Louis Isaac Middleman, Ph.D.**

without whom not…

Acknowledgments

The following gave of their time and expertise with generosity and grace. I could not have completed the work without them, and will be forever in their debt.

My colleagues at **Marymount University**, especially the staff of Library & Learning Services

My advisor-Dr. James F. Wolf.

David Alsobrook-George Bush Library
Elizabeth Aversa-The Catholic University of America
Michelle Cobb-Office of Presidential Libraries, NARA
John Constance-Congressional Liaison, NARA
Dennis Daellenbach-Ronald Reagan Library
George Elsey-former member of the Presidential Libraries Advisory Committee
John Fawcett-retired Director of the Office of Presidential Libraries
Sharon Fawcett-Office of Presidential Libraries
Sherrie Fletcher-Ronald Reagan Library
Bradley Gerratt-John F. Kennedy Library
Allan Goodrich-John F. Kennedy Library
Rosemary Green-Shenandoah University
Larry Hackman-Harry S. Truman Library
Joan Hoff-Contemporary History Institute, Ohio University
Dan Holt-Dwight D. Eisenhower Library
David Horrocks-Gerald Ford Library
Mark Hunt-Ronald Reagan Library
Will Johnson-John F. Kennedy Library
Jim Kratsas-Gerald Ford Museum and Library
Alan Lowe-Office of Presidential Libraries
Harry Middleton-Lyndon B. Johnson Library
Page Miller-National Coordinating Committee for the Promotion of History
Verne Newton-Franklin D. Roosevelt Library
Wendell Parks-Franklin D. Roosevelt Library
David Peterson-Office of Presidential Libraries
John A. Rohr-Virginia Tech
Richard Norton Smith-Gerald Ford Museum and Library
Donald Schewe-Jimmy Carter Library
Marilee Socia-Transcriber
John Stewart-John F. Kennedy Library
Ray Teichman-Franklin D. Roosevelt Library
Tim Walch-Herbert Hoover Library
Gary L. Wamsley-Virginia Tech
Leonard Weiss-Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs

Orion F. White

# Table of Contents

# Chapter 1 Introduction and Purpose

*Overview of the Dissertation*

This dissertation is designed to be a descriptive one in which I map the Presidential Library System and its processes using the policy subsystem concept from public administration theory as a framework. Policy subsystems, which will be discussed in detail in Chapter II, may be defined as "links among members of Congress, interest groups, program beneficiaries, and federal and subnational government agencies - that blanket the American political landscape." (Stein & Bickers, 1995, n.p.) I will answer the following questions:

- What do all of the presidential libraries share?

- What is unique about each?

- To what extent IS the Presidential Library System a policy subsystem?

- How is government organized to deal with presidential libraries and their two-fold mission of a) preserving and providing access to presidential archives and b) providing museums and educational programming about individual presidents?

This dissertation is presented in three parts in order to help the reader follow the progression of the research and findings. Part I includes two chapters which lay the groundwork for the detailed analysis to follow. Chapter One provides the introduction, setting and context of the Presidential Library System, including a review of the existing literature on the topic. The first chapter also presents the dissertation's objectives, the importance of the research, the literature gap being filled, its rationale, its theoretical grounding statement, its research expectations and propositions, and its limitations. Chapter Two presents the research methodology used in this study, including a review of the policy subsystems literature used as the theoretical framework for examining the Presidential Library System.

Part II contains Chapters Three, Four, and Five, which present detailed case studies of three representative presidential libraries. The Roosevelt, Ford, and Reagan Presidential Libraries were chosen because they cover the 60-year life span of the system, with Roosevelt being the first institution within the federal Presidential Library System, Ford representing the middle years, and Reagan the most recent library operational at the time the research was conducted in mid-1997. The George Bush Library opened late in 1997, too late to allow a visit during this research project. Each of the case study libraries is examined and described along four dimensions: the library's internal economy, internal polity, external economy, and external polity. This descriptive framework derives from the policy subsystems literature noted earlier.

Part III contains chapters Six and Seven. Chapter Six provides abbreviated descriptions of the Office of Presidential Libraries at the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) and the seven presidential libraries not addressed as case studies. Chapter Seven addresses three topics: the conclusions I derived about the Presidential Library System policy subsystem, issues

associated with the future of the Presidential Library System, and the utility of the policy subsystem model for conducting this study.

*Objectives and Importance of the Research*

My primary objective is to highlight the Presidential Library System as an important, but often overlooked, policy subsystem within the federal government. The ever-expanding Presidential Library System policy subsystem has a variety of constituencies and several distinct missions, which make it both interesting and vital to the preservation of the detailed records and documentary evidence of the presidency.

In the monetary terms used to describe the enormous federal budget, the Presidential Library System is a small program, which may help explain its relatively low visibility. Nevertheless, the Presidential Library System promotes what Robert N. Bellah and others have called America's "civil religion" by making two major contributions to American culture: timely availability of presidential papers, and public awareness of the institution of the presidency.

The United States of America is a young country with neither royal traditions nor centuries of government documents and collections of the personal papers of national leaders. Dr. John Rohr touches on this issue several times in To Run A Constitution. Rohr  quotes W.H. Auden's elegy to President John F. Kennedy, "the future of the past depends on us." In other words, if we allow the source documents of our history to disappear, then we are responsible for the poverty of our ability to study and learn from them. A few paragraphs later, Rohr(1986) asserts:

> For Americans… documents are not dispensable because…American foundings are characterized by 'mutual promise and common deliberation'; they rest on consensus and argument based on that consensus. The documents capture and crystallize, albeit imperfectly, the nature of the consensus and the outcome of the argument. (p. 178-179)

Rohr was undoubtedly thinking of documents such as the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights, but he was perhaps also referring to Madison's personal diary during the Constitutional Convention and President Richard Nixon's Daily Diary entry for July 20, 1969, when he held an "interplanetary conversation" by telephone with Neil Armstrong and Buzz (Ed) Aldrin shortly after the two astronauts landed on the moon.

The Presidential Library System represents a major effort made by our federal government to preserve and make available the types of documents Rohr refers to. Examples abound, from Franklin Roosevelt's World War II correspondence with Winston Churchill, Albert Einstein, and others to Ronald Reagan's files on the Grove City, Pennsylvania, civil rights case and the Three Mile Island nuclear power disaster. Before the Presidential Library System was established, access to presidential documents was haphazard at best and impossible at worst. Although critics of the

implementation details of the  Presidential Library System (e.g., regarding the need or desire for a decentralized operation with both museums and archives at each site) have existed since the 1930s and probably always will to some extent, their number and influence appear to have waned in recent years, especially in Congress. Even the critics admit that some method for collecting, organizing, and making presidential materials available is an absolute necessity.

In 1983, Benedict Zobrist, then Director of the Truman Library, stated in <u>Whistle Stop: Harry S. Truman Library Institute Newsletter,</u> "when we preserve [documents], we prove our commitment to the values on which our society has been built, and it is on the basis of these materials that posterity will make its judgment of our lives and times" (no page). The Presidential Libraries not only preserve important core documents of our nation's government, but they make the documents available and promote their use by scholars and the general public alike. The exhibits and educational programs at the libraries reach a broad audience, thereby promoting knowledge of how the government works, along with information about a given President and his era. This is an egalitarian, anti-elitist approach possible because the libraries are geographically dispersed, built at a human scale,  and unique to a given President.

Partially in response to critics of the Presidential Library System, then Archivist of the United States Don W. Wilson, said "presidential libraries are living institutions…less monuments to great men than classrooms of democracy" (1991, p. 773).   Similarly, James O'Neill argued in the <u>American Archivist,</u> "so long as men continue to honor their own and their fellows' achievements …monuments of one sort or another will continue to be built. What is significant is not that a presidential library is a monument but that it is a particular kind, and a particularly suitable kind, of monument" (1973, p. 347).

Prior to the establishment of the Presidential Library System, our society had no organized method for preserving presidential archives and making them available to the public. Over the 60-year history of the system there can be no doubt that awareness of individual Presidents, and more importantly, the presidency as an institution, has increased. The burdens and benefits of the office are being highlighted, along with the context of each President's tenure.

From a public administration perspective, the Presidential Library System provides an administrative solution to the disposition of presidential archives. As the results of this research will show, despite having evolved in an idiosyncratic way based on reasons of historic timing and Franklin Roosevelt's personality, today's Presidential Library System offers our society a way to "get the job done" with relatively high levels of efficiency and effectiveness, while promoting our larger obligation to enhance the public's knowledge of the presidency as a key institution in our constitutionally grounded federal republic. Despite the seemingly perennial controversy surrounding the disadvantages of decentralization for these archives, the system persists because it meets the goals of its many constituents and because the financial advantages of the private-public partnership for supporting the libraries are persuasive to decision-makers.

***Introduction: History and Functions of the Presidential Libraries, including a review of the literature on the topic***

It seems almost incredible that there was no major federal archival repository or systematic way of handling any of the federal government's archival collections until the National Archives itself was founded in 1934, when President Franklin D. Roosevelt undertook the agency's establishment as one of his many initiatives. Given the expanding size and scope of the federal government during the New Deal, establishment of the Archives was designed as one attempt to help bureaucrats who were trying to survive under the mountains of government documents being created by all the new agencies. Until 1985, when it became an independent agency known as the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA), the National Archives and Records Service (NARS) was part of the General Services Administration.

But during the first 150 years of our Republic, the preservation and management of all public records was generally neglected, including the papers of chief executives and their cabinets and White House staffs. When Presidents left the White House, they took with them their official documents as well as their personal collections. Many documents and artifacts found homes in state libraries, university libraries, state historical societies, and, most prominently, the Library of Congress. Beginning in 1834 and continuing for a century, the Library of Congress undertook major and minor purchases of presidential papers, $45,000 for Washington's and $65,000 for Madison's being among the largest expenditures. Fire destroyed the collections of several former presidents, including those of W.H. Harrison, John Tyler, and Zachary Taylor.

*How the Current System Developed: Privately Built, Publicly Maintained*

In 1914, the first presidential library - never a member of the current federal Presidential Library System - was completed by the State of Ohio as the Rutherford B. Hayes Memorial Library in Fremont. The library continues to be maintained jointly by the Rutherford B. Hayes-Lucy Webb Hayes Foundation and the state government. Similarly, the Hoover Library of War, Revolution, and Peace was established in 1919 on the campus of Stanford University to house documents related to Herbert Hoover's public service beginning in 1914. Subsequently, Hoover's presidential papers were housed at Stanford for more than 30 years, from the end of his term in 1933 until the Herbert Hoover Presidential Library was opened at his West Branch, Iowa, birthplace in 1964.

By 1937 President Roosevelt had adapted the Hayes and Hoover presidential library models to develop his concept of a privately built, but publicly maintained, presidential library (Wilson, 1991, p. 772). In 1939, the legislation chartering the Franklin D. Roosevelt Presidential Library was enacted (53 Stat. 1062), and the completed library became a federal government facility on July 4, 1940. Given today's timeframe for the development of presidential libraries, the FDR Library's establishment was remarkably swift. FDR was the only President to see completion of his library during his term of office. Several of his radio "fireside chats" were broadcast from there. President Harry Truman, aware that he was establishing the precedent for future Presidents,

followed Roosevelt's lead and created a Missouri corporation to establish his presidential library on the FDR model. Before the Truman Presidential Library was completed, Congress enacted the Presidential Libraries Act of 1955 (64 Stat. 583, 588), and President Eisenhower signed it into law. All subsequent federal presidential libraries trace their statutory authority to this legislation. Until passage of the Presidential Records Act in 1978, this 1955 legislation gave former Presidents the authority to designate which papers were to be considered "presidential," and they retained complete ownership and control over them after leaving office. The Presidential Library System progressed in a fairly routine and incremental manner under the 1955 legislation until 1974 and the demise of the Richard Nixon administration.

*Controversies: Watergate and Questions of Access*

In the wake of the Watergate scandals and President Nixon's resignation, his official papers and records were placed under federal custody by the Presidential Recordings and Materials Preservation Act of 1974 (88 Stat.1695). The legislation mandated that Nixon's materials remain in the Washington, DC, area under the supervision of the Archivist of the United States. The Nixon presidential materials are now housed in the National Archives facility in College Park, Maryland. The private library and museum that opened in 1990 at Nixon's birthplace in Yorba Linda, California, is not part of the Presidential Library System. Presently, the Yorba Linda museum contains Nixon's diaries and pre-presidential papers, and, unless Congress passes legislation to return custody of his presidential papers to Nixon's heirs, they will continue to reside in the Washington, DC area (Freidel, 1989, p.109). Given its unique and somewhat ambiguous status, the Nixon presidential materials and his library will not be directly addressed in this paper. Should the Nixon Library ever enter the system, it will be potential material for another dissertation, as it does, or does not, follow the patterns elucidated in the present study.

The 1974 law also established a temporary National Study Commission on Records and Documents of Federal Officials to examine "the control, disposition, and preservation of records and documents produced by or on behalf of Federal officials…" (Relyea, 1995, p. 7). The Commission's report resulted in the Presidential Records Act of 1978 (92 Stat. 2523), which defined what "presidential records" are and how they are to be preserved and made available to the public. The law also established public ownership of all Presidential records and materials created on or after January 20, 1981. President Ronald Reagan's papers were the first to be subject to the provisions of the 1978 law.

During the late 1970s, public and congressional discontent was mounting over the benefits bestowed upon former Presidents and their families. In addition to office support and secret service protection, one of the main concerns was the cost of maintaining and staffing the presidential libraries. As each new library joined the system, it tended to eclipse its predecessors in size and grandeur. The escalating cost of maintaining and staffing such facilities in perpetuity began to dawn on journalists and the general public, as well as lawmakers. After several years of Congressional investigations, the Presidential Libraries Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 495) was enacted. The new law placed fiscal limitations on future presidential libraries, architectural and design conditions, reporting requirements, and the establishment of operating endowments for "any President who takes the oath of office as President for the first time on or after January 20, 1985"

(100 Stat. 498). The George Bush Presidential Library is the first to be subject to all provisions of the 1986 reforms.

*Controversies: Access to Restricted and Classified Documents*

Researcher access to restricted and classified documents is another area of controversy that has cropped up periodically throughout the history of presidential libraries. Restricted documents are those with donor restrictions, such as opening the materials only upon the death of the principle parties, or opening the materials 50 years after the donation, or similar strictures. Classified documents are declared so by the originating government agency, usually for reasons of national security.

Illustrative of  library critics' current views are those of presidential historian Joan Hoff presented in an interview I conducted with her on December 4, 1997. Hoff asserted unequivocally that "Blum got privileged access at the FDR Library, Bob Ferrall got privileged access at the Truman Library, and the Kennedy Library is the worst. They have censored the oral histories and other documents. Nothing negative gets out of there." This type of assertion reaches all the way back to the beginning of the Presidential Library System. When I asked Hoff for her views about why presidential library directors and professional archivists would want to behave in such an unethical manner, Hoff replied "The directors sell out. It's that simple."

Despite the fact that one of FDR's missions in establishing his presidential library was to get his papers organized and available to researchers as quickly as possible, some inevitable delays regarding restricted and classified documents did arise almost from the beginning. Fear of delays in processing was one reason Roosevelt resisted depositing his papers at the Library of Congress, where there had been a history of such delays. Had he lived to see it,  FDR would have been pleased to know that some of his papers were opened as early as 1947 and that 85 percent were cleared by 1950. By comparison, most of Lincoln's papers took 80 years to be released. Nevertheless, some  of  FDR's papers, primarily in military and foreign affairs areas, were not cleared for researcher access for up to 20 years. Historian Charles Beard, an early supporter of the FDR Library, soon claimed that certain "Court Historians" had access to records that were closed to him. No evidence supported his claim, and as soon as it was made, the FDR Library director personally invited Beard to the library to peruse whatever materials were open to others. Unfortunately, Beard died before he could make the visit. (Freidel, 1989, p. 108)

In a similar incident, the American Historical Association (AHA) and the Organization of American Historians (OAH) launched an investigation of the FDR Library policies and procedures after a diplomatic historian said other researchers had seen correspondence he was not privy to. The AHA-OAH investigation concluded that the archival staff had failed to bring the correspondence to the attention of the historian, but that he had been denied nothing. In the wake of this finding, the FDR and other presidential libraries instituted new procedures for developing finding aids and other reference tools to direct all researchers to the materials they might be interested in (Freidel, 1989,  p. 108). More information on this controversy appears below in the literature review section.

Likewise, the John F. Kennedy Library has long been criticized for its refusal to release papers restricted by the Kennedy family. Prominent historians, including Stephen Ambrose, charge the family with trying to maintain a censorship role over the papers. For instance, when Ambrose tried to examine the Kennedy-Nixon correspondence during the time both men were members of Congress, he found the letters closed. Even more upsetting to some researchers is their belief that writers sympathetic to the Kennedys, such as Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., have been able to peruse materials that are off-limits to them.

The fact is that the archival materials at the Kennedy Library are a complicated mixture of collections, some given by deed-of-gift, others simply "on deposit" at the library but not owned by it. Because the gift of JFK's presidential records took place before the 1978 Presidential Records Act, the Kennedy family was allowed to place whatever restrictions on the materials they wished. Collateral materials given by deed-of-gift to the JFK Library are also subject to any restrictions placed by the donors. Materials "on deposit" at the library are under even less control by the custodial library than donated materials. In all cases, the Kennedy Library staff are legally, professionally, and ethically bound to abide by a donor's or depositor's wishes. William Johnson, chief archivist at the Kennedy Library, counters critics by asserting that the Kennedy family has placed "absolutely no pressure" on the library to influence the research carried out there, and he consistently reminds users of the library's obligation to fulfill its commitment to donors. Failure to do so would seriously jeopardize any hope of future donations.

*Controversies: Archival Processing and Declassification versus Public Programming*

Another complaint from scholars about the Kennedy Library involves the balance the institution strikes between archival processing and public programming. The Kennedy Library has been slower than its counterparts in processing archival materials, and critics charge that Kennedy family pressure to slow the release of documents has resulted in too much money being spent on public programs, like children's hours and forums on topics such as running for Congress or democracy in cyberspace, and too little on the hiring of archivists to process collections (Jaschik, 1990). In the case of the Kennedy Library, although it does spend a huge amount on such programs, they are supported by the Kennedy Library Foundation and by the Trust Fund generated from admissions fees at the Library, not by the federal funds that support the library's core operations, including archival processing. Therefore, staffers attribute the slower pace and less visible nature of archival processing to federal funding priorities, rather than to pressure from the Kennedy family or other financial backers.

Archival processing is a core function at all of the libraries and is funded from the National Archives and Records Administration's (NARA) portion of the federal budget. Archival processing is more complex than it appears to most researchers, because the processing is in some ways beyond the control of the libraries. As noted above, classified materials, usually defense or foreign policy-related, can be released only on the authority of the federal agency that classified them in the first place, except in tightly controlled circumstances outlined in the next paragraph. In most cases, if a researcher wants to see classified documents, archivists must send the documents to the originating agency in Washington for declassification. The process can be lengthy.

Recent developments have both improved and complicated the situation for presidential library archivists. Where federal records are concerned, and these constitute the majority of documents in NARA's holdings, NARA's headquarters and regional office-based archivists have always had limited declassification authority under tight criteria laid down by originating agencies such as the Department of State (see E.O. 12958, Section 3.3, paragraph c). These tightly defined categories of materials include those beyond a specified number of years old and documents such as trip itineraries for trips already concluded. This authority might be considered a ministerial function, because the archivists are not required to apply judgment, only follow guidelines developed by originating agencies. For many years, presidential library archivists did not have similar declassification authority, but it has now been extended to them.

Meanwhile, in 1995, President Clinton signed Executive Order #12958 mandating the declassification of all documents within 25 years of their origination. The order grew out of a lobbying effort mounted by professional historians and journalists dissatisfied with the pace of document releases. That 25-year deadline will force several presidential libraries to speed up their efforts to get documents open by reordering their priorities away from educational and public programming endeavors in favor of archival processing. NARA's existing Remote Archives Capture (RAC) project initiated some time ago with the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) to scan documents at the field sites and send them to the originating agency for declassification has been expanded to help respond to Clinton's Executive Order.

Nevertheless, despite these recurring complaints, many scholars praise presidential libraries for their "combination of choice historical materials and archivists with specialized knowledge" (Jaschik, 1990, p. A4). The Johnson Library at the University of Texas and the Eisenhower Library in Kansas are frequently praised for their openness and support of scholars. Likewise, some scholars appreciate the geographic dispersal of the libraries because the setting puts the writer in touch with the background and milieu of the person who became president. The evening of the George Bush Library dedication, November 6, 1997, historian Doris Kearns Goodwin said about presidential libraries on PBS's *News Hour with Jim Lehrer* "…they're wonderful places. I mean, to presidential historians they're like food and water…. So I am totally for them." On the same program, another presidential historian, Michael Beschloss, said, "I'm totally for them too, and if it takes a shrine for presidential libraries to be in good shape, I'm all for it." Nevertheless, on the same program, journalist and author Haynes Johnson, while admitting the great value of presidential materials being made available to researchers, also criticized the Presidential Libraries as "marble mausoleums, sort of celebrations of self, what used to be called the imperial presidency." Further discussion of the views of presidential library critics will appear in Chapter VI.

*The Presidential Library System Today*

Today, the Presidential Library System includes ten libraries and the Nixon Presidential Materials Project. President Bush's materials project became a full-fledged library and museum upon its recent dedication. Planning for President Clinton's presidential library began in 1993, and those plans will lead to creation of the Clinton Presidential Materials Project when he leaves

office. The project will remain in that status until President Clinton's proposed library in Little Rock is dedicated.

The Office of Presidential Libraries in NARA's DC area headquarters provides oversight, as well as administrative and technical support, for the geographically dispersed libraries. A variety of procedures and standards are implemented throughout the system under the guidance of the central office, including budgeting and personnel functions. With federal support, the libraries carry out their legally mandated core program of preserving, processing, and making their archival holdings available. While it is understood that *some* outreach activity is also appropriate under the federal mandate and with its funding, the extent of such efforts is always under discussion. It is clear that the major educational programs, symposia, changing exhibits, and other outreach activities are primarily the responsibility of the supporting foundations. (Wilson, 1991, p. 776) Given the variability in foundation support for the different libraries, their ability to carry out these "extra" functions and develop to their full potential differs significantly. "Enlightened self-interest [where] each partner promotes the other by pursuing its own aims" (Wilson, 1991, p. 777) is the oil that lubricates the system. Underwriting conferences and funding special exhibits allows a foundation associated with a presidential library to promote good citizenship and the public interest (as it defines the public interest), while contributing to the usefulness of the library. Likewise, funding research grants-in-aid allows a foundation to foster use of the archival collections and potential publications that illuminate *their* president or era.

*Presidential Libraries Are Not Exactly Libraries*

A final introductory note is that U.S. presidential libraries are not libraries in the traditional sense (i.e., providing circulating collections of books, journals in all formats, and access to various online database services). Rather, the presidential libraries are 1) archival repositories for the papers and historical materials of U.S. Presidents, and 2) museums focused on the individual President and his era. One might wonder how they came to be called libraries. Donald R. McCoy described the naming process in American Libraries (1976). Until December 17, 1938, what was to become the FDR Library was referred to as a "repository," as an "institution," and as "it." On that December day, a group of scholars called the "Executive Committee" met for the first time. The committee included Waldo Gifford Leland, executive secretary of the American Council of Learned Societies (chair); Robert D.W. Connor, Archivist of the United States; Samuel Eliot Morison, Harvard History Department; Helen Taft Manning, Dean of Bryn Mawr College and daughter of President William Howard Taft; Randolph G. Adams, William L. Clements Library Director at the University of Michigan; Stuart A. Rich, Central Statistical Board chair; and Charles E. Clark, Yale University Law School Dean. None of the previous appellations for FDR's facility seemed appropriate. Almost incidentally, Mr. Adams was the first to try out the term "library," undoubtedly because he was comfortable with it and because in the United States that term can refer to a depository with a great deal more than just books, for example personal manuscripts, photographs, films, and sound recordings. Mr. Adams also cited the example of "Mr. Hoover's Library" at Stanford University. After some wrangling, the committee decided to recommend the name "The Franklin D. Roosevelt Library" to the President. FDR countered with the "Hyde Park Library" but realized that would cause confusion with the town library near his

estate. He also jokingly suggested the "Crum Elbow Library," referring to the bend in the Hudson River near the Roosevelt home. Nevertheless, the decision was finally made to follow the committee's suggestion. (McCoy, 1976, p. 154-155)

*Two Primary Contributions of Presidential Libraries: Archival Preservation and Museums/Public Programming*

In the Roosevelt Library and all subsequent presidential libraries, materials are made available to researchers, while museums and programming for the general public attempt to promote a better understanding of the individual President, the institution of the Presidency, and the American political system in general. The libraries are designed to make two major contributions to American culture: timely availability of presidential papers, and the promotion of public awareness of the Presidency (Wilson, 1991, p. 773).

The Presidential Library System, a phrase codified in the enabling legislation as far back as 1955, is a uniquely American institution (Wilson, 1991, p. 771), and it is unique in American government. While it operates under the auspices of NARA, it encompasses eleven quite autonomous, independent, idiosyncratic, and geographically dispersed institutions. Although built with private money, they are maintained and staffed in perpetuity by the American people. Former presidents, their families, and supporters wield great influence over the libraries long after each president's term of office. The libraries serve dual functions as museums and archives, with the inevitable issues of complementarity that arise regarding the conflicting missions of serving the general public and scholars, while simultaneously protecting the materials for posterity and honoring donor restrictions on gift collections. There also appears to be an unspoken, informal obligation for the museum functions of the libraries to "protect" the reputation of the individual president and the presidency. (Relyea, 1995)

**Literature Review of Presidential Libraries as Portrayed in Popular and Professional Sources**

I have not identified any literature on the Presidential Library System as a policy subsystem, which is the focus of this paper. Indeed, even though the term "systematic" used in the 1955 enabling legislation signals the possibility of such a descriptive inquiry on the Presidential Library System as a policy subsystem, none has been conducted.

The following categories of discourse have been identified: professional journal articles and book chapters, official government documents, monographs primarily designed for tourists, and popular press articles and editorials. I surveyed this literature primarily as a source for background information and illumination of how professional staff associated with the system see themselves and their work.

Major themes in the literature on presidential libraries detailed below include the following. A) Most professional sources are narrative in nature and were written by archivists or scholars who use presidential libraries for their research. The articles or book chapters are presented from an applied or professional perspective, rather than a theoretical one. These sources define "how we are doing it good" or "how to use a presidential library effectively." B) Popular sources -- newspapers, magazines, news programs -- take note of presidential libraries when site selection instigates controversy, when a new library is dedicated, or when scandal arises about one

of principals associated with a library. C) Sources written by federal archivists tend to emphasize traditional public administration principles of providing archival collections and services "at the least expense" and with the "greatest benefits." D) Many sources trace the history of presidential archives, an individual presidential library, or the presidential libraries as a group. E) Historians and other scholars provide their professional opinions about the merits of the decentralized presidential library system, with a majority being either mildly or harshly critical of the system. F) Several sources highlight the constant and inevitable friction between scholars, who want all archives processed and available for research immediately upon deposit in a library, and archivists, who must process collections to insure their permanent preservation and proper description. G) Tourist information is provided by the few monographs on presidential libraries.

*Professional Journals and Book Chapters*

Numerous articles about the Presidential Library System and about individual libraries have appeared in the professional journals of various disciplines including history, political science, public administration and policy, law, archival studies, library science, museum studies, and presidential studies. One of the best overviews of the system, including a literature review of information about it, is Cynthia J. Wolff's "Necessary Monuments: The Making of the Presidential Library System" in Government Publications Review (1989). Government documents librarian Wolff also presents an even-handed analysis of the controversies surrounding the libraries. Most significant was the 1969 battle between Rice University historian Francis L. Loewenheim and the FDR Library, in which Loewenheim charged the Library with suppressing documents to him that had been made available to other researchers. These charges led to investigations by the American Historical Association, the Organization of American Historians, and a special House of Representatives committee. The investigations found plenty of blame to go around and some "administrative lapses," but expressed fundamental satisfaction that the presidential libraries are assisting researchers and others in a satisfactory and professional manner (Wolff, 1989, p. 52). President Lyndon Johnson's Library created a storm of controversy because of its immense size (at the time it was by far the largest of the libraries) and the deals Johnson struck with the State of Texas and the University of Texas to accomplish it. Most significant of all have been the ongoing battles over President Richard M. Nixon's archives. Wolff presents a concise summary of the controversies and legislation resulting from them, including the Presidential Recordings and Materials Preservation Act of 1974 and the Presidential Records Act of 1978. Her final paragraph concludes that the reforms implemented under the Presidential Libraries Act of 1986 have solidified the current arrangement for the Presidential Library System and that the idea of a central presidential archive is probably dead. Although Wolff acknowledges that the libraries will continue to be monuments to individual presidents, she concludes that each one is "a necessary monument to provide for the preservation of the historical record and to insure that presidential papers are available to scholars" (Wolff, 1989, p. 58).

More than a dozen relevant articles have appeared in The American Archivist. Among these are Buford Rowland's "The Papers of the Presidents" (1950), which outlines the disposition of all presidential papers from Washington through Franklin Roosevelt. "General Legislation for Presidential Libraries," by Elizabeth Hawthorn Buck (1955), carefully traces the development of

the Presidential Libraries Act of 1955, and, most significantly for this dissertation, highlighted the testimony of the Archivist of the United States who clearly enunciated fundamental mid-20th century public administration principles of expanding U.S. archival facilities "at the least expense" and with the "greatest benefits nationally" (Buck, 1955, p. 340).

Philip C. Brooks' "The Harry S. Truman Library-Plans and Reality" (1962) illuminates Presidents' wariness about succeeding administrations attempting to "exploit confidential matters for political purposes" (Brooks, 1962, p. 28) and about the need to protect confidentiality by placing presidential papers in government custody in a depository devoted to one president alone. Brooks also notes that President Truman never intervened in a personnel appointment nor in the use of the collections at the Truman library.

University of Missouri history professor Richard S. Kirkendall's "Presidential Libraries-One Researcher's Point of View" (1962) speaks favorably of the professionalism of the staff at the libraries, as well as the scholarly output evident from the libraries' sources. Kirkendall points out that geographic decentralization of manuscript collections is nothing new for researchers and notes that his own research would have required at least 18 of the 20 cities he visited, even if the presidential papers had been centralized in the Washington area. Nevertheless, four years later Kirkendall partially revised his opinion of the Truman Library and expressed disappointment with the lack of significant scholarship on Truman, especially in comparison with the output on Roosevelt. He also expressed frustration with the slow release of foreign policy documents, some of which were still held by former President Truman. Professor Kirkendall concludes the later article by expressing confidence that "the passage of time will solve many of the problems by removing restrictions upon access to existing materials and increasing the number of collections that supplement the Truman papers, thereby enabling scholarship to benefit more fully from the excellent facilities and staff of the Library" (Kirkendall, 1962, p. 386).

Richard Polenberg reviews the Final Report of the Joint AHA-OAH Ad Hoc Committee To Investigate the Charges Against the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library and Related Matters in "The Roosevelt Library Case: A Review Article" (1971). The Cornell professor of American history summarizes the controversy started by Professor Francis L. Loewentheim over access to the Dodd letters at the FDR Library. In an even-handed manner, Polenberg recounts the events of the late 1960s and the conclusions. Polenberg gave a clear explication of the almost inevitable friction between historians, who want everything open and available for review immediately, and archivists, who must preserve materials and honor donor restrictions or risk losing the materials altogether.

In 1973 James E. O'Neill, former director of the FDR Library, published "Will Success Spoil the Presidential Libraries?," in which, while acknowledging the criticisms and fallibility of the libraries, he asserts that the presidential libraries are admirably meeting their fourfold archival mission of preserving presidential papers, bringing them under public ownership and control, making them available in a timely manner to researchers, and providing for the storage and exhibition of presidential artifacts.

H.G. Jones' "Presidential Libraries: Is There a Case for a National Presidential Library?" (1975) while noting once again the perennial questions about centralization versus

decentralization of presidential archives and artifacts, emphasizes that the wrong question was being debated. Jones makes an extremely strong statement that the tradition of presidential papers being the personal property of each incumbent was "misfounded" when George Washington removed the records of the nation's first chief executive because there was no program to care for them and no professional group to call him on it, when the documents were in fact public property. Jones sounds the strongest possible call for new legislation or a statesman-like Executive Order declaring all such records public property. Given the timing of Jones' article so soon after the Nixon resignation and impoundment of his papers, the call to make presidential papers public property is understandable, but as history confirmed, only new legislation could accomplish the task. An Executive Order, statesmanlike or not, would probably have been ruled a "taking" of the personal property of future presidents.

Robert M. Warner's 1978 presidential address to the Society of American Archivists was published as "The Prologue is Past" in the Society's journal. From his perspective as Director of the Michigan Historical Collections, Warner recounts how the Ford Presidential Library developed in a unique fashion as an outgrowth of Watergate and resulted in separate Michigan locations for the archives in Ann Arbor and the museum in Grand Rapids. For a decade before he was appointed Vice President, Congressman Ford had been depositing his official papers at the Michigan Historical Collections on the campus of his alma mater, the University of Michigan. When he unexpectedly ascended to the Presidency in 1974, Ford decided to continue that practice with his Presidential papers. Nevertheless, his desire to have his Presidential artifacts preserved in his hometown of Grand Rapids influenced the decision to build a separate museum there. On December 17, 1976, President Ford signed an agreement with the Archivist of the United States and the President of the University of Michigan agreeing to locate his papers in Ann Arbor, locate the museum in Grand Rapids, deed the papers to the United States, and place the entire operation under the control of the National Archives. This was the first time a sitting President had given his presidential papers to the United States. Warner, who later became Archivist of the United States, concludes his article by acknowledging that presidential libraries are here to stay, but urges that they be professional establishments staffed by archivists who will provide objective, non-partisan service, free from political control. He also notes that the libraries must adapt to changes over the years as research interest in a given president fades.

In the summer of 1986, Martha J. Kumar published a "News Notes" overview in <u>Presidential Studies Quarterly</u> on the Presidential Libraries Act of 1986. Kumar reviewed the history of legislation on presidential libraries and explicates the six-year crusade led by Senator Lawton Chiles (D-FL) to reduce the government's costs for supporting former Presidents, especially their libraries. In the same journal in 1991, then Archivist of the United States, Don Wilson, published an overview of the development of presidential libraries. Starting with the private Rutherford B. Hayes Library, Wilson traces the libraries' history and contributions up to the 1990s. Wilson presents the widely accepted concept that all such libraries go through three phases during their "life cycle." First comes the creation of a permanent facility and relatively high visitation when the library is launched, next comes the phase of heavy archival processing workloads accompanied by a stabilization of visitation, and finally comes completion of the major archival processing coupled with aggressive outreach programs.

Chang C. Lee in a 1991 Journal of Library and Information Science article recommends the establishment of presidential libraries in Taiwan based on the U.S. model. In 1994, the Herald of Library Science (a periodical published in India) devoted an article to national libraries in specific countries and included a discussion of the history and role of presidential libraries in the U.S. The Roosevelt, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, Ford, Carter, and Reagan libraries are described, along with a brief explanation of the controversy surrounding the Nixon tapes and documents.

Government Information Quarterly in 1994 and again in 1995 devoted an entire issue to symposia on presidential libraries and materials. The 1994 topics include access to documents at the Ford Library, creation of an archive at the private Nixon Library and Birthplace, Harold Relyea's 1995 update of his earlier work for the Congressional Research Service on the Presidential Library System as a whole, computerization at the Carter Library, and an overview of the Reagan Library. The 1995 issue has articles on the birth of the Bush Library, looking to the future at the Roosevelt Library, the Truman Library's accomplishments and plans, the Kennedy Library's administration and funding, computerization at the Johnson Library, the relationship between sitting Presidents and NARA, the status of the Nixon Presidential Materials Staff, the Eisenhower Library in mid-life, and reinventing the Hoover Library.

Articles occasionally appear in peripheral journals such as "Using the Presidential Libraries" in Social Education (1984).

The Foundation Grants Index, published by the Foundation Center and available through Dialog Information Services as an online database, provides up-to-date information on grants made to Presidential Libraries. A March, 1996 search of this file covering the years between 1990 and 1996 revealed twelve donations to the George Bush Presidential Library, two to the Carter Library, eleven to the Hoover Library, and seven to the Reagan Library. Although this is obviously not an exhaustive list of donations to the Presidential Libraries, it is a good source for identifying major gifts. Gifts are also documented in the NARA Annual Reports. Some of the foundations affiliated with presidential libraries produce annual reports, but others do not, and the information provided is not comparable from one to another.

Two chapters in Edwards and Wayne's Studying the Presidency (1983) are on presidential libraries. In one chapter, Martha Kumar answers her own question in "Presidential Libraries: Gold Mine, Booby Trap, or Both?" by concluding that they are both. While acknowledging the problems with the libraries as research tools, such as the incomplete records, the unevenness of the material from library to library, the restrictions placed on some materials, and the weak oral history programs, she opines that "They offer the most complete portrait available of the presidents of the United States and those who surround them" (Kumar, 1983, p. 199). Further, Kumar found the libraries particularly useful for tracing policy development because the White House has become the center for both domestic and foreign policy initiation. Her last section on "Making the Most of the Libraries" provides a good lead into the following chapter by Larry Berman (1983), "Presidential Libraries: How Not to be a Stranger in a Strange Land." Berman provides an informative and directive researcher's guide to the seven presidential libraries in operation at the time. In the process, Berman helps researcher understand how the archivists do their work and the constraints upon them in making papers available, such as

document classification or donor restrictions. He also familiarizes readers with the special lingo of archival collections, for example, the distinction between "papers" and "files," and an overview of the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) process for requesting the release of restricted documents. Berman ends by offering practical, down-to-earth tips for "managing one's economy and one's life" when using presidential libraries.

*Monographs*

Several monographs of a popular nature have been published about the Presidential Library System. William G. Clotworthy's 1995 <u>Homes and Libraries of the Presidents: An Interpretive Guide</u> is designed for tourists, and portrays almost 100 presidential homes, libraries, and museums that are open to the public. The Presidential Library System sites are included. Similar in content to Clotworthy's book, but designed for a somewhat younger audience, is Rachel M. Kochmann's <u>Presidents: A Pictorial Guide to the Presidents' Birthplaces, Homes, and Burial Sites</u>, originally published in 1976 and revised through a ninth edition in 1993. Kochmann provides in a simple, graphically pleasing format details of each president, including his zodiac sign, ancestry, names and dates of close relatives, education, occupation before presidency, military service, occupation after presidency, cause of death, and other information; followed by photographs and descriptions of presidential birthplaces, homes, and the presidential libraries of the nine most recent Presidents. Pat Hyland's <u>Presidential Libraries and Museums: An Illustrated Guide</u>, also published in 1995, is a visitor's guidebook specifically devoted to the institutions in the Presidential Library System, with the addition of the Rutherford B. Hayes Museum and Library in Ohio.

To date I have not located any scholarly or professional monographs on the Presidential Library System. The closest such source is Frank L. Schick's <u>Records of the Presidency: Presidential Papers and Libraries from Washington to Reagan</u> (1989). At more than 300 pages, it is a lengthy and comprehensive guide to the contents of all known presidential archives and bibliographic references to them. It lists record groups for the collections and is arranged by the type of agency of deposit (i.e., the Library of Congress Manuscript Division, historical societies and special libraries, and presidential libraries administered by the National Archives). Nevertheless, it does not deal with the Presidential Library System per se, but with the archival collections and their disposition.

*Popular Press*

Articles about presidential libraries appear regularly in the popular press, especially when a new library site is being selected or when a new facility is dedicated. The libraries have been a frequent target of editorials and feature stories in such publications as the <u>NY Times</u>, the <u>Washington Post</u>, the <u>Chicago Tribune</u>, the <u>Wall Street Journal</u>, the <u>Chronicle of Higher Education</u>, and <u>Forbes</u>.

Typical was Thomas Foley's <u>U.S. News and World Report</u> article May 2, 1983, titled "The 'Imperial' Life of Our Former Presidents," which documented Senator Lawton Chiles' (D-FL) criticisms of the costs of government support of retired Presidents, especially their libraries.

Similarly, on November 11, 1991, upon the dedication of the Ronald Reagan Presidential Library, the same magazine published "All the Truth That's Fit to Tint." Author Miriam Horn repeated charges that various presidential libraries have restricted access to presidential materials and asserted that "Without exception, these museums offer versions of history that fall far short of objectivity" (Horn, 1991, p. 36). Malcolm S. Forbes, Jr. in his eponymous magazine published a1993 editorial highlighting a movement in Congress and NARA to eliminate separate presidential libraries by centralizing the records. A commentary in a 1992 issue of the Chronicle of Higher Education by Alonzo Hamby asked the question, "Do Presidential Libraries Facilitate or Hinder the Study of Politics?" Over the years Scott Jaschik has written a series of articles in the same newspaper, which report the praise and the complaints raised by scholarly users of presidential libraries. A good example is his 1990 article, "Long a Mainstay for Studies on American Politics, Presidential Libraries Draw Praise, Complaints," which drew a rebuttal from William Johnson (1990) titled "The Kennedy Library Does Not Seek to Restrict Research."

Many publications, including newspapers and magazines such as The Economist, devoted space to the controversy surrounding President George Bush's 1993 appointment of former U.S. Archivist Don Wilson to head the new Bush Foundation. In his capacity as Archivist, Wilson had signed an agreement with Bush granting the President exclusive control over potentially damaging electronic material from the White House files. A restraining order subsequently prevented the suppression of the files, and Wilson left the Bush Library, again sparking reportage in the popular press. Wilson's successor was David Alsobrook, a career public servant, who had previously worked at the Carter Library. Alsobrook was Acting Director, then Director of the George Bush Materials Project (now Library) throughout the construction of the College Station, Texas, facilities, and he continues in that role. Wilson meanwhile has become head of the George Bush Library Foundation. This story illustrates the networking and complex relationships that exist within the presidential library arena. This complexity and its meaning will become more obvious as the case studies and concluding chapters of the dissertation unfold.

As always, the dedication of a new library, in this case the George Bush Presidential Library and Museum, prompted numerous features in the press and on television. Throughout the week of November 6, 1997, when the Bush Library was dedicated, the library and its sister institutions were highlighted. The evening of the dedication, PBS's "Jim Lehrer News Hour" devoted a full segment to the Presidential Library System. Guests included presidential scholars and commentators Doris Kearns Goodwin, Michael Beschloss, and Haynes Johnson, who debated the merits of the current system versus a centralized facility for all presidential archives. The lively interchange illustrated in capsule form the key controversies surrounding the library system. Similarly, in addition to Sam Verhovek's November 7 New York Times story on the Bush Library dedication, the same day the paper published William Homan's story on the Presidential Library System titled "11 Ridiculed but Rewarding Institutions." Quoting such presidential scholars as Doris Kearns Goodwin, Arthur M. Schlesinger, and Stephen Ambrose, Honan concluded that "although the presidential libraries have been mocked as ego trips for former presidents…most scholars who have used them agree that they are an enormously valuable resource for academicians, students, authors, and the general public." Nevertheless, Ambrose, while praising the Eisenhower Library as "a scholar's dream," once again raised the perennial charge that the

Kennedy Library is "notorious for protecting Kennedy." <u>USA Today</u>'s November 4 feature by Richard Benedetto, titled "Bush Hopes Library Will Catalog His Successes," included a sidebar with brief highlights of the eleven libraries. Like Honan, Benedetto made no distinction between the strictly private libraries of Rutherford B. Hayes and Richard Nixon and the public institutions of the Presidential Library System.

The literature reviewed in this section provided the documentation for Chapter I's description of the Presidential Library System's development over the past 60 years. In addition, the sources provide details on each library highlighted in the individual case study chapters (III, IV, and V) and the Presidential Library System policy subsystem and conclusions chapters (VI and VII). This literature lead me to and allowed me to explore the relationships between the libraries and their networks, i.e., NARA, their local communities, their foundation partners, their professional communities, and others.

*Legislative History - Hearings/Official Documents*

Listed below are the statutory authorities for and the major Congressional hearings about the Presidential Library System, with summaries immediately following. They are presented in chronological order to illustrate the development of the system over the past 40 years.

1. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Government Operations. (1955, June 13). To provide for the acceptance and maintenance of presidential libraries, and for other purposes. Hearings before a Special Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations on House Joint Resolution 330, House Joint Resolution 331, and House Joint Resolution 332, Bills to Provide for the Acceptance and Maintenance of Presidential Libraries, and for other purposes. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

House Joint Resolutions 330, 331, and 332, 84th Congress, 1st session proposed to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (44 U.S.C. sec. 397) to authorize the Administrator to accept for deposit papers and historical materials of any President or former President of the United States or any other official of the Government "subject to restrictions agreeable to the Administrator as to their use," and documents, including motion-picture films, still photos, and sound recordings from private sources that are appropriate for preservation by the Government as evidence of its organization, functions, policies, decisions, procedures, and transactions.

Second, the Administrator is authorized to accept title to any land, buildings, and equipment offered as a gift to the United States for the purposes of creating a presidential archival depository and to maintain and protect them as part of the national archives system. Further, the Administrator is directed to deposit in the depository any papers, documents, or other historical materials accepted under appropriate authority. Cooperation with any university, institution of higher learning, institute, foundation, or other organization or qualified individual to conduct study or research in the depositories is mandated. Reasonable fees for exhibit visits are expressly

authorized, as is acceptance of gifts or bequests of money or property in support of the depositories.

The first speaker to appear at the hearing was the Congressman Edward H. Rees (R-KS) of Kansas' 4th Congressional district. He started by noting his particular interest in the proposed legislation because it would include the Dwight D. Eisenhower Presidential Library planned for Abilene, which is located in Mr. Rees's district. The Congressman included in his testimony a statement by the president of the Eisenhower Foundation, Mr. Sam R. Heller. Heller's statement emphasized the opportunities the Eisenhower Library would offer Midwesterners, including the stimulation of study and research, serving the needs of midwest universities and colleges, education for the general public in "matters of Government," promotion of better citizenship, and enhancement of the overall cultural life of the people of the area. Committee Chair, Senator McCormack (D-MA) , questioned Mr. Rees about who would pay to build these libraries, and was assured that they would be built at no cost to the Government. Mr. Jonas (R-NC) asked whether the plan was to continue building presidential libraries around the country wherever appropriate for each future president. When the response was yes, Mr. Jonas speculated whether it is a good idea to have the papers scattered about the country, and whether it might not be better to consolidate them in the nation's capital. Mr. McCormack noted that the resolutions call for the integration of the presidential papers into the national recordkeeping system despite their geographic dispersal. Mr. Jonas pressed the point  by invoking the inconvenience to scholars of having to travel around from library to library. Mr. Rees pointed out that the papers in question are the property of the President, and each one has the right to decide where his papers reside. Mr. Jonas seemed mollified, and agreed that there is some advantage to having the libraries convenient to people "who live in places removed from Washington" (p. 54).

The statement of Joseph W. Martin (R-MA), Minority Leader, noted the bi-partisan nature of the support for the legislation and presented the rosy scenario about the projected costs for the Presidential Library System over the next 100 years. Speaking on behalf of the Eisenhower administration, Mr. Martin summarized his position:

> As I understand, this legislation will permit the Government to take advantage of the generous motives of a President's associates and friends whose interest in a memorial provide us with the expensive physical facilities and equipment for an archival depository at no cost to the Nation's taxpayers. There could be no better memorial, no more lasting tribute, than a living institution dedicated to research and to the preservation in impartial hands of the documentary source materials of our Nation's history. (p. 55)

Again noting that presidential papers are the private property of each President, Martin nevertheless pointed out the public's interest in these archives and their preservation. The Federal Government is obligated to "develop systematic means for their preservation consistent with our constitutional form of government, and our tradition," and the proposed system will keep "all the materials in official custody, under the supervision of professional archivists, and assure that the integrity of the documents as evidence will not be impaired" (p. 56).

The Administrator of the General Services Administration declared himself "wholly in favor" of the proposed legislation and highlighted the fact that there is nothing mandatory in the proposal. Each President can decide whether he wants a presidential library and, if so, where it should be located. The legislation simply provides a "vehicle by which the President is assured the integrity of his papers, their proper and orderly arrangement, and their eventual availability to the people as the historical record of his administration" (p. 57).

Wayne C. Grover, Archivist of the United States, was grilled by Mr. Jonas about the annual operating costs for the presidential libraries. The experiences of the FDR Library were used to illustrate potential costs for the others. Dr. Grover speculated that professional scholars would go wherever necessary to use the materials they needed for their research, but the advantage of having these institutions throughout the country would be to make them available to school children and others in the localities who do not have the opportunity to travel far from home. When Mr. Jonas again raised the question of consolidating the papers for the convenience of scholars, Mr. Mansure of the General Services Administration re-emphasized that the presidential papers are the private property of the President and his heirs, and that the government cannot mandate the disposition of the papers. Given that fact, the proposed system has the advantage of bringing some control over these records, where otherwise none exists. This point prompted Mr. Jonas to inquire about the transfer of title to the presidential papers, which was left vague in the proposed legislation. The transfer of title to the physical facilities was spelled out, but title to the documents was not. The Archivist of the United States, Dr. Grover, assured the chair, Mr. McCormack, that the final draft of the legislation would have sufficient authority and flexibility for the Archivist to "carry out the purposes to the maximum extent possible" (p. 66). Grover was very concerned that the language of the law provide enough flexibility for the Archivist to negotiate with a number of potential donors to deposit their papers or artifacts at a presidential library with the hope of a future transfer of title. Requiring the transfer of title might prevent some potentially advantageous arrangements involving something less than complete transfer of title.

The prepared statement of Dr. Grover followed. He outlined the history of the disposition of presidential papers before presidential libraries existed (including the government's purchase of prominent collections of former presidents at considerable sums), the increasing proliferation of presidential papers since the 1930s, which made it impossible for an individual President to manage this resource after his retirement, and the advantages of a decentralized system of presidential libraries. On the decentralization issue in particular, Grover said:

> In all candor, Mr. Chairman, I should say that I have heard some arguments against Presidential libraries. They are made by persons inclined to favor the concentration of Presidential papers in a single depository. I am convinced myself, however, that overcentralization - the endless piling up in one or two large cities on the eastern seaboard of ever greater quantities of papers, books, and other cultural materials - is shortsighted public policy. (p. 73)

Given the fact that either a central presidential archive or a decentralized system of semi-autonomous presidential libraries would come under the authority of the Archivist of the United States, one can speculate that Dr. Grover had no reason to favor one arrangement over the other. Grover summarized the chief points of the day's discussion and noted the principal benefits of the proposed legislation as follows:

1. It provides a system for the preservation and use of Presidential papers that accords with our Constitution and traditions;

2. It enables the Government to acquire, as gifts, expensive archival depositories and equipment that can be used not only for Presidential papers, but also for the preservation of valuable Federal records accumulated outside of Washington;

3. By establishing important collections of manuscript sources in other parts of the Nation than the Capital, thereby giving local scholars easier access to them, it will stimulate interest in our history and Government; and

4. It takes into account the growing need for the dispersion of research facilities resulting from the existence of nuclear weapons. (p. 75)

He concluded that "The establishment of Presidential libraries is the best method that has as yet been devised for properly preserving Presidential papers" (p. 74).

Detailed information on the FDR Library followed, including a list of 51 published works and 40 Ph.D. theses based in whole or in part on research in the library and statistics showing museum visitorship and research use of the papers. This report took pains to note that the list of published works included viewpoints both favorable and unfavorable to FDR. The Resume of Presidential papers charted disposition of each President's papers from George Washington through FDR. Some of these presidential papers are concentrated in one location, but most are scattered in various institutions having some tie to the particular president. For example, Thomas Jefferson's papers are found in seven locations from Massachusetts to California. The Archivist's remarks concluded after more grilling by Mr. Jonas.

Letters in support of the proposed legislation from the Bureau of the Budget and the Comptroller General were introduced into the record. Likewise the statement of David D. Lloyd, Executive Director, Harry S. Truman Library, Inc., acknowledged the rapidly developing Truman Library in Independence, Missouri, and supported the proposed legislation, encouraging Congress to codify the "now widely accepted" Presidential Library System. An article reprinted from The American Archivist (1955), "The Harry S. Truman Library" by Mr. Lloyd, was entered into the record. It detailed the advantages of having a former president's papers in a location convenient to him and all the other benefits Truman and his supporters saw in creating the facility

in Independence. Further, this article was prescient in its anticipation of a problem, the separation of official documents from those of a personal or political character, which would become a "showstopper" with the Richard Nixon papers 25 years later.

Columbia University historian, Henry Steele Commanger's prepared statement in support of the proposed legislation followed. Perhaps his most cogent argument noted that centralization is a moot point, because the papers belong to each President to dispose of as he sees fit. (This argument would be rendered ineffective 20 years later with the passage of the Presidential Records Act of 1978.) Boyd C. Shafer, Executive Secretary of the American Historical Association also submitted written testimony in favor of the legislation. These statements were followed by similar ones submitted by the Chancellor of the University of Kansas and the President of the University of Missouri (both states in which construction of Presidential Libraries was already well underway).

Floor debates from the Congressional Record followed, along with the Senate (No. 1189, July 28, 1955) and House Reports (No. 998, June 29, 1955).

2. Presidential Libraries Act of 1955 (44 U.S.C. 2112)

Today's Presidential Library System still operates on the foundation laid in the 1955 enabling legislation, which authorizes the Archivist of the United States to:

*Accept papers and historical materials by and about Presidents

*Accept land, buildings, and equipment offered for the establishment of presidential libraries
*Maintain, operate, and protect the libraries and their holdings
*Observe mutually agreeable donor restrictions on access to the documents and historical materials in presidential libraries

*Provide for the public exhibit of museum items.

In addition, when the library administrator considers it to be in the public interest, he may charge reasonable fees for exhibit visits and for use of museum space for community events. Gifts, bequests of money, or income from the sale of historical materials, museum gifts, photocopying services, etc. are to be deposited into the National Archives Trust Fund and designated for the benefit of the library originally receiving the income.

Hearings held before passage of the 1955 act had provided the ultimate rosy scenario regarding the future costs of the system. It was projected that by 2055, the annual net operating cost would be $1.5 million total for the 15 libraries they believed would comprise the system by that time. Experts also proposed that about one-third of these costs could be offset by receipts from museum visits. As we will see below, both projections were wildly inaccurate.

3. Presidential Recordings and Materials Preservation Act of 1974 (44 U.S.C. 2107 note).

This act, applying only to Richard M. Nixon's presidential materials, authorized the Administrator of General Services to "take complete custody and control of the Nixon Presidential historical materials," to store them within the Washington, DC metropolitan area, to release "the materials relating to abuses of governmental power" at the earliest reasonable date, and to provide eventually public access to all of the materials of general historical interest.

4. Congress, House of Representatives, Committee on Government Operations, Presidential Records Act of 1978: Hearings before a Subcommittee of the Committee, 95th Congress, 2nd session, 1978.

See summary of number 5, below.

5. Presidential Records Act of 1978 (44 U.S.C. 2201-2207).

One of the major issues surrounding the Watergate hearings and President Richard Nixon's resignation in 1974 was the impoundment of his official White House papers and audio tapes. At that time a President's official papers and other archival materials were still considered his private property. Long court battles were fought between the former President and the federal government over the disposition of his papers, with the government eventually being declared the winner. Early on Congress had passed specific legislation for the Nixon papers authorizing the Administrator of General Services (the parent agency of the National Archives at that time) to take complete custody and control of the former President's historical materials - The Presidential Recordings and Materials Preservation Act of 1974.

Subsequently, Congress enacted the Presidential Records Act of 1978 to establish ownership of future presidential records. As of January 20, 1981, all presidential records are owned by the United States, not by the President. The Archivist of the U.S. is instructed to take custody of the records immediately after the President leaves office. The records are to be maintained in a federal depository (either a presidential library, unless a President chooses not to establish such a facility, or a federal records center). The 1978 act allows the President to restrict access to specific kinds of information for clearly enunciated periods of time. Vice-Presidential records were directly addressed for the first time in this act, which declares them to be U.S. property as well, to be placed in an existing federal depository or in a non-federal depository approved by the Archivist.

The terms "Presidential records" and "personal records" are defined in this part of the U.S. Code, Title 44 Section 2201, albeit somewhat imprecisely. Presidential records are those of the President or his advisors or staff throughout the Executive Office of the President that "relate to or have an effect upon the carrying out of the constitutional, statutory, or other official or

ceremonial duties of the President." Included are materials related to the political activities of these individuals if such activities have an effect upon carrying out the constitutional, statutory, or ceremonial duties of the President. Personal records are those of a purely private or nonpublic character not related to the activities listed above. Materials related exclusively to the President's own election to the office of the Presidency or other individuals' elections to local, state, or federal office are considered personal as well, but only so long as they have no relation to carrying out constitutional, statutory, or other official duties of the President.

Subsequent Sections 2202 and 2203 define ownership of the records and the obligation of the President to assure that his administration is fully recorded, documented, and the records preserved for posterity. Discard of such documents is to be done in consultation with the Archivist of the United States and in turn with Congress.

Section 2204 allows a President to restrict access to his Presidential records for up to 12 years if they fall into specified categories such as national defense, foreign policy, appointments to federal office, trade secrets, commercial or financial information received under privileged circumstances, confidential communications between a President and his advisors, personnel and medical files, and so on. Appeal procedures for those denied access to materials are specified.

Section 2205 provides exceptions to restricted access for NARA archivists, for materials subpoenaed, and for Congress for materials normally under their jurisdiction. Section 2206 provides regulations for advance public notice of records disposal and notice to the former President when restricted materials are to be opened. Section 2207 provides the same provisions for vice-presidential records as those for presidential records; the vice president's duties are the same as the president's regarding his records.

The clear budget implication of this legislation arises from the expanded scope and volume of the government's responsibilities to preserve, maintain, and make accessible in perpetuity so many historical materials.


6. U.S. Congress. Senate. Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government, Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Civil Service and General Services, Committee on Governmental Affairs. (1979, November 6). Oversight-cost of former presidents. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 297 p.


Senator Lawton Chiles (D-FL) chaired three days of hearings on government expenditures for former Presidents, their wives, and widows. Chiles operated in his capacity as Chair of the Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government of the Committee on Appropriations. He was joined by Sen. David Pryor, (D-AR) Chair of the substantive oversight committee, the Subcommittee on Civil Service and General Services, Committee on Governmental Affairs.

The precipitating cause for the hearings was the escalation of overall spending on presidential libraries, office allowances, and Secret Service protection between 1955 ($63,745)

and 1980 ($18,250,869). The first day's hearings concentrated on presidential libraries, which account for the vast majority of the costs for maintaining former Presidents. Sen. Chiles asserted that the "program was established to preserve the papers of former Presidents for scholarly research. We now learn that less than 1 percent of the people who visit these libraries do so for scholarly research" (p. 4). Chiles was troubled by the grossly inaccurate estimates for the long range costs of presidential libraries projected in the 1955 legislation which established the program. Whereas original estimates were $375,000 per year to maintain a presidential library, by 1980 the actual costs had quadrupled to approximately $1.6 million per year. In a similar vein, Sen. Pryor stated, "I think that we do have a very serious problem, Mr. Chairman, with the rapid growth of expenses and with an almost seeming unquenchable thirst for money at the time a President and a family leaves the White House."

Senator Schmitt (R-NM) ranking Republican on the Appropriations Subcommittee of Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government, cautioned those present to remember that former presidents are a national resource, as well as an expense, and as such "we must be willing to provide adequately for them in the exercise of those duties" (p. 7). He specifically cited the decades-long work of former President Hoover on behalf of relief activities throughout a war-ravaged world and Hoover's invaluable studies for and about the U.S. government itself.

The first witness called to speak at the hearing was Donald Eirich, Associate Director, Logistics and Communications Hearings of the General Accounting Office. Mr. Eirich provided a brief history of the Presidential Library System and outlined what had occurred since passage of the 1955 act. In addition to normal inflation, the number of libraries built far exceeded the number projected in the original legislation; the income from fees that was originally projected to defray at least one-third of the operating expenses of the libraries was actually bringing in only 10% of the cost of staffing and maintaining the facilities; and finally the libraries kept getting physically larger. The Roosevelt Library originally had only 39,000 square feet, but by the time the Johnson Library came along it covered 100,000 square feet.

The ambiguous relationship between the National Archives and the National Park Service in managing and funding some presidential homes that accompany presidential libraries was mentioned, along with the fact that the American public seems much more interested in the museum functions of the libraries than in their archival functions. This assertion was justified by citing the 1,100 research visits to the libraries compared with the 1.3 million museum visits in fiscal year 1978.

Eirich explicated a National Archives report, "The Presidential Libraries System: A Review," submitted to the Senate Appropriations Committee earlier in 1979. Five alternative approaches to the current Presidential Library System were presented, the first three coming from the Archives report and the last two added by the General Accounting Office. First was a central depository for all Presidential records, which would have the advantage of reduced operating and administrative costs but the distinct disadvantage of the government's having to fund the facility because private groups would not be motivated to give to such a generic institution. Additional disadvantages of option one were less geographic access for most Americans, the potential catastrophe of losing all presidential archives in case of fire or other disaster, and the potential

unwillingness of collateral donors to give their papers or oral history interviews to a generic library.

Option two was to build designated regional archival centers to house the papers of several presidents with ties to that geographic area. The advantages and disadvantages enumerated were the essentially the same as for option one.

Option three was to curtail or eliminate the museum functions of the presidential libraries. Despite savings on staff and building size, the Archives' report concluded that public support would wane to the extent that the federal government would have to absorb the full cost of library construction and that the fees and contributions currently generated by the institutions would disappear.

Option four was to centralize the storage, preservation, and processing of presidential papers and provide them to the public for a "reasonable cost" via microform or computerized technologies. The obvious advantage to this option is the elimination of funding numerous libraries. The idea was that localities that wished to build presidential museums with private money could obtain microform copies of presidential papers at low cost. The major disadvantage was the likelihood that presidents would donate their personal papers to other institutions instead of the National Archives. Start-up costs for a centralized technologically-sophisticated facility were projected to be quite high.

The fifth option offered decentralized libraries, perhaps with university affiliations, and a centralized museum. This option was not explicated in detail, and appeared to have some of the same advantages and disadvantages as options one through four.

 The Archives report concluded "that no alternative to the current Presidential libraries system appears to offer a superior method for providing effective archival care of Presidential records and assuring their full use and availability to a broad cross section of the American public." The report acknowledged that although all future presidents are likely to have libraries built in their names, there are sufficient safeguards in place to protect the public interest. In the unlikely event the public loses interest in supporting such institutions, there will not be enough private money forthcoming to build the libraries in the first place. In addition, every library must secure Congressional approval for its initial construction plans and for ongoing funding for staff and building maintenance. A call for the General Services Administration (GSA) to develop building design and efficiency standards presaged the actions eventually taken in the 1986 Presidential Libraries Act. Likewise, the Archives report suggested that as the Presidential Library System grows, it will need "strong Central direction to guarantee consistent operations" (p. 21). Attached to the report were Appendix A listing "Selected Recent Presidential Library Conferences and Symposia" and Appendix B listing "Notable Books Based on Presidential Library Holdings," with a notation of the awards each book has received.

Finally, Mr. Eirich noted that if economy considerations were the only factor in evaluating the Presidential Library System, costs could be significantly curtailed by reducing or eliminating the museum functions and by instituting a centralized archival depository; nevertheless, there are "value judgments involved - in service to the public and other factors" (p. 13).

Senator Chiles next questioned Mr. Eirich regarding the addition of space to existing libraries at federal expense. Charts for each library were shown to illustrate their original cost, expansions since opening, reference services, researchers/visits, and museum visitors. Chiles emphasized that one of the original reasons for creating the dispersed libraries was the fact that each President could put his papers wherever he wished, but the situation had changed dramatically with the passage of the Presidential Records Act in 1978, which declared the official papers of presidents public property. The constant theme of cost escalations in the current system was hammered home. The Ford Library and Museum were cited as an egregious example of proliferation and excessive expense because they encompassed two facilities 130 miles apart. Senators Pryor (D-AR) and Schmitt (R-NM) weighed in with quite a bit of sarcasm about the "loose" criteria for document retention. Office space for former presidents at the libraries was the next target of concern. Schmitt suggested establishing a cap on each former President's operating funds for museums and archives (p. 131).

Senator Chiles called on John Broderick, Assistant Librarian of Congress for Research Services, to describe that Library's presidential collections. Twenty-three former Presidents' papers have been donated to or purchased by the federal government over the years, and in 1903 the nineteenth-century collections were transferred from the Department of State to the Library of Congress (LC). In 1957, Congress authorized the microfilming of these presidential papers (Public Law 85-147); the project was completed in 1976 with at least one copy of the collection available in 49 of the 50 states and in a number of countries abroad. The Library of Congress also makes the microfilms available on interlibrary loan to researchers around the country. Mr. Broderick respectfully answered Senator Chiles' questions about users' satisfaction with the service his library provides and the cost of LC's activities in support of the presidential papers.

General Services Administrator Admiral Rowland Freeman spoke in his capacity as supervisor of the National Archives and Records Service (NARS), which fell under his agency's jurisdiction until 1985. Admiral Freeman emphasized his agency's efficiency in operating the Presidential Library System, noting that there had been no increases in their operating budgets for the past four years. He outlined several possible cost-saving options such as reducing the museum component of the libraries and eliminating acquisition of the personal papers of each President. The basic alternatives he offered were to centralize the presidential archives, to combine functions, or to limit the size and scale of each library. And then he said "we will have to do all three" (p. 145). The projected cost of establishing a Washington-area central facility to accommodate six presidential libraries was estimated to be $222.5 million, versus $280.5 million for six individual libraries. Federal construction standards were next outlined, and Admiral Freeman offered his opinion that this was the most advantageous option available for bringing more efficiency to the system.

Senator Chiles again charged that since only 1% of visitors to the Presidential Libraries are researchers, program development at the libraries over the years had clearly been inconsistent with the legislative intent of the 1955 law under which the system was established. Chiles questioned the fact that title to the Johnson and Ford Libraries had not been turned over to the Federal Government, both of them having been built as part of state-supported universities.

Admiral Freeman cautioned Senator Chiles that his criticisms of the visitorship was perhaps neglecting the extent of research correspondence each library handles, as well as the educational function played by the museum and conference roles of the facilities. He also reminded the Senator that the expansion of government in general, and presidential papers in particular, made analogies to LC's presidential papers inappropriate.

Senator Pryor then engaged Admiral Freeman in a long discussion about the disposition of President Nixon's papers and the legal entanglements surrounding them.

Near the end of this lengthy Congressional document we have the following exchange between Senator Chiles and Admiral Freeman. The Senator asked Admiral Freeman, "Is there a bikini-clad statue of Raquel Welch in the Lyndon Baines Johnson Library?" (p. 158). To which Admiral Freeman responded that the item in question was part of a Smithsonian Institution traveling exhibit titled "The Time of Our Lives." The exhibit covered the 1960s and 1970s and displayed original artwork from Time magazine. Its appearance at the LBJ Library was paid for by the Lyndon B. Johnson Foundation, with non-federal funds. When asked what this exhibit had to do with the mission of the LBJ Library "as an archival depository of Presidential papers" (p. 158), Admiral Freeman offered an eloquent defense of such exhibitions in portraying "the history of the respective Presidential administrations."

The hearings concluded with nondepartmental witnesses from the American Historical Association, the Organization of American Historians, and the Society of American Archivists, all of whom spoke in favor of the current system.


7. U.S. General Services Administration, Office of Plans, Programs, and Financial Management and the Office of Planning and Analysis. (1980) Presidential library study, May 16, 1980. In U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Government Affairs, Benefits to former presidents: Hearings before a Subcommittee of the Committee, 97th Congress, 2nd session, 1982, 81-139.


This report prepared by GSA at Congress' behest found that the cost growth calculations for presidential libraries from 1955-1979 could be accounted for by the following: 1) inflation of approximately 300% over the period accounted for 83.2% of the cost growth, 2) the increase in the average size of the facilities' square footage and concomitant staffing increases amounted to 2.1 times more in 1979 than 1955 accounting for 13.2% of the cost growth, and 3) additional charges of approximately 10% levied by GSA against the presidential libraries in the form of Standard Level User Charges (SLUC), otherwise known as rent, accounted for 2.5% of the cost growth. One other very small factor was the underestimation of the original 1955 costs, primarily in the staffing cost data, amounting to 1.1% of the cost growth.

The study offered cost estimates for seven alternative presidential library programs over a 100 year period and assumed there would be either 20 individual presidential libraries, or four centralized libraries designed to accommodate five presidents each. The seven alternatives

included: the current system of individual presidential libraries, the current presidential library archival system without museums, individual libraries under a revised and scaled down National Archives model, individual libraries under the National Archives model without museums, centralized libraries in metropolitan areas, centralized libraries in non-metropolitan areas, and centralized libraries in metropolitan areas without museums. The presence or absence of a museum and differences in size were the primary differences in the alternatives. A key factor in determining ultimate costs was the assumption that acquisition costs for facilities similar to the current system of one library per president would continue to be privately financed through donations, while the acquisition costs for the centralized alternatives would be financed by the federal government. The assumption here was that centralized facilities would not be able to generate private donations the way individual libraries are able to do.

The centralized alternatives were projected to cost from $110 million to $147 million more than the decentralized alternatives, while providing 12,300 net square feet less space per president. In the final analysis the centralized alternatives were seen in general to cost about three times as much as the decentralized alternatives. The report acknowledged the higher initial investment costs could be offset by lower operation and maintenance costs over the long run, but estimated that offset would not happen until the 200th year out, at which time total costs were estimated to be $4 billion.

Given Congress proclivity for short-term, rather than long-term vision, it is not surprising that this report contributed to the defeat of Senator Lawton Chiles' proposed legislation calling for the establishment of a central library for presidential archives.


8. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Government Operations. (1982). Presidential libraries: Unexplored funding alternatives. House Report 97-732. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.



This report, based on a study by the Government Information and Individual Rights Subcommittee, noted on the first page that characterizing presidential libraries as a perquisite to former presidents was probably inappropriate. While acknowledging the need to mitigate the cost of these facilities to taxpayers, the study defined the public, rather than former presidents, as the primary beneficiaries via preservation of presidential materials and associated educational endeavors.

At the time of the study, the National Archives Service was a unit within the GSA. The major finding of this study was that the Presidential Library System had exceeded original cost estimates in large part because of inflation in the economy at large and excessive charges levied by GSA for rent (called standard level users charges, or SLUC) and recurring reimbursable costs (RRC) for standard services and protection above the standard charges included in the SLUC. Given that the libraries are all built with private funds and donated to the government, it was deemed

inappropriate for the government to be levying rental charges against the libraries. Therefore, the report recommended that GSA should limit the SLUC and RRC charges to its actual, direct cost of the services provided. Further, it recommended the establishment of perpetual endowments to cover operating expenses of each existing library, the authority for which already existed for the Administrator of General Services. On the final page, the report noted that "the very existence of the National Archives Trust Fund is evidence of a long standing congressional endorsement of private support for the Archives [and] this support extends, specifically, to Presidential Libraries…" (p. 12) Further, the decentralized system of libraries was deemed more likely to generate private support than a centralized facility.

The recommendations in this study would reappear in the revisions to the Presidential Libraries Act enacted by Congress in 1986.

9. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Government Operations. (1984, June 21). Preservation and management of presidential records. House Report 98-856.  Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office,  22 pages.

This report covers amendments to the Presidential Libraries Act of 1955 that would provide a "new mechanism for funding the ongoing operational costs of future Presidential libraries" (p. 2). The four provisions of the amendment were:

1. all future Presidential libraries comply with minimum standards prescribed by the Archivist of the United States;

2. an endowment equal to at least 20 percent of the acquisition cost of the land, building and equipment shall be donated for deposit in the National Archives Trust Fund for the Presidential libraries of Presidents taking office for the first time on or after May 9, 1984;

3. endowments be established in the National Archives Trust Fund for each Presidential library not subject to the 20 percent endowment requirement in which gifts and bequests, and the proceeds from admission fees and sales, shall be deposited; and

4. the income to each endowment shall be applied to the building operations costs of that particular Presidential library. (p. 2)

Discussion of the amendments covered the history of the Presidential Library System, including recent concern over the related costs of former Presidents. A 1982 report by the Committee on Government Operations (H. Rept. 97-732), "Presidential Libraries: Unexplored Funding

Alternatives," was cited as evidence that much of the increase in the cost of the Presidential Library System was the result of "inappropriate space rental and unduly large service charges on the National Archives by its parent agency, the General Services Administration" (p. 5). That report also noted the GSA Administrator's failure to enhance his authority to accept monetary or property gifts in support of the libraries. By May 1983, the GSA Administrator issued a report prepared by the Archivist of the United States entitled "Endowments for Presidential Libraries," in which he called for the application of any such endowments to those presidential library functions clearly beyond the "core archival responsibilities" required under the Presidential Records Act of 1978. The Archivist also called for new legislation to implement these changes (as opposed to simply a policy change) and the implementation of such new legislation on or after January 20, 1985, at the beginning of the next new presidential term of office.

Discussion of the proposed bill addressed minimum standards for presidential archival depositories, the endowment requirement, clarification of authority on the part of the Administrator of GSA to solicit and receive funds on behalf of presidential libraries, and the effective date of the legislation. After much discussion, the Committee voted to exclude the library of the current President of the United States, Ronald Reagan, from the amendment's provisions, as well as those of former Presidents Nixon, Ford, and Carter. Nevertheless, encouragement of voluntary compliance by former Presidents and their supporters was emphasized because it could result in savings to the government almost immediately.

10. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Government Operations. (1985a, March 26). Hearing on H.R. 1349 to reduce the costs of operating presidential libraries, and for other purposes. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

This hearing continued the process begun with the investigative report done during the 97th Congress and the legislation proposed in the 98th Congress to "shift the burden for operating future [presidential] libraries" through H.R. 1349. The one new provision added to this proposed legislation was the call for the Archivist of the United States, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, and the Chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission to conduct a study of the demand for, the cost of, and space and program requirements of establishing a museum of the Presidents. The three were also to assess the feasibility of establishing and operating such a museum with non-federal funds. The fact that the National Archives and Records Service was soon to become independent of the General Services Administration was duly noted, and then the only witness of the day was introduced, Dr. Robert Warner, Archivist of the United States. Warner noted the need for Presidential Libraries, especially since a major battle had recently been fought to ensure that Presidential papers were made government property, but he also cautioned that the libraries must be "modest, functional, and tasteful" (p. 9). He expressed strong support for the government's setting design standards for the library buildings and the concept of private funding for certain library activities which are not the core functions of archival preservation, maintenance, and servicing. Warner also supported conducting the feasibility study of a Museum of the Presidents.

11. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Government Operations. (1985c, May 15). Reduction of costs of presidential libraries. House Report 99-125. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 23 p.

This document recaps earlier hearings held during the 98th and 99th Congresses. It includes perhaps the best enunciation of Congress's view of the appropriateness of private endowments in support of federal institutions. The earlier hearings had included the strong opinion of the Archivist of the United States that the endowment funds raised for Presidential Libraries should support only those functions which go beyond the "core" archival responsibilities incumbent upon the federal government itself. The Archivist's statement "raised the issue of the extent to which the Government should rely on private donations to carry out governmental responsibilities" (p. 11). The report pointed out that there is nothing in the Presidential Libraries Act of 1955 or the Presidential Records Act of 1978 that requires the government to donate a building to house Presidential papers. Rather those laws require simply that the National Archives accession presidential papers.

This latest version of the bill included the following provisions directed at satisfying those who feared the abdication of governmental responsibilities to the private sector: 1) the endowments must be transferred to the Archivist and deposited in the National Archives Trust Fund where they are outside the control of the private donors, and 2) the income from the endowments must "be applied only to the cost of building operations, and not to the performance of archival functions" (p. 11). The amount of income generated by the endowment "is not intended as a limitation on how much may be spent in any year on building operations costs of the presidential library, but rather is intended to offset those costs which otherwise would be borne in full by the taxpayers. This is no more reliance on the private sector for the carrying out of Government responsibilities than is the utilization of the privately donated library facilities themselves" (p. 12).

12. Presidential Libraries Act of 1986 (44 U.S.C. 2106)

The 1986 revisions to the Presidential Libraries Act were a direct consequence of Congress's growing discontent with the cost of maintaining former Presidents and their libraries. The law which took effect upon the inauguration of President George Bush in 1989, requires the Archivist to issue architectural and design standards for presidential libraries. If the building is larger than 70,000 square feet, a substantial supplemental endowment must be provided by the donors of the facility. The Archivist must establish separate endowments for each library within the National Archives Trust Fund, and each must equal 20 percent of the cost of the land, building, and equipment before title to a library is accepted by NARA. Funds from the endowments may be

used to defray the cost of facility operations, but not the performance of archival functions, which are considered to be a federal responsibility. The Archivist was also required to complete a feasibility study of a Museum of the Presidents to be submitted with the 1986 NARA annual report to Congress.

This law was clearly designed to put the brakes on spending for the presidential libraries, but its effects will be difficult to gauge until the Bush Library is operational and there is time to evaluate its functioning.  Even preliminary data show, however, that the proliferation of presidential documents and artifacts has made it difficult for one-term President Bush to accommodate his collections in the prescribed space. It seems almost certain that Clinton's materials after two terms in office will not fit into 70,000 square feet unless the architect has extraordinary powers of design and the very latest technology.

In addition to all legislation related to the Presidential Library System, which is published in the U.S. Code and U.S. Statutes at Large,  the federal government publishes numerous other sources that deal with the system. Among these are congressional hearings , regulations, annual reports, background briefing documents, budget hearings, public information resources, archival finding aids, and internal NARA documents. Each library regularly updates its finding aid booklet titled Historical Materials in the … Presidential Library. The journal, Prologue: Quarterly of the National Archives, has featured the Presidential Library System as a whole and individual libraries on several occasions, in particular the Summer 1989 issue. That quarterly also publishes in each issue a list of newly released documents and files in the Presidential Libraries and throughout the National Archives' facilities. NARA regularly publishes the CIDS Bibliography: Research Papers Prepared by Member of the Archivist Career Training Program, National Archives and Records Administration, which includes numerous papers on Presidential Libraries prepared by archivists-in-training. Topics covered in these masters thesis-type documents available from NARA have included "Research in Presidential Libraries: A User Study" by Conway (1984), "The Role of Educational Programs in Presidential Libraries" by Linde (1986), "Records Management at the White House and Its Impact on Presidential Libraries" by Lowe (1991), and "The Role and Function of Presidential Libraries" by Fischer (1991).

*Literature gap being filled*

This dissertation will make its primary contribution to the literature on the Presidential Library System. There have been no scholarly, dissertation-length descriptive studies of the library system, despite its almost 60-year history, its contribution to American culture, its $30 million annual budget, and its steadily expanding size (with the addition of each new library, costs increase by at least $2 million/year). There are ten libraries in operation, plus the Nixon papers project. The proposed Clinton Library in Little Rock, Arkansas, should open early in the next century.

If the primary and practical aim of this study is to see the Presidential Library System clearly, the secondary theoretical aim is to test the power of the policy subsystem "lens" as a conceptual investigative tool. This dissertation will supplement existing policy subsystem cases such as those

of the outer continental shelf energy leasing policy subsystem by Jenkins-Smith (1991) and the federal emergency management policy subsystem by Wamsley and Schroeder (1996).

Although it is an important policy subsystem, the Presidential Library System has not been mapped. This will be a mapping exercise, an attempt to consciously capture what the system is, in order to add to the literature on the system. I will focus on the policy subsystem dimension. The problem statement is one of describing the Presidential Library System, which is not a well understood system. My goal is to raise the system to the level of acknowledgment and a clearer understanding of its importance to a variety of constituents.

## *Theoretical grounding statement*

The theoretical framework used for examining the Presidential Library System policy subsystem is the policy subsystems literature in public administration. The policy subsystem literature provides in fact two lenses that support the study: 1) public administrative processes, and 2) a political economy framework. The first allows the researcher to identify and examine the institutional processes of the Presidential Library System policy subsystem, map how they unfold, and relate them to our overall political-administrative system. This framework allows me to investigate how members of the policy subsystem, including agency personnel, legislative actors, special interest groups, and former presidents' families and supporters interact to impinge upon the administrative processes. The political economy framework gives me a tool for examining the structures that support the institutional mission for the Presidential Library System policy subsystem.

## *Research expectations, propositions*

Archivist of the United States Don W. Wilson states in a 1989 Prologue article that "no other nation has succeeded in creating a similar head-of-state archival-museum network"(Wilson, 1989, p. 100). My research proposition is that the Presidential Library System policy subsystem is in fact a unique and quintessentially American policy subsystem that is relatively unknown and little understood. This dissertation's description will illuminate the Presidential Library System policy subsystem and reduce ambiguity about it. The project may also be seen as a sensemaking activity (after Karl Weick) directed at an important policy area of the federal government. The dissertation may become a cognitive map, or framework, for viewing the Presidential Library System policy subsystem for these characteristics.

Echoing Wamsley's 1996 description of public administration as an interdisciplinary and applied field, rather than a discipline in the traditional social science sense of detachment and objectivity, this public administration dissertation deals with "problems and questions encountered by practitioners…in the social construct we call institutions" (Wamsley, 1996, p. 364), in this case the Presidential Library System. A  dialogue format for most of the data collection and a process orientation provide the project's focus. I use first-person voice to highlight the personal nature of the qualitative research methodology undertaken to examine the presidential library policy

subsystem. Although I have never been a direct actor in the Presidential Library System, I saw (and see) the interviewees who work in the libraries as colleagues. While maintaining a stance of as much objectivity as possible, I empathize with their problems and their achievements. The presidential library policy subsystem constitutes a relatively small community in which most of the actors know one another and are used to being investigated by both Congress and the media, usually for negative purposes. The subjects knew they were likely to be quoted for attribution in my dissertation, and it took some effort for me to achieve an acceptable level of trust to glean the information I needed. Although I am careful to distinguish my own opinions from those of the subjects, and I take care to provide multiple sources of information for describing each aspect of the cases, I can assert neither complete objectivity nor that my presence and interest in the libraries had no effect on the information I was given. Further, I admit I was interested in describing not only the three Es of economy, efficiency, and effectiveness of the Presidential Libraries, but also the three Rs of responsiveness, representativeness, and responsibility (Wamsley, 1996, p 355). Since all description inevitably includes an element of evaluation, the three Rs provide a more complex and fundamental criterion for success than the 3 Es can.


### *Limitations of the Research*

As a single-case study, the results apply only to the policy subsystem under investigation. The three libraries selected for detailed analysis will be viewed as separate and distinct policy subsystems, but I believe the information gleaned will allow me to describe the overall Presidential Library System policy subsystem in an informed way. I expect serendipitous findings will allow me to integrate new information on the overall policy subsystem and produce some building blocks for further research about the Presidential Library System.

# Chapter 2 Methodology

## *Policy Subsystems Literature*

The policy subsystems literature will be reviewed insofar as it provides a lens for viewing the Presidential Library System policy subsystem. The sources cited are found in political science, public administration, and policy journals, along with a few monograph chapters. Authors in the field whom I will rely on for this dissertation are most importantly Gary Wamsley (1983 and 1985) and Milward and Wamsley (1984), followed by Robert M. Stein and Kenneth N. Bickers, whose 1995 monograph, <u>Perpetuating the Pork Barrel: Policy Subsystems and American Democracy</u>, is the most current and lengthy treatment of the topic, albeit from a political science viewpoint.

## *Definitions of the phrase "policy subsystem"*

Prior to Stein and Bickers' brief definition of policy subsystems cited in Chapter I, policy subsystems had previously been characterized as iron triangles, policy milieus, interorganizational policy networks, and subgovernments (Wamsley, 1983).

The following definition of a policy subsystem appears in the public policy chapter in Chandler and Plano's <u>The Public Administration Dictionary</u> (1988):

## Subsystem

Any political alliance uniting some member of an administrative agency, a congressional committee or subcommittee, and an interest group with shared values and preferences in the same substantive area of public policy making. Subsystems are informal alliances or coalitions that link individuals in different parts of the formal policy structure. Their members have influence in the policy-making process because of their formal or official positions-bureau chief, committee or subcommittee chairman, or member. The essential strength of a subsystem is its ability to combine the benefits of bureaucratic expertise, Congressional leverage, and interest-group capabilities in organizing and communicating to the government the opinions of those most concerned with a particular public issue. Subsystem activity tends to be behind the scenes. Bureaucrats derive considerable benefit from subsystem arrangements, because they can count on political support from within government (i.e., Congress) and from without (i.e., interest groups). The three-sided relationship allows any one component of the subsystem to activate a joint effort toward common objectives,

with the willing cooperation of the others. Unless challenged from outside - by other subsystems or adverse publicity, for example-a subsystem can dominate a policy-making area. Policy is made in a spirit of friendly, quiet cooperation among various influential people. A subsystem depends on a larger political entity, but in actuality it functions with a high degree of autonomy (111-112).

This definition strongly echoes the early "iron triangle" metaphor for the relationships that develop among interest groups, legislative committees, and executive branch agencies. This relationship was first described by Ernest S. Griffith in 1939 as "whirlpools of interest," which he thought scholars, specifically political scientists, should be studying rather than the governmental institutions which had preoccupied the field for so long. Through the next four decades, case studies authored by Arthur Maass (1951), Leiper Freeman (1955), Douglas Cater (1964), Emmette Redford (1969), Lee Fritschler (1975), and others popularized the concept through their richly detailed (if nomothetic, or derived from law) analysis of policy formulation. Their work helped plant the iron triangle metaphor firmly in the conventional wisdom, which eventually led to its adoption by the media and in the popular imagination.

Nevertheless, the iron triangle metaphor fails to highlight the richness and complexity of policy subsystems emphasized by Wamsley.

*Wamsley and Milward & Wamsley on Policy Subsystems*

As a device to illuminate the Presidential Library System policy subsystem,  I will evaluate its congruence with the policy subsystem characteristics Gary Wamsley first synthesized in 1983, which in turn were revised by Milward and Wamsley in 1984, and are revised once again here. For this paper I have mapped the seven characteristics and 15 major conceptual points Wamsley made in 1983 with the 13 entries in the "conceptual inventory of policy subsystems" in Milward and Wamsley (1984). In my new synthesis there are eleven characteristics. We may think of these characteristics as the nouns of policy subsystems, which serve to name it, while the political economy quadrants described following this section are the verbs, which illustrate the actions that take place within the policy subsystem.

I include parenthetical notations of my source for the characteristic, using "W" followed by a page number for Wamsley (1983), and "M&W" followed by an item number for Milward and Wamsley.  I also note which of these characteristics are statements of fact and which are variables (either dichotomies or variables subject to Likert scale description). Key descriptive terms are highlighted in bold letters.

1.  "Policy subsystems are primarily an **analytical construct** imposed by the observer (i.e., in mapping a subsystem's network you have to start somewhere and end somewhere). They may also be self-conscious social entities, but, if

so, this will be coincidental." *(M&W #1)*

*Statement of fact* about the observer, not the policy subsystem.

2. "The relations between and among the actors of this analytical construct **can be empirically observed** and the pattern revealed in what organizational sociologists have labeled the network. (The network is always within the subsystem but may not always be coterminous with it at a given point in time.)" *(M&W #2)*

*Statement of fact* about the observer and his/her professional language (i.e., the terms that discipline uses to describe things).

3. Policy subsystems are **numerous** and **multifarious** in nature. (W. p. 77)

*Statement of fact:* The individual libraries and the Presidential Library System are among these numerous policy subsystems associated with the federal government and the individual communities in which the libraries reside.

4. "Policy subsystems are systems in the sense that the variables that comprise them are interrelated so that a change in one variable results in a change in others. Members of policy subsystems are thus **functionally interdependent** or interrelated; in some, members have close symbiotic relationships, in others members have worked out guarded truces, while in still others members are engaged in open competition or aggressive interaction." Their general effects "generally do **not** represent conscious, planned centrally coordinated, **macro-rationality**." And, finally "the behavior of individuals within a policy subsystem exhibits **micro-rationality**; i.e., these individuals reflect functional activity of the subsystem and their roles; these roles provide determinate goals, rationales, and calculable strategies that are rational for the individual actors within the context of the subsystem." *(M&W #3, #12, #11)*

The first sentence is an hypothesis, which I judge to be correct, and a dichotomous *variable* (i.e., the Presidential Library System is or is not a system). The relationships are *variables* and they offer the opportunity to devise a Likert scale along the continuum from collegial relationships to adversarial. I must describe individuals' behavior and their relationships.

5. "Policy subsystems in the American system cut across the conventional divisions of power (legislative, executive, and judicial) and levels of government with **varied internal distributions of power**." "The configuration of power within policy subsystems varies widely from one to another. Some are dominated by one or a few very powerful actors, but in others power may be relatively diffuse." *(M&W #5 and #6)*

*Variable*: The "internal distribution of power" can range from a narrowly dispersed distribution of internal power (very few powerful leaders) to widely dispersed powerful leaders.

6. "The structure of **functional differentiation**, or, in some cases, task interdependency, also varies; in some it is consciously structured and interrelated in complex ways, others will have much less interdependence or it will exist on an unconscious level." *(M&W #6)*

*Variable*: From consciously structured to unconsciously structured.

7. "Policy subsystems manifest a **normative order**. Some are replete with symbols, myths, rituals, and sometimes a special language which reflects the intersubjective reality of the members or their consensus as to what is important, desirable, and right. Referred to by some as a 'constitution,' it has the effect of legitimating and delegitimating behaviors, reaffirming intersubjective reality, and of enhancing exclusivity and autonomy." *(M&W #7)*

*Variable:* Each policy subsystem exhibits a visible normative order to a greater

or lesser extent.

8. Policy subsystems are "comprised of actors seeking to influence the authoritative **allocation of values**, be it rewards (dollars, services, status, benign neglect) or deprivation (regulations, taxation, conscription, punishment, status denigration)" (W. p. 77-78). Policy subsystems "have embedded in them an opportunity or incentive structure. Functional interaction holds forth the prospect of affecting public policy either in formulation or implementation, i.e., interaction has payoffs that, while by no means certain, nonetheless seem plausible to members." *(M&W #10)*

*Variable:* Each of the policy subsystems described in the dissertation, and the overall policy subsystem of the Presidential Library System, is more or less successful in

influencing the "allocation of values" (i.e., does a better or worse job of taking advantage of its available resources in all sectors of government and the private sector to promote its health and viability, i.e., funding, clear mission, passionate supporters, etc.).

By "allocation of values" I mean basically what Congress approves for the budgets and authorizing legislation for the presidential libraries. These are the public funds which require for passage at least some agreement among various powerful actors. In turn, the work of the presidential library foundations is influenced by what happens with the public funding. It is a complex interweaving of what each sees as its particular responsibilities and what each is willing to pay for.

9.  Policy subsystems are "heterogeneous, have variable **cohesion** and they exhibit internal **complexity**." (W., p. 78) "Policy subsystems are comprised of multifarious actors: institutions, organizations, groups, and individuals linked on the basis of shared and salient interests in a particular policy. In the American polity these might include bureaucratic agencies from all levels of government, interest groups, legislative committees and subcommittees, powerful individuals, or relevant others." *(M&W #8)*

*Variable*: Each library and the Presidential Library System have 1) more or less cohesion and 2) more or less internal complexity. It is possible for a library to have any level of combination of these two variables.

10. Policy subsystems have "an unremitting drive for **functional autonomy** on the part of those interests which are dominant in a subsystem at any given point in time." (W. p. 78) "Policy subsystems are subsystems of the larger political system; related to it but in varying degrees of intensity and richness. All have established some degree of autonomy from the larger system." *(M&W #4)* "Self perpetuation of the policy subsystem is the most consistently shared goal of participants. If authority and funding of its correlated programs or its functional autonomy are threatened, this will tend to enhance consensus." *(M&W #13)*

*Variable*: Each policy subsystem described is more or less autonomous at this

moment in terms of its balance of powers and functional activities in relation to its "larger political system"-NARA, and in terms of its feelings of security about its perpetuation.

11.  Policy subsystems have "an identifiable core of **horizontal integration**. Unfortunately, most of the research tended to see this horizontal integration as confined to the agency or agencies with statutory responsibility, interest groups and relevant

legislative committees or subcommittees. Thus they gave impetus to the oversimplistic metaphor of the 'iron triangle'." (W., p. 78) And **vertical integration** is a part of policy subsystems. Interest groups, program managers and program professionals can be found systematically linked through all layers of the federal government into what the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations called 'vertical functional autocracies'." (W. p. 78) "The linkages between units of a policy subsystem are vertical as well as horizontal so that a policy subsystem may consist of horizontal cluster at different levels which are linked to one another vertically to form the overall system. For example there can be linkages among health agencies in a city as well as each agency being linked to separate state and federal agencies." (M&W #9)

*Variable*: Each policy subsystem described has more or less horizontal

and vertical integration.

In addition to investigating and evaluating policy subsystems along these characteristics, Wamsley recommends using the political economy framework for describing a policy subsystem, which should enable the researcher to systematically analyze the subsystem as a whole entity and to profile its "system state." The goal is a holistic profile of a policy subsystem. From this profile the analyst can identify vulnerability points where influence, power, or information can be brought to bear to effect change at least cost or effort.

Key additions to these concepts were made by Milward and Wamsley in 1984. Here they accord policy subsystems a "central place at the center of the American political economy" where they "act on narrower rather than broader public interests, and these narrower interests are then implemented and enforced through bureaucratic means" (Milward & Wamsley, 1984, p. 20). The subsystems strive for autonomy and insulation from public accountability. Further, "the interpenetration of the public and private sectors has also allowed private organizations and professions to use state power to shelter themselves from the rigors of the competitive marketplace" (Milward & Wamsley, 1984, p. 20).

In 1985, Gary Wamsley presented "Strategies in Implementation: Applying the Political Economy Framework to Policy Subsystems" at the Conference on Multi-Actor Policy Analysis: The Scope and Direction of Policy Recommendations, in Sweden. Therein he says that policy subsystems may be described by viewing them through the lens of political economy to include three major concepts, as follows:

1. The two commodities most coveted in any society are power and material resources...the actors of a policy subsystem strive to obtain both in sufficient quantities to be able to affect their societal level allocation.

2. Perceptions of the actors determine whether phenomena or behavior are political or economic in character. We are socialized to think of *economic phenomena* as if they are 'natural,' 'given,' and not the result of conscious human intent. Conversely, *political phenomena* are seen as deriving from conscious, purposive actions aimed at affecting their purposes and 'rightful share' of societal values.

3. A given phenomenon or behavior has the potential to be either political or economic, indeed it may transform in character as the actors' perceptions of it alter. (Wamsley, 1985, p. 10-11)

A key point here is that the relationships between economic and political variables are interdependent. Economic relations between actors are seen as "routine," while political relations are seen as "non-routine."

Extending the description of the political economy framework, we see that phenomena in subsystems may be divided into four quadrants, described below. In the chapters to come I will focus more on the internal polity and economy, rather than on the external polity and economy, because the internal quadrants reflect the public administration practitioner focus of the project. It was not the goal of the paper to do a thorough analysis of the external economic and political conditions surrounding the Presidential Library System, but rather to give the highlights of those factors as they impinge on internal operations.

Internal Economy of a Policy Subsystem (Routine)

The internal economy of a policy subsystem is comprised of the routine, functional interaction (sometimes, maybe even often, the conflict) that results from a shared desire to affect public policy. It deals with the incentives available for system maintenance, and the marginal adjustments that maximize gains and minimize losses for the system. Routine conflicts can be perennial or episodic, and they are the issues around which members instrumentally and routinely interact. The internal economy operates in the netherworld removed from public scrutiny.

An internal economy of a policy subsystem cannot long function if it is far from consonance (not congruence) with its external economic and political environments and its internal polity.

In this quadrant we put those things that policy subsystem members consider routine, business as usual, or "economic" and what each actor's functional role is.

Headings used to describe the internal economy of the Presidential Library System include the following:

- Administration

    decision-making processes

    staffing

    budgeting

    revenue generation

    routine reports filed with NARA

    information systems and technologies

    service policies

- Archives Functions

- Exhibits/Museum Functions

- Education/Outreach

Internal Polity of a Policy Subsystem (Non-routine)

The internal polity concerns who controls or alters incentives and why. A policy subsystem is a miniature political system with: a normative structure akin to an unwritten constitution of shared values and beliefs, symbols, and rituals (institutionalized through structure); socialization; patterns of demand and support; interest articulation and aggregation; and rule making, rule application, and rule adjudication. The dominant coalition wants to maintain the status quo. Struggles here invariably affect policy, which in turn restructures the internal polity and may restructure the internal economy (if routines become different).

In this quadrant we put those things that members of the policy subsystem consider *political*, such as who gets what and on what basis, who has the real power in the organization, how do I fit into the institutional mission and memory, who decides what is important here, and what is my role in carrying enforcing the rules.

The structure of the internal polity will have to be somewhat consonant with the external political and economic environments.

Headings used to describe the internal polity of the Presidential Library System include the following:

- Normative Structure

    Incentive Structures

    Dominant Coalition

    Socialization

    Interest Articulation and Aggregation

- Leadership Attributes of the Director

- Rule-making, application, and adjudication mechanisms

The internal economy and polity combine to form the overall Internal Political Economy, which provides the pipeline leading from the federal treasury to the library and necessary to sustain the system. Actors use horizontal and vertical cluster relationships within the internal political economy to make marginal adjustments in value allocations.

External Economic Environment of a Policy Subsystem (Routine)

The external economy affects the incentives available to the policy subsystem. The external economy can have a disruptive or stabilizing effect on the policy subsystem, i.e., policy subsystems are affected by the economy of the larger society. The employment rate, boom or bust cycles, perceptions of "what we can afford" all enter into such a picture.

In this quadrant we put those things that subsystem members use to analyze trends and potentials that may aid and facilitate implementation of policy. A strategy of implementation that piggybacks on an "economic" trend has a much greater chance of success than without it, because it will be seen as a "given" or inevitable.

Headings used to describe the external economy of the Presidential Library System include the following:

- Local Economy, including the Labor Pool and Employment Rate

- Stability and Vitality of the General Economy

- Overall Perception of "what we can afford" as a country

- Government Funding for the Library/PLS

External Political Factors of a Policy Subsystem (Non-routine)

The external polity is concerned with who controls or alters incentives and why. It is perceived by the policy subsystem's members to be conscious efforts by outside actors to alter the subsystem's structure of power and thereby alter the allocation of values. (Again, PERCEPTION of the actors is the key!)

In this quadrant we put those things used to develop an inventory of actors who are outside the policy subsystem, but who can either be drawn into it or drawn into an internal power struggle. In other words, a list of potential political

intervenors and an assessment of their capabilities and power.

Headings used to describe the external economy of the Presidential Library System include the following:

- Relations with the former President and/or his family

- Relations with Congress

- Prominent Friends

- Prominent Enemies

Milward and Wamsley also stressed that each policy subsystem is unique. They note that "One of the things that continues to plague students of policy subsystems is the nagging belief that their multitudinous variety of forms ought to somehow be classifiable so that some generalizations by class are possible rather than being forced to deal with each as completely unique" (Milward & Wamsley, 1984, p.16). They conclude that "categories leak like sieves despite every effort to seal them shut" (Milward & Wamsley,

1984, p. 18). Given Milward and Wamsley's warning, I developed unique subheadings for the political economy quadrant descriptions used throughout this study.

Another metaphor for policy subsystems used by Wamsley in a 1990 graduate seminar at Virginia Tech is that of a carbon chain, which can be described as a complex molecule model with many moving actors, or atoms. The policy subsystem as carbon chain might span all three branches of the federal government, state and local governments, interest groups within and without government, consultants, the public, and others. In short, the carbon chain includes any stakeholder in a policy question. The carbon chain model highlights the fact that policy subsystems do not necessarily fit either the conventional wisdom of iron triangles or the rational model. The conventional wisdom, which calls for managing or administering a subsystem with a top-down model flowing from the enabling legislation, to executive control, to judicial review, simply cannot account for all of the positive and negative influences, and historical accidents, brought to bear on a policy subsystem such as the Presidential Library System. Political and economic events can pierce a subsystem at any moment and rearrange its molecules and actors. If we assume that the Presidential Library System is a macro-level program (or policy subsystem), then structural prescriptions derived from the rational model will not necessarily work. Coordination and control by executive mandate simply will not work.


*Stein & Bickers on Policy Subsystems*

Another key source for developing the descriptions in this paper was Stein and Bickers' 1995 monograph, Perpetuating the Pork Barrel: Policy Subsystems and American Democracy. The authors fundamentally see policy subsystems as sets of government programs surrounded and influenced by "networks of relationships among different actors, all of whom have a stake in [the] policy arena." The programs are purposefully (i.e., non-randomly) established as they are in order to "address the heterogeneous preferences of the diverse actors in the subsystem" (Stein & Bickers, 1995, p. 4). Subsystem participants pursue their own agendas but are forced to engage in cooperative endeavors to reach their individual and organizational goals. The authors look at the ways policy subsystems are established and maintained. To do so, they attempted "to appreciate the purposive actions of legislators, interest groups, agencies, and other actors in the American political process" and concluded "that both the strengths and the dangers associated with policy subsystems have in large measure been misspecified"(Stein & Bickers, 1995, p. 5).

Stein and Bickers agree with Wamsley that the old iron triangle metaphor has now become conventional wisdom among journalists, politicians, political scientists, and others. They see this development as an unfortunate misplacement of an early theoretical construct into the popular imagination, where writers now sometimes use the term "policy subsystem" in an impoverished and cynical sense as a synonym for iron triangles. Stein and Bickers advocate development of a richly detailed policy subsystem model as an improved way to look at programs and policies of government. Of particular interest for this dissertation, they build on Charles Goodsell's The Case for Bureaucracy (1983) and Steven Kelman's Making Public Policy: A Hopeful View of American Government (1987), both of which argue that "public policy reflects the efforts of policy makers who divine policy problems and who devise programs to solve these problems…[and] the belief

that people who seek public service usually choose to do so in order to promote public goals rather than their own private ambitions" (Stein & Bickers, 1995, p. 8). This more optimistic view of  policy subsystem actors and their motives promotes a somewhat different and more articulated perspective for my research project than some of the earlier policy subsystems literature.

The authors center their discussions around three issues, which will be addressed for the Presidential Library System as a whole in Chapter VI. 1. To whom is the policy subsystem accountable? 2. Whose interests does it serve? 3. How is the connection between the public and its elected representatives distorted by the policy subsystem?  Finally, they assert that "policy subsystems do not pose the problem for American politics that most people think they do" (Stein & Bickers, 1995, p. 12); rather, "subsystems exist within the context of democratic institutions and practices in America [and] at the same time, subsystems require constant vigilance to assure that basic democratic values are preserved and cultivated" (Stein & Bickers, 1995, p. 151).

The Stein and Bickers work will be supplementary to Wamsley's earlier, but somewhat richer, theoretical constructs for providing the underpinnings of this study. I will use a modified form of Wamsley's and Milward and Wamsley's policy subsystem characteristics to describe the Presidential Library System, Wamsley's political economy quadrants to illustrate the actions within the individual and overall policy subsystems, and Stein and Bickers' key questions to show how the Presidential Library System policy subsystem "fits into the context of democratic institutions and practices in America" (Stein & Bickers, 1995,  p. 151).

### *Research Design and Method*

Methodological grounding for this study is provided by the qualitative research and case study literature within the social sciences. Van Maanen (1979) asserts that researchers conducting qualitative analysis are engaged in describing, decoding, and translating the meaning, rather than the frequency, of naturally occurring phenomena in the social world. Specifically, the case study technique, which is widely used in public administration research, is the preferred method for investigating 'how' or 'why' questions "when the investigator has little control over events, and when the focus is on a contemporary phenomenon within some real-life context." (Yin, 1994, p.1). Yin goes on to say that "case studies…are generalizable to theoretical propositions and not to populations or universes" (Yin, 1994, p. 10). My use of the policy subsystems literature provides the theoretical propositions Yin refers to here. Use of numerous data sources and triangulation of the findings will compensate for the acknowledged limitations of the case study approach, in particular investigator bias.

O'Sullivan and Rassel's <u>Research Methods for Public Administrators</u> (1989) describes designs for description including case studies, which are "designs to fill in the details…that examine in some depth persons, decisions, programs, or other entities that have a unique characteristic of interest" (O'Sullivan & Rassel, 1989, p. 30). They go on to assert that administrators (or Ph.D. candidates) may conduct such studies to look at programs that are either remarkably successful or unsuccessful, individualistic or with ambiguous outcomes, or where actors' behavior is discretionary (O'Sullivan & Rassel, 1989, p. 31).  All these criteria apply to my dissertation.

I will apply a case study methodology (single-case type) to focus on issues that validate use of the policy subsystem concept to describe the Presidential Library System policy subsystem.

*Case Study Methodology*

I use Robert K. Yin's Case Study Research: Design and Methods (1994) as a key resource for the case study methodology. In addition, I rely on Miles and Huberman, Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook (1994), and, for background, White and Adams, Research in Public Administration: Reflections on Theory and Practice (1994).

This study is an example of the type Yin defines as a single-case study (the Presidential Library System policy subsystem) with an embedded design. It is a single-case study, rather than a multiple-case, because it examines one program, one unique case in American government. The design is an embedded one because, although the study is about a single program (the unit of analysis is the Presidential Library System), attention will be directed to subunits within the system (the three libraries selected for detailed attention). Data will be linked to the theoretical propositions of the policy subsystems literature.

Following Yin's advice, each of the individual libraries receiving detailed analysis , i.e. the embedded cases, will be treated at the single-case level. The descriptions for each single case will then be compared across cases and with the less detailed data from the remaining seven libraries, and conclusions drawn about the overall system.

Care was taken to address the issues of construct validity, external validity, and reliability. Yin and Miles and Huberman provided extensive guidance in this arena. *Construct validity* was increased by using three tactics. 1) I used multiple sources of evidence, including in-person and telephone interviews; internal documents from each of the libraries and from NARA ; external documents from Congress and other federal agencies; published articles from scholarly and popular media; and statistical information. 2) I established and maintained a chain of evidence that could allow an observer to follow the evidence from the initial research questions straight through to the conclusions. Sources, carefully cited in the text of the dissertation, lead the reader to the evidence supporting the statements, be they published sources, interview data, or researcher observations. Almost all interview data was authorized for attribution, so there are very few anonymous statements from interviewees. The time and place of the interviews are noted in the data files, and in most cases in the text of the dissertation as well. All resource files, both electronic and paper, are maintained by the author and organized in a subject arrangement for easy retrieval and future reference. 3) The draft dissertation case study was reviewed for the accuracy of the actual facts of the case by two key informants, Michelle Cobb-Management and Program Analyst in the Office of Presidential Libraries, and John Fawcett-Retired Director of the Office of Presidential Libraries. This does not mean that these reviewers agreed with every statement made or opinion expressed by the author, but rather, that they confirmed that there are no misstatements of facts.

*External validity* addresses the issue of generalizing from this case study to theory. It was addressed by using the previously developed policy subsystems theory as a template for

comparison with the empirical results of this case study. Critics of case study research often contrast its methodology to that of survey research, in which information collected from a "sample" or subset, if correctly selected, can be generalized to the total population from which the sample was selected. Such survey research relies on statistical generalization. Case study research, on the other hand, relies on analytical generalization whereby we can generalize the results of this study to a broader theory, in this case the field of public administration's policy subsystems theory.

*Reliability* is the case study attribute which minimizes errors and biases and allows later investigators to replicate the procedures of the earlier research to arrive at the same findings and conclusions. This type of replication, however, assumes doing exactly the same case study, not "replicating" this study by conducting another case study. Two tactics were used to increase the reliability of this study. First, a case study protocol indicating what data were to be collected was developed. From the beginning data were collected and stored with analysis, reportage, and third-party audits in mind. A matrix of categories for describing the Presidential Library System was devised and the evidence placed in these categories during the analysis phase of the project. Data displays were devised for use in  describing the policy subsystem. Virginia Tech's innovation of electronic transfer of dissertations and publication of them on the Internet's World Wide Web enabled me to provide links to relevant websites in the body of the dissertation and in appendices. Second, a case study database of evidence was established. All taped interviews were transcribed into Microsoft Word files, and interview notes for those not taped were also transcribed for easy access. The use of edit functions allowed quick retrieval of topics by keyword. In order to document procedures and findings, extensive paper files were developed for each presidential library, for the Office of Presidential Libraries, and for each external interviewee. These files are available for future research and possible replication of this study. For entrée to the appropriate offices and personnel, I established a good working relationship with Sharon Fawcett, Director of the Presidential Materials Staff; and Michelle Cobb, Program Manager in the Office of Presidential Libraries at NARA headquarters in College Park, Maryland. They provided much written documentation about the Presidential Library System policy subsystem and introduced me to their budget officer and other key personnel in the Office of Presidential Libraries in the Washington area and in the field sites. In May 1997, Ms. Fawcett notified all of the Presidential Library directors about my project and distributed an abstract of my dissertation proposal by way of introduction. Cooperation from subjects was remarkably positive, and each interview led to further sources of information and networking.

My methodology included site visits and in-person, in-depth interviews with the directors and selected staff of  four presidential libraries, and telephone interviews with the remaining presidential library directors at the sites not visited. In addition, I conducted in-person interviews with current and former staff of the Office of Presidential Libraries at NARA headquarters in College Park, Maryland; the Congressional Liaison at NARA; other key staff in the field locations;  and a former member of the Advisory Commission on Presidential Libraries. The Advisory Commission is a legislatively mandated citizen's group comprised of private-sector individuals with an interest or connection to one or more of the presidential libraries. The body provides advice on the Presidential Library System to the Archivist of the U.S. Because I am not a

NARA staff member, I was denied permission to attend the annual Presidential Libraries Directors Conference in November 1997; nevertheless, I was provided with a detailed in-person description of the meeting by Michelle Cobb, who prepared the official minutes of the meeting.

Both open-ended and guiding questions were included in the interviews to encourage emergent responses and comparability among interviewees. Questions were tailored to local differences among the libraries and to the variance in the position or interest-group status of the interviewee. Interview guides are found in Appendix 1.

I asked questions that helped me map the administrative processes of the system and verify whether the Presidential Library System fits the definition of a policy subsystem. Questions were derived directly from the policy subsystem literature. Although I initially believed the Presidential Library System to be a policy subsystem, I also allowed for the possibility that the data would show it to be simply a formal policy system, without the complexity inherent in a true policy subsystem. In either case, this dissertation was designed to provide valuable information through its testing of the propositions of the policy subsystem theory and its explication of a relatively unexamined policy arena.

Sampling parameters used in this study are those recommended by Miles and Huberman (1994, p. 30) to provide a systematic boundary for data collection. They are:

*Settings:*   Presidential libraries and museums, NARA Office of Presidential Libraries, homes or offices of stakeholders.

*Actors:*  Presidential library directors and staff, Office of Presidential Libraries staff, Congressional staff, key stakeholders.

*Events:*  Routines and daily operation activities of presidential libraries operations, routines of the Office of Presidential Libraries,  special exhibits or celebrations at presidential libraries.

*Processes:*  Discussing, reviewing, interpreting and implementing laws and regulations, providing public service to users of the presidential libraries and museums.

*Data Collection*

After securing informed consent and permission to audio tape the interviews with each major participant, I garnered biographical information regarding his/her position, civil service status, length of public service or involvement with the Presidential Library System policy subsystem, and types of involvement with the Presidential Library System policy subsystem. I began with unstructured, exploratory questions to promote cooperation and a relaxed atmosphere. Structured questions then helped to provide full exploration of my research questions. I conducted thirty 60-

90 minute interviews with key players in the Presidential Library System policy subsystem. I sought serendipitous opportunities for unstructured interviews/conversations and documented them via contact summary sheets.

Given the small number of presidential libraries and interviewees, the presumption of attribution was emphasized, except in cases where the interviewee specifically requested anonymity or confidentiality for a given remark. Such cases were rare. Many of the interviews were audio taped and transcribed. Throughout the process, in order to identify patterns and evaluate the interviewing process, I coded and analyzed emerging themes using Wamsley's four political economy quadrants and seven characteristics of policy subsystems. I also took notes during the interviews as a supplement to the audio tapes. The handwritten notes were used to create contact summary sheets immediately following each interview. Each interview transcript and contact summary sheet was coded to capture emergent patterns and issues. The interview guides are listed in Appendix 1.

*Coding Categories*

The following coding device was used to analyze the data collected from interviews and serendipitous contacts. It was derived from the policy subsystems literature described above. Each interview transcription or set of notes was reviewed and statements were categorized according to their applicability to the institution's internal economy, internal polity, external economy, or external polity. Further, the concluding section of each case study chapter includes a graphic display summarizing each of the four quadrants, and a statement of my opinion regarding the extent to which that case fulfills each of Wamsley's and Milward and Wamsley's criteria for policy subsystems. My procedure here is to use a modification of the semantic differential attitude scale "developed by psychologist Charles Osgood and his associates to measure the meaning of concepts" (Sommer & Sommer, 1991, p. 160). Although the technique was designed for use in attitude surveys, I am simply using the semantic differential rating tool to describe the connotative meaning of my findings and help readers visualize them more easily.

I visited the following sites and interviewed those listed at each site.

1) The Roosevelt Library in Hyde Park, NY was included because it was the first library in the system and the prototype for subsequent libraries. I interviewed the Director, Verne Newton; Supervisory Archivist Raymond Teichman; and Exhibits Specialist Wendell Parks.

2) I visited the Kennedy Library in Boston because it had a difficult "birth" due to its site and architectural considerations, and has had a strong family and foundation influence. It has the largest staff, the highest income, and the second highest visitorship of all the libraries (after the LBJ, which has free admission). I interviewed Director Bradley Gerratt; Supervisory Archivist William Johnson; Education Information Officer John Stewart; and Audio-Visual Archivist Allan Goodrich.

3) I visited the Ford Library and Museum in Ann Arbor and Grand Rapids, MI, respectively, because they are unique in having two sites, separated by 130 miles. A decision was made after

the Ford Library was created that no future presidential libraries will have two sites. The participants in that decision and its ramifications are of interest from a policy subsystem perspective. In addition, the fact that the director of the Ford Library is a professional historian and writer who has headed four different presidential libraries made the interview with Richard Norton Smith invaluable. In addition to Smith, I interviewed Curator James R. Kratsas and Supervisory Archivist David Horrocks.

4) I visited the Reagan Library in Simi Valley, California, because it was the most recent fully operational library in the summer of 1997 when data were collected, and the first to have fully automated record groups and files, all of which were the first to be covered by the Presidential Records Act of 1978. Its design and operations were also influenced by the Presidential Libraries Act of 1986, although it was deliberately excluded from the act's requirements, when the Reagan White House negotiated the exclusion of the sitting President. I interviewed the Director, Mark Hunt; Assistant Director Dennis Daellenbach; and Archivist Sherrie Fletcher.

Michelle Cobb and Sharon Fawcett of NARA's Office of Presidential Libraries confirmed that these are among the most "active" presidential libraries, and that they provide a rich picture of the system and how it operates.

After the site visits, I selected three of the four libraries for detailed description as individual policy subsystems. The three chosen reflect the 60-year time span of the Presidential Library System, with Roosevelt being the first, Ford being from the middle years, and Reagan being the latest. Comparisons and contrasts among the three are highlighted to illustrate the Presidential Library System as a whole. I show how each library operates within a complex world of internal and external, local and national, public and private, vertical and horizontal relationships.

At NARA headquarters in College Park, Maryland I had extensive interviews with Management and Program Analyst Michelle Cobb; and more targeted interviews with the Director of the Office of Presidential Libraries, David Peterson; Management and Program Analyst Alan Lowe; Director of the Presidential Materials Staff Sharon Fawcett; and NARA Legislative Liaison John Constance. I twice interviewed retired Director of the Office of Presidential Libraries, John Fawcett, and consulted with him by phone several more times. Leonard Weiss, Staff Director of the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee, was interviewed because of his committee's role in oversight of the Presidential Library System. Page Miller of the National Coordinating Committee for the Promotion of History was interviewed as a prominent user and critic of the system. I conducted telephone interviews with the following: Dr. Joan Hoff, prominent historian and vocal critic of the Presidential Library System; David Alsobrook, Director, George Bush Library; Larry Hackman, Director, Harry S. Truman Library; Dan Holt, Director, Dwight D. Eisenhower Library; Harry Middleton, Director, Lyndon B. Johnson Library; Donald Schewe, Director, Jimmy Carter Library; and Tim Walch, Director, Herbert Hoover Library.

*Format for Chapters III, IV, V, and VI*

Chapters III, IV, and V are all organized according to the same format, as follows. After a brief introduction and description of the library being presented, I use Wamsley's four political economy quadrants as a descriptive tool. Descriptions are derived from the interviewees' own words, library documents, NARA documents, and documents of the foundation associated with the library. In each section of the chapters, I address the primary research questions of this dissertation: 1) how do the administrative and political processes of this policy subsystem unfold?, 2) how do these processes provide system maintenance?, and 3) who are the players?

I conclude each chapter with my observations about the quadrants in the form of a schematic with a bulleted summary of the findings. Finally, I describe the library's policy subsystem in relation to the eleven characteristics of policy subsystems defined in Chapter II.

Chapter VI follows a similar format, but it addresses the Presidential Library System policy subsystem as a whole.

# Chapter 3 Franklin D. Roosevelt Library

*Description and Background Information*

The FDR Library, dedicated July 4, 1940, is located on the grounds of Springwood, the Roosevelt family estate, in a quiet, rural area of the Hudson River Valley 72 miles north of New York City. The estate is open to the public under the auspices of the National Park Service. The library sits on 16 acres donated by FDR and his mother and built according to his own sketches. The museum portion of the FDR Library opened to the public June 30, 1941, and researchers were welcomed for the first time on May 1, 1946. Papers from all of FDR's political offices - New York state senator (1910-13), assistant secretary of the Navy (1913-1919), governor of New York (1929-32), and President of the United States (1933-45) - are housed here. His private collections of papers, approximately 15,000 books, and memorabilia on the history of the U.S. Navy and Dutchess County, New York, are included as well. Franklin Roosevelt's papers were opened for research at the library March 17, 1950. At the time FDR embarked on this precedent-setting endeavor, he was described by then Archivist of the U.S., Robert D.W. Connor, as "the nation's answer to the historian's prayer."

In 1972 two wings were added to the library in memory of Eleanor Roosevelt, with 50 percent of the costs borne by the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation, a private group of supporters who raised funds from public donations. Mrs. Roosevelt's papers from a lifetime of public service are housed here. President and Mrs. Roosevelt are buried in the rose garden adjacent to the library. Total square footage in the building stands at 58,750. Museum visitorship was 159,347 in Fiscal Year 1996 and daily visits by researchers equaled 1,271. Total federally funded costs for the FDR Library in FY96 were $1,592,000.

The planned addition of a 25,000 square foot Roosevelt Visitors and Conference Center to the facilities at the estate has gone through a long and sometimes painful journey, one that is not yet over. Nevertheless, the new building, which will serve both the library and the FDR home, is now scheduled for completion in 2001.

The town of Hyde Park is small and slightly dowdy. Motels and fast food outlets line Rt. 9 just north of the estate, and a somewhat run-down movie theater sits across the street. The picturesque towns to the north, such as Rhinebeck and Rhinecliff, are prettier and have managed a higher level of historic preservation. One local resident observed that perhaps the towns up river learned from Hyde Park's mistakes regarding development and preservation.

The library/museum, while charming and appropriate for its setting, seems rather cramped and somehow faded. With the exception of the new video-based WWII exhibit, the displays appear old-fashioned compared to many now seen around the country. At the FDR Library, exhibits consist of wall-mounted glass cases with photos, a few artifacts, and labels. The lack of space for changing exhibits is clearly a handicap.

I met with Library Director Verne Newton in his office on a stifling July afternoon. He was very forthcoming about both his own background and the work of the FDR Library. Newton

came to the library after a career in public policy (including a stint in the State Department under Jimmy Carter), investment banking, writing, and documentary film-making. His work for a Public Broadcasting System (PBS) documentary on FDR and Harry Hopkins brought him into the Roosevelt orbit, and in 1991 he was asked to direct the library when the previous director retired. [Note: Verne Newton left the FDR Library in 1998 to return to Washington for a position in another government agency.]

Newton derives most satisfaction from his efforts to bring computerization to the library and a World Wide Web presence through which it can annually serve thousands more users around the world than was possible in the past. The website received 41,000 hits in its first month. While only 600-700 individuals come to the library as researchers every year, ten times that number will be able to conduct  preliminary research via the web.

Other key interviews I conducted at the FDR Library were with Exhibits Specialist Wendell "Tex" Parks and Supervisory Archivist Raymond Teichman. Throughout this chapter I rely on the observations I made during my visit, interviews with library employees and with current and former NARA employees, and internal and external documents relating to the library. Organizing data collection, analysis, and reportage according to Wamsley's four quadrants enabled me to avoid missing important information.

### *Internal Economy* (Routine)

*Internal Economy: Administration (Decision-making, Staffing, Budgeting, Revenue Generation, Reports Filed with NARA, Information Systems and Technologies, and Service Policies)*

DECISION-MAKING

I use decision-making to mean policy-setting, as opposed to policy implementation, which happens during day-to-day problem-solving. Basically, because of the age and maturity of the library, most questions here are rather routine and many issues long settled, i.e., many of the decisions have already been made. Almost all document collections were long ago declassified and opened to the public, and the lack of space for changing exhibits limits the initiation of substantive decisions regarding artifacts, other than which of them can be loaned to other institutions. The core mission to serve researchers and museum visitors cannot be delayed or shirked. Therefore, there are no regular resources available for such "extra" projects as computerization. Newton resorts to interns, volunteers, partnering relationships, and other arrangements beyond the federal employees to get these important "extra" things done. Newton believes there is less decision-making and more problem-solving occurring now than in earlier years. The one possible exception to this characterization is the new Visitor and Conference Center which does require significant decision-making by Newton in particular.

During day-to-day operations, problem-solving is done in an informal, decentralized manner. So many projects go on at any one time that Newton meets with the players regarding individual projects; general staff meetings, he found, wasted too much of the archivists' time on museum

matters and vice versa. This system of ad hoc meetings arises partly from the downsizing of staff, so there are fewer players in the system, and it is easier to meet with them individually. A professional staff of 16 when Newton came in 1991 has now been reduced to 11. People are doing more and more. When the retiring Assistant Director's position was abolished in 1996, the work was distributed among the remaining staff.

Interactions between the FDR Library and other federal agencies are highly decentralized among different staff members. Although policy and operational matters go through the director, most other problems are handled by staff directly with their personal contacts at the other agencies. *Much* - and this will be a key point throughout my analysis - *depends on personal relationships*. For example, Newton meets almost daily with his current National Park Service (NPS) counterpart, who runs the FDR Home, but he met with the NPS predecessor only about once per month. The frequency of meetings probably has to do also with the new Visitor's Center they are jointly planning.

Newton's relationships with GSA regarding decisions concerning maintenance and other functions are sometimes an issue, partly due to NARA's long and sometimes difficult relationship with GSA. As mentioned earlier in Chapter I, NARA was a unit within GSA before it became an independent agency. The split took place at least in part because of Congressional findings that GSA had been charging NARA inflated rent for occupying space in presidential libraries, which had been built with private funds in the first place!

Newton described his level of local discretion for decision-making as rather high, given the weak External Polity of the library. For example, in setting up the databases and creating a presence on the World Wide Web, Newton was able to use FERI funds to do the project, unique among presidential libraries in that the database and web functions are merged. This approach was taken after NARA sponsorship was unavailable or insecure. He got computers and software through the Institute, rather than with government funds. Although it was not well received at NARA initially, according to Newton, the other presidential libraries are now being, encouraged to follow the FDR Library's lead in setting up their own web pages, while NARA concentrated on setting up a NARA-wide database called the Archives Resource Catalog (ARC) for descriptive information. What they have been able to accomplish at the FDR Library in the automation realm has been done with interns, volunteers, Marist college staff, and some private support from IBM. Automation efforts will be addressed in their own section below.


STAFFING

Currently, there are 11 professional staff at the library, plus clerical and administrative staff, for a total of  25. The senior archivist, museum specialist, and administrative officer are similar to department heads, but they are not officially designated as supervisors. Here and at other presidential libraries, the comment was made that "DC doesn't like supervisory positions now." There is no assistant director at the FDR Library.  When the previous one retired in December 1996, she was not replaced. All professionals report to the director. The employees fall into the following categories: six in administration, eight in the archives, one in education, three in the

museum, and seven in the museum store (many store personnel work part time). Most staff have great devotion to the FDR Library but have not worked at NARA or at any other presidential library. Most do not come up through the archives route, and they do not tend to have the broad perspective provided by previous experience in other institutions.

The museum shop is a somewhat self-supporting public service function. While the shop is not part of the core mission of the library, the staff are employed by the federal government. Some library functions, such as maintenance and construction of exhibit projects, are contracted out to private firms.

Recruiting and hiring is controlled by the federal personnel system, making it hard for Newton to enunciate what is distinct about local practices. Resumes are sent to the Office of Personnel Management's central processing unit in the midwest, where they are evaluated and rated. Only after those steps is the director told whom he can interview. The hiring is done on the basis of professional, rather than personal, qualifications. Still, in Newton's view, this is "not the best system." The jobs don't pay enough to lure people to move here, and the federal government pays almost no relocation expenses. Last year the Library had a GS11 opening and recruited a very good candidate, but, given the salary, she could not afford to move to Hyde Park.

The big issue in recruitment is that Newton wants to hire one or more computer specialists, but the request is consistently denied by NARA's Office of Presidential Libraries. When the library's position for a professional librarian was abolished some time ago as a result of downsizing, Newton wanted to hire a person with computer skills, but the request was denied. He felt the skills of a librarian were no longer needed at the library, but since everyone at FDR is self-taught in computers, Newton would really like to be able to hire someone with education and expertise in that area.

Wendell Parks and Raymond Teichman have each been at the FDR Library for more than 20 years and are obviously committed to the institution and its mission. They both expressed some of the inevitable frustrations associated with a chronic lack of staff, money, and most of all space.


BUDGETING

Budgeting at the FDR Library under the NARA rubric appears to be straightforward and incremental from year-to-year. The library's minuscule portion of the federal budget has permanent authorization and goes through Congress via the annual appropriations bill for independent agencies, of which NARA is one. In FY 1997 the library's total costs to taxpayers was $1,559,000.00, almost all of which goes to cover salaries and fixed costs, such as maintenance and repair of the facilities. It broke down to $826,000.00 in program costs and $538,000.00 in building operations costs (NARA Presidential Libraries Statistics, internal document). The Director has only about $60,000 to spend on discretionary items, but again, most of the items purchased are basic, such as office supplies. They simply maintain the status quo.

The more interesting budgeting activity involves the library's relationship with the FERI. Newton presents to the foundation detailed plans for the year, and then he receives gifts of the

items he requested. Gifts are both monetary, for purchasing items such as computers and peripherals, and in-kind, such as supplementary staffing for educational programs.

REVENUE GENERATION

From the FDR Library staff viewpoint it is fortunate that in planning the repository for his archives, FDR insisted on an accompanying museum. He did so despite the objections of the National Archives, which was only two years old itself at the time and completely unfamiliar with museum functions. In retrospect, the decision to include museums with the presidential archives turns out to have been helpful in terms of the admission fees museum visitors generate to support other activities of the presidential libraries. The addition of gift shops to the libraries, as an afterthought for the early libraries and as an integral part of the newer ones, has in most cases generated revenue while providing a service the public desire. In FY 1997, the library generated $345,330 in admissions income. Over-the-counter sales in the gift shop generated $264,600. Reproduction services generated $31,603. Investment and other income amounted to $50,206. All revenues go into NARA's Trust Fund designated for support of the FDR Library, and the cost of goods and services is deducted from the same source, leaving some surplus most years to support the library. After expenses, in FY 1997 the library's net income from these sources was $114,887.

REPORTS FILED WITH NARA

All presidential libraries are supposed to file quarterly reports and annual work plans with the Office of Presidential Libraries at NARA in Washington. Some of the libraries do not always comply, but the FDR Library's current reports and plans were readily available. The FDR Library's 1997 Annual Work Plan appears routine and very similar to the previous year's report. The plan includes sections on Archives, Education, Information Systems, Audio-Visual, Museum, Printed Materials, and Public Programs. Information from this report is incorporated under the appropriate headings below.

The FDR Library's Quarterly Report for April-June 1997 is rather lively, quite specific, and reveals interesting details about the library's internal and external operations. While some sections such as those on processing and preservation are straightforward, documenting the person-hours spent on preservation activities such as making archival electrostatic copies of deteriorating manuscripts and refoldering Eleanor Roosevelt's papers, other sections of the report give less predictable specifics. For example, the audiovisual department provided reproductions to such divergent requestors as ABC News, Zorro Publications, the Book-of-the-Month Club, and Digital Ranch. The automation activities section is long compared to the other sections and displays a high energy level. There was some excitement over the gift of a non-linear editing system called an Amiga Video Flyer from Mrs. Pare Lorentz. This gift will allow the library to digitize its video footage and store it on large hard drives instead of tape, which will provide quicker and higher quality film editing. Videos for classroom use will be created using the new system, with the first project being a documentary on the S.S. St. Louis. Also, a CD writer was acquired so staff and

volunteers can create CD-ROMs of Roosevelt photographs. The grants section of the report announced that during the quarter the Institute awarded $15,320.00 in grants to Roosevelt scholars, nine for dissertations and one for a post-doctoral fellowship. The outreach section shows an impressively broad spectrum of groups with which the library conducted some sort of outreach activities during the quarter. These activities are detailed below under "External Economy."

While all these activities were going on, meetings were held with General Services Administration representatives on asbestos abatement and reinsulation for the library boiler room. Volunteer hours for the quarter were enumerated, and an approximate savings to the library of $7,500.00 was reported as a result of these contributions of time.

INFORMATION SYSTEMS AND TECHNOLOGIES

Computerization for the library is considered the director's "baby" by the staff, and it appears to have been an uphill battle for him. Both the Exhibits Specialist and the Supervisory Archivist expressed some reservations about the energy being expended on the computerization efforts. Since Newton could not get NARA to approve computer-qualified staff, he had to do everything "through the back door." Despite these reservations, one of the projects they do appreciate having been able to undertake because of computerization is the "FDR Day-by-Day" calendar. Newton sees this project as especially important because FDR left such scant written records of what he did each day and why he did it. Researchers can learn a lot by knowing whom the president had been talking to during a given period. So far about 300,000 entries populate the database for the presidential years. The added value of the calendar and all of the finding aids, now that they are computerized, is their searchability online.

The Information Systems portion of the 1997 annual plan emphasized both the automation of internal processes via a Local Area Network/Wide Area Network and a new phone system for high speed transmission of data and multimedia information. With help from local Marist College volunteers and interns, plans continue for further development of the "FDR Day-by-Day" calendar for web access.

Meanwhile, the Audio-Visual section of the 1997 annual plan reported placidly that the library will maintain and upgrade audiovisual equipment as needed.

SERVICE POLICIES

According to all interviewees, the library is both officially, and in fact, neutral in its service policies. Equal service is provided to all researchers. No book reviews or recommendations are produced by library staff because of potential conflicts of interest. The staff abide by their respective professional ethics and provide all records to all users equally. Nevertheless, donor-placed restrictions on deed-of-gift collections are faithfully honored. This requirement is sometimes frustrating to researchers who want access to the restricted documents.

According to Newton, the FDR Library is very democratic (with a small "d") in its service provision. For example, when the television networks call now, they wait their turn for responses, unlike in earlier years when they often got preferential treatment. Questions coming from the White House are most often very specific and relatively easy to answer. White House staff usually want a specific speech, photo, or artifact, and they tend to submit the request through the Office of Presidential Libraries at NARA.

*Internal Economy: Archives Functions*

Raymond Teichman is the Supervisory Archivist in charge of seven other staff, including two archivists, three specialists, and two technicians. Teichman and his staff all provide public service in the researchers' room to about 500 researchers per year, who make around 1,300 visits per year. The staff also respond to correspondence at the rate of 3,000-5,000 requests per year. Everyone at the library seems to understand that researchers are always the top priority. The archival staff are obviously dedicated to the FDR collection and maintaining a thorough professional knowledge of it. Teichman strongly supports decentralization for presidential libraries, primarily because he believes it fosters the archivists' intimate knowledge of their collections.

The Archives section of the 1997 annual plan discussed refining the automated finding aids data base, refoldering and reboxing the Eleanor Roosevelt White House Papers, resubmitting national security classified information directly to the originating agencies for re-review, and serving the researchers who visit or correspond with the library throughout the year.

Likewise, the Printed Materials section of the 1997 annual plan report addressed acquisition of new books and periodicals with selection done by the library director, an archives specialist, and the secretary, since the library has no librarian now.

*Internal Economy: Exhibits/Museum Functions*

The Library has had no Exhibits Curator since 1986, when the previous incumbent retired. Parks, a retired military officer who came to the library as his second career, unofficially took on some of those duties. He is now assisted by a museum aide and a museum technician, who devote 50-100 hours a month to other duties outside their museum functions. Parks himself has spent most of his time for the past three years on loans of FDR artifacts to other institutions. No new exhibits have been mounted here since the World War II exhibit and map room were installed in 1994. Only about 1% of the library's 23,000 museum objects are on display at any one time, so preservation and maintenance of the items in storage have become important functions. Even when there were new exhibits being produced, in recent years the library has contracted out most of the display construction, which used to be done with relish by Parks and other museum staff on site.

Parks revealed some skepticism about the time and money spent on multimedia displays, which he thinks tend to crowd out the artifacts themselves. He seemed especially disturbed that

Albert Einstein's letter warning FDR about the Germans' development of the atomic bomb has been removed from display and filed away, despite the public's frequently expressed interest in it. The electronic displays are more expensive to produce and maintain than traditional exhibits, and Parks fears a potential loss of immediacy for users.

The Museum section of the 1997 annual plan reported such tasks as monitoring the pilot program being developed by NARA to computerize museum collections catalogs, cataloging museum objects which had never been described, and rearranging artifacts in museum storerooms. A new audio exhibit on FDR's "fireside chats" will be considered and cost projections devised. Other routine tasks are to be undertaken as time permits by the museum staff.

*Internal Economy: Education/Outreach*

The Education section of the 1997 annual plan displayed a status quo tone. Perhaps this reflects the fact that there is only one staff member in that department. Development of curriculum materials, a CD-ROM in particular, and pedagogical workshops (with financial support from the Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt Institute) are highlighted under education. The library's educational newsletter is on hold pending reevaluation. Promotion of off-season visits by school groups will be pursued.

The Public Programs section of the 1997 annual plan seems somewhat perfunctory in stating that the library will work with community groups, local colleges, and other interested parties to promote the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library and its resources in the community.

When asked whether there is any conflict between the two missions for the library, i.e., archival preservation and research versus museum exhibits and public programming activities, Newton opined that there is no real conflict over this dichotomy. The presidential libraries, he said, have learned to manage those functions well. Where there is conflict, it is the almost inevitable friction between NARA's central office and the presidential libraries (i.e., the field offices). This situation he described as typical of most federal programs that have field operations with some level of administration in the nation's capital.

*Summary of the FDR Library's Internal Economy*

The Internal Economy of the FDR Library may be described as stable, routine, and reflective of a "mature" presidential library where the physical plant is aging, the major collections are processed and open to the public, and the public programs are constrained by a lack of space and staff. Although a revival looks likely in the near future, with the development of a new Visitors and Convention Center, in 1997 the library appears to have been in a stable, status quo mode. The administrative processes are mainly carried out in traditional, hierarchical manner, with each unit functioning autonomously. System maintenance seems assured, but expansion and exciting new projects are uncertain and dependent upon development of the new center, which has not become a reality to most of the staff. The players have been consistent for the most part over the past 15 years. The impending retirements of key staff will undoubtedly produce changes

of some sort. It is possible that the arrival of new staff, combined with construction and launch of a new facility, will reinvigorate the FDR Library.

The key players outlined above routinely cooperate to promote the interests of the FDR Library, as each of them perceives those interests. Clearly, maintenance of federal funding and staffing for basic operations is assured, but the ability to thrive and attract today's audiences as museum and educational program visitors is dependent on substantial new federal and foundation dollars. Despite struggles with other state and federal entities (NYSHPO, NPS, and GSA), FDR Library staff with NARA's support, the FERI and its board, members of Congress with ties to the library, and other supporters achieved authorization for the addition/renovation project. The internal economy of the library functions effectively enough that these groups achieve their shared desire to affect public policy in support of the library. The impediments to the project arose because other interested parties (NPS, GSA, NYSHPO) supported an addition to the library, but only insofar as the addition also promoted their own particular agendas as well.

### *Internal Polity*(Non-Routine)

*Internal Polity: Normative Structure (Incentive Structures, Dominant Coalition, Socialization, and Interest Articulation and Aggregation)*

INCENTIVE STRUCTURES

Incentive structures for anything other than maintaining equilibrium all seem to lie outside the "core" programs funded by the federal government. Given the shrinking size of the staff, the loss of middle management positions such as the exhibits curator and the assistant director, and federal funding for the bare necessities only, the library's opportunities to prosper or move into new endeavors such as developing its web site or creating multimedia exhibits lie in securing outside funding from the FERI or other sources or finding volunteers and interns to partner with. Garnering this added support requires creativity and entrepreneurialism among the staff. Given such a small staff, who must keep the doors open long hours each week and insure the visitors' comfort, they have little time for such endeavors. What is remarkable is that they have been able to carry out the level of outreach reflected in their reports filed with NARA (previously described under Internal Economy).

NARA does not appear to provide many incentives for outstanding performance in either service to users or cost-saving initiatives. In fact, their oversight appears to be primarily in the areas of compliance with budgetary and other rules and regulations and the submission of routine statistical reports showing the number of visitors and public programs, archival and museum holdings, personnel, and programmatic costs. Assessing the quality of the services provided or users' satisfaction with the services has not been emphasized, although NARA did initiate a pilot visitor survey project in 1995 at its Rotunda Exhibit in Washington and the Office of Presidential

Libraries built on that model in conducting a visitor survey at the Hoover Library. Presumably this effort will be expanded eventually to cover all of the libraries.

DOMINANT COALITION

At the oldest presidential library in the system, now approaching its 60th anniversary, it seems almost inevitable that there would be some friction between long-time staff members and a relatively new director who wants to move in new directions despite the fact that few new resources are available to support these endeavors. The fact that Newton does not hold staff-wide meetings may reduce obvious conflicts, but it probably also promotes some isolation among the staff. There does not appear to be much opportunity for staff "buy-in" for the new projects.

Similarly, Newton's views about a centralized presidential archival facility and his preference for hiring a recent college graduate with computer skills, rather than a professional archivist or librarian, may not enhance staff support for him. My observations lead me to believe that a somewhat uneasy truce exists at the library now. Several retirements in the near future, both in the library and at the FERI, could change things dramatically, as will the completion of the new Visitors and Conference Center.

SOCIALIZATION

Reduced federal support and shrinkage in the number of library staff means the FDR Library must find new ways to accomplish its goals. For example, volunteers and interns are being recruited and trained to produce computerized tools for preserving and accessing the collections. Recent retirements and the approach of several more within the next few years means the library will have both a challenge and an opportunity ahead. When the incumbents retire, it may be difficult to retain all of the positions, since they must first be reviewed and approved by a central personnel committee at NARA in competition with vacancies throughout the entire agency. Filling the positions with qualified staff, given modest salaries and a relatively remote location, will not be easy. Nevertheless, it may give the library a chance to attract some "new blood" with experience in other institutions and more technological skills.

According to respondents, NARA officials want the field offices to be dependent upon them, and they do not want people in the field who know more than they do. Even Newton, however, seemed to have a similar mind-set when he said he'd rather have a 21-year-old college graduate with computer skills than a librarian or archivist any day. Newton believes these new graduates are more useful to him than experienced professionals, because anyone who comes to work at the FDR Library must learn the collection anyway. Young graduates have fewer preconceived notions. The long-term professional staff are probably well aware of the implied disrespect of such statements made by the director.

Obviously, if we assume that breadth of knowledge and expansive outlook are valuable in employees of any institution with an educational mission, one challenge for the FDR Library is to build a broader viewpoint among staff. Almost certainly, along with such an expansion of viewpoint would come greater allegiance to the mission and goals of NARA, rather than just to

the FDR Library as a local institution. Currently many of the employees are local and have not been exposed to the broader system of which the library is one small part. Such activities as NARA's development of online databases, standardized web access mechanisms, and joint traveling exhibits potentially involve all presidential libraries and demand the adoption of this broader viewpoint among staff system-wide. Once the required socialization has taken place and new policies are stable, they will fold into the internal economy and become routine.


INTEREST ARTICULATION AND AGGREGATION

An example of interest articulation and aggregation at the FDR Library is exhibited in the library's relationships with other partners in the current renovation/building addition project. The planning for this project goes back at least to 1992. By 1994 Congress had appropriated $500,000 to initiate planning for the renovation. At first NARA and FERI alone worked with GSA on behalf of the library to design a new visitor and conference center on NARA property just north of the existing library. Among the long-standing problems they were trying to address were public spaces in the basement, including the auditorium, gift shop, vending area, and rest rooms, some of them inaccessible to the handicapped; the lack of temporary exhibit space, which has meant the library cannot accommodate traveling exhibits, with the ultimate irony being its inability to host NARA's traveling commemoration of World War II; and lack of space for educational and public programs.

NARA's work with GSA produced a proposal for a 25,000 square foot building. That proposal was soon declared unacceptable by the N.Y. State Historic Preservation Office (NYSHPO). Unfortunately, simultaneous with development of the new building plans, a major project for building repairs at the FDR Library (slightly more than $1,750,000 authorized in July 1991) was initiated under GSA auspices. Even after eight years, the repair project is still causing concern as a result of significant problems between the library and GSA, litigation with the first prime contractor hired to carry out the work, and NYSHPO concerns. The lingering effects of the now completed repair project have soured some elements of the new building's development.

Eventually, NARA and FERI agreed with NYSHPO that an alternative site would be preferable to the first one proposed. By 1996 the National Park Service (which runs the Roosevelt home and the estate) had entered discussions with NARA, NYSHPO, and FERI to build the new facility on one of two sites located on NPS property. Eventually a preferred site was agreed upon by NARA, NPS, and FERI, and this site received NYSHPO approval. Negotiations were initiated in 1998 with an architect, and work on design has now begun. Design is scheduled to be completed by September 1999, and dedication of the new facility and renovation of the existing Library is scheduled for completion in 2001.

By FY1997 Congress appropriated to NARA $4 million for the FDR project, with an additional $4 million in FY1998. The FERI has committed itself to raising another $4 million in private funds. As of December, 1998 the estimated cost of the new facility is $12,200,000.

*Internal Polity: Leadership Attributes of the Director*

Newton offered the following sentiments, which he himself described as heretical. If he were in Congress today, with the budget balancing initiatives and other constraints, he would leave the presidential archives in Washington, DC, with an office to oversee them and provide access to them. If future presidents want museums for themselves, let them build their own, presumably through private fund-raising.

One of Newton's primary reasons for holding this view is that, especially for overseas researchers, but in fact for all researchers, the cost and time involved in presidential research under the current system is high. Also, because presidential libraries house only the White House documents for a given presidency, while the agency papers are in DC, researchers must go to Washington anyway to see the full picture of a period or historical event. Most importantly, the cost the government incurs to maintain these research centers, Newton said, is out of proportion to their benefit. Viewed in a less romanticized way, the archival side of the presidential libraries' operation is not self-supporting. The country could provide better service to researchers at a central facility and at less cost.

This is not a view shared by many staff or stakeholders active in the Presidential Library System policy subsystem.

*Internal Polity: Rule-making, application, and adjudication mechanisms*

Numerous federal government rules and regulations must be applied daily at the FDR Library, such as special procurement procedures for equipment and supplies purchases and compliance with federal personnel guidelines. Nevertheless, most rules directly affecting presidential libraries, such as those defined in the Presidential Records Act dealing with ownership and access rights to presidential records under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) and Executive Order (E.O.) 12958 dealing with declassification of records, have much less impact on the FDR Library than on the more recent libraries. This is because the FDR materials came into government ownership through deed-of-gift and most have long been declassified. Nevertheless, the library will probably always have to continue to some extent the process of resubmitting national security classified information directly to the agencies for re-review and declassification under E.O. 12958.

Another area of compliance with NARA's rules, initiation of new information technologies, illustrates the autonomy of the individual presidential libraries in the development of their web pages. In the view of some staff at all of the presidential libraries I visited, NARA appears to be dragging its feet in setting up web page support and initiatives. This is a political matter, rather than an economic matter. NARA is trying to make the system fit all of the different types of NARA components throughout the country, which will be very difficult. Meanwhile, Newton is not willing to penalize his users by waiting, so he went ahead and started his own project for a web site with outside support. It turns out this happened at *all* of the presidential

libraries, and the result today is, although all the sites are linked to NARA's home page, they all have different domain names. Most of these domain names have nothing to do with NARA, or even the federal government! The FDR Library's web address points users to Marist College, a private school just down the road. Staff at the Office of Presidential Libraries admit that having presidential library web sites hosted by lots of different domain names in unaffiliated institutions has become awkward for NARA's automation office.

*Summary of the FDR Library's Internal Polity*

At this point, as we will see, the external economic and political environments of the FDR Library appear consonant enough with the internal political structure and processes to provide adequate stability and functionality. Staff size has been dwindling since the 1980s, and there has been little turnover among key staff. Staff roles are well-defined and do not appear to be seriously questioned. The director's arrival in 1991 apparently did not signal major changes, other than his computerization efforts. The broad questions of survival, institutional goals, and legitimacy of function were settled long ago and do not appear to be challenged in any significant way. Again, some of this stability will probably change with the advent of the new building and replacement staff when the current "department heads" retire, assuming that people from outside the library are hired. There is no evidence of any strategic planning or other efforts that might change the internal polity in the near future.

Struggles in the internal polity over such issues as computerization, i.e., NARA's unwillingness to authorize job descriptions for positions devoted to computer skills and some reluctance on the part of long-time staff to embrace these technologies, inevitably affect policy. NARA's acknowledgment of some controversy over the way the libraries have had to develop their web sites independently and with little help or guidance from the central office may change this policy stance in the future. To be fair, I should state that NARA never forbid computer skills from appearing as part of job descriptions devoted to specific tasks such as archival processing or exhibit curator functions. What the central office did try to assure that there was consistency and a modicum of centralized planning for major information access databases and other system-wide computerization initiatives. By late 1998 NARA policies and procedures dealing with automation in the field were beginning to adapt to the rapidly changing technology environment.

**External Economy (Routine)**

*External Economy: Local Economy including the Labor Pool and Employment Rate*

According to a NARA employee at another presidential library who formerly worked at Hyde Park, the FDR Library is the town's leading "citizen." In Hyde Park the library can get a front page story any day, in both the town newspaper and the Poughkeepsie Journal. Over the

years, many of the public meetings in Hyde Park have been held at the FDR Library because they had the only auditorium in town.

During the April-June 1997 quarter, in addition to groups one would expect the library to be interacting with, such as a local chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution, the education specialist spoke to 73 members of a local GALA (Gay and Lesbians Alliance) group at the Unitarian Church. The library director seemed to be speaking to or participating in meetings of external groups several times each week. For example, in June, Newton moderated a panel discussion at a premier screening sponsored by the Hudson Valley Film and Video Office, attended a Hyde Park Chamber of Commerce meeting on the future of the town held a few miles down the road at the Culinary Institute of America, attended a Distinguished Citizens Award dinner honoring the Vice President of the Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt Institute, and was guest speaker at the Rotary Youth Leadership Awards Conference at a local school. Farther afield, Newton participated in several events associated with the dedication of the new FDR Memorial at the Tidal Basin in Washington, DC As part of the festivities, he was a guest on C-Span, provided commentary on MSNBC, attended a White House ceremony hosted by Mrs. Clinton, and attended the 1997 Four Freedoms Awards dinner hosted by the Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt Institute.

Back in Hyde Park, the library entertained Prince Andrew, Duke of York, as well as FDR's granddaughter, Nina Roosevelt, and her class from nearby Winward School, where she is a teacher. A May 28 meeting was held at the library with representatives from NARA, the National Park Service, the New York State Historic Preservation Office, the General Services Administration, the Cannon Group, and the Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt Institute to discuss the plans for the new visitors center. Plans were underway for a September 25 "Day in Hyde Park" to include a meeting of the Institute's board of directors, a luncheon, a memorial service for former FDR Library Director William R. Emerson, and an evening discussion of "America, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and the Holocaust" by William vanden Heuvel and Henry Morgenthau III.

The FDR Library is dependent largely on the local labor pool for staff. Newton reported that recruiting staff for the library who have experience in other presidential libraries or at NARA is difficult because the salaries are not high enough to entice someone already in the system to move, and the federal government does not pay moving expenses. Also, Hyde Park's rural character may make it somewhat less desirable for young, upwardly mobile professionals. It is safe to assume that FDR Library jobs are attractive to locals with college degrees, because other options in the area are limited and the federal salary scale is adequate if one does not have to move.

Newton's biggest headache is trying to recruit and retain staff with computer skills. As noted above, since NARA will not approve positions for the field offices devoted exclusively to computer skills, he is depending largely upon interns and volunteers to do this work. Nevertheless, Newton seems proud of the partnership he has worked out with nearby Marist College for both interns and as a site for mounting the library's web page.

*External Economy: Stability and Vitality of the General Economy*


The effect of the general economy on presidential libraries is rarely addressed directly in NARA documents or by NARA staff. Nevertheless, a February 1998 internal NARA document titled "Library Expansions Analysis" provides an overview of the history of the political economy surrounding presidential library expansions. This document addresses the role of private and public funding in such projects, especially the importance of a powerful sponsor in Congress and an active foundation, along with the rationale for expansions, and the criteria for funding them. Although the document deals only with expansion projects, it is illustrative of general funding issues for anything in presidential libraries beyond baseline, status quo funding for personnel, travel, and general operational and maintenance costs. The document states "…even with a Congressional patron, much depends on the general budget climate. As can be seen with the paucity of Government-funded projects in recent years, the Congress appears hesitant to take on large projects in a time of budget constraints." In fact, no presidential library projects since the Carter administration have been funded purely with government funds.

A "snapshot" of the current general economic climate and its effect on presidential libraries follows. Like all of the presidential libraries and their foundations, the FDR Library appears to be benefiting from a robust national economy, a somewhat more generous Congress than in the 1980s, and increased tourism.

Most significantly, under the sponsorship and leadership of Senator Daniel Patrick Moyhihan (D-NY) and a vibrant foundation (FERI), in 1998 the FDR Library is initiating construction of a new Visitor and Conference Center facility at a total cost of $11.5 million. FERI has agreed to raise more than one-third of the money, or $4 million. As mentioned earlier, the project has had a difficult birth since the initial appropriation of $500,000 to NARA in FY1994 for planning purposes. Nevertheless, the projects realization would appear to be connected, at least in part, to more favorable economy in the last several years.

Only a freak snow storm in April 1996, which forced a six-day closing, prevented the library from increasing its visitorship over the previous year. The library optimistically anticipates increased interest in the Roosevelts as a result of the impressive new FDR Memorial in Washington, DC

Likewise, the FERI appears robust under active leadership of its CEO and Executive Director, and a good economy does not hurt in fund-raising and public programming. It's commitment to raising $4 million for the expansion project is a good indication of its vitality.


*External Economy: Overall Perception of "what we can afford" as a country*


Verne Newton's views on decentralization of presidential libraries reflect those held by a number of people, especially the vocal critics of the Presidential Library System. Nevertheless,

there does not appear to be a dominant movement in the country to articulate the position that "we cannot afford" to continue building individual presidential libraries throughout the country. Despite recurrent opinion pieces such as Roger Rosenblatt's December 1997 New Republic piece titled "Underbooked: Our Empty Presidential Libraries," new libraries continue to be planned and to receive Congressional approval. Even as Rosenblatt was writing his article, plans for the Bill Clinton library in Little Rock, Arkansas were announced. The policy point here appears to be about what we, as a society, have decided we must have more than what we can afford, i.e. what we cannot afford *not* to have.

Students of the NARA Presidential Library System budget should also note that the agency's one presidential materials collection not housed in its own library, i.e., the Nixon Presidential Materials Project at Archives II in suburban Washington, had a FY1997 budget of $1.04 million, very similar to that of the individual presidential libraries housed in privately built facilities. This undercuts the budgetary argument made by the system's critics, who assume that a central facility for presidential archival materials would cost less than the current decentralized arrangement.

*External Economy: Government Funding for the Library/PLS*

Newton cautioned me to remember that NARA is a relatively small federal agency without a well-defined constituency. It is sometimes hard to get the necessary support in Congress. Former Senator Mark Hatfield (R-OR) was always a strong supporter of the Presidential Libraries, but he was atypical. Other supporters in Congress are the Senators and Representatives who have presidential libraries in their districts. More typical, however, are the sometimes vocal critics, such as Senator Chiles and Representative Gingrich (R-GA), who see the libraries as obvious targets for budget cuts.

As noted earlier, actual federal government costs for the FDR Library in FY 1997 were $1,559,000, including personnel, building operations and maintenance, and repairs and alterations to the facilities. Like all presidential libraries, the FDR Library's budget has permanent authorization and goes through Congress via the annual appropriations bill for independent agencies, of which NARA is one. Critics or no, having and funding the Presidential Library System is government policy.

*Summary of the FDR Library's External Economy*

Clearly, the revival of the FDR Library's private foundation support in the 1980s has bolstered the survival and enhancement of the library. Full development of the FERI is the key element in the external economy and polity of the FDR Library. FERI has had a stabilizing effect on the library's future, because without it, the library would be unable to do anything other than exist in an impoverished way. Being an older library and one with little space or staff to promote public programs and activities, the library's need for foundation and local community support has

become the key element in  its ability to thrive. Implementation of the Visitors and Conference Center now depends on outside funding as much as it does federal support.

To achieve its new building, the FDR Library had to seize the small window of external economic opportunity which presented itself in the early 1990s, and it had to survive the almost inevitable conflicts with other interested parties. Continued attention to relations with the FERI and its board must always be the primary concern of the FDR Library and its director. Likewise, the eventual retirement of strong Congressional supporters such as Senators Moynihan (D-NY) and Sarbanes (D-MD) will also require that the director recruit new supporters to take their place.

### *External Polity (Non-routine)*

*External Polity: Relations with the former President and/or his family*

An enormous difference exists between presidential libraries with a living former president and/or first lady, versus one where the president and first lady have died. The former naturally provide their libraries with more opportunities for controlling/altering incentives through activities and resources for fund-raising. The rhythm, direction, and pace of the library are determined by the first family when they are still around. The FDR Library never had a living former president, nor fund-raising until the last decade or so. The original fund-raising group that built the Library disbanded shortly after the building was turned over to the federal government.

Nevertheless, the Roosevelt family continues to play a role in the everyday life of the library. For example, on May 6, 1997, President and Mrs. Roosevelt's grandaughter, Nina Roosevelt, visited the library with her class of students from the Winward School in White Plains, New York. Likewise, there are usually from three to five members of the Roosevelt family on the board of the FERI helping it to fulfill its mission "to inform new generations of the ideals and achievements of Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt…."

*External Polity: Relations with Congress*

As is the case with most presidential libraries, direct relationships between the FDR Library and Congress are sometimes complex, but there appears to be routine and effective communication between the library and NARA about these activities. As noted above, the sponsorship of Senator Moynihan (D-NY) was essential is getting Congressional approval for the current building project at the library. There are usually several current and former members of Congress on the FERI board, including in recent years Senators Moynihan (D-NY), Claiborne Pell (D-RI), and Paul

Sarbanes (D-MD).

*Prominent Friends*

THE FRANKLIN AND ELEANOR ROOSEVELT INSTITUTE (FERI)

The Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt Institute (FERI) is the private foundation that supports the FDR Library and the Roosevelt Study Center in Middelburg, the Netherlands. The study center was founded in 1986 by the Roosevelt Institute and the Province of Zeeland to promote the study of American history in Europe, where few resources exist for understanding the American past. Referred to as "The Institute," FERI was formed in March 1987 from the merger of the Eleanor Roosevelt Institute and the Four Freedoms Foundation. FERI became strong and active around the time of the 1982 centennial of FDR's birth. Now it is an exceptionally sound foundation. Its approximately 100-member board is made up of very influential people, including members of Congress and presidential cabinets, businessmen and women, at least four or five members of the Roosevelt family, former members of the FDR administration, historians, judges, and others. In addition to former ambassador William vanden Heuvel as CEO, FERI co-chairs are historian Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., and Trude Lash, confidant of President and Mrs. Roosevelt.

Newton sees them as the program arm for the FDR Library. The Institute tries to meet any need the Library has. FERI understands the Library's priorities, such as funding internships and children's programs. The Institute hires instructors and provides full support for these projects. It also buys all the books and periodicals, computers, and software for the Library.

Newton's "discretionary" federal funds are no more than about $60,000 per year for preservation, books, and all the other "optional" purchases. The Institute's budget is about $750,000, with 4 full-time staff.    The Institute is now in the midst of a capital campaign to raise the millions of dollars it has committed to provide for a partial match of the federal funds already authorized for building a new conference and visitor's center at the FDR Library.

Sometimes those involved in the foundations affiliated with presidential libraries believe that NARA takes advantage of them and avoids paying its appropriate share of the cost of  core programs. The definition of what constitutes a "core program," which should be paid for by the government, is a perennial issue. It is through this issue of definition that NARA attempts to continue or alter incentives and thereby influence the allocation of values.

Newton works with the Institute throughout the FDR Library's planning process. The Institute funds formal plans as proposed by the Library, such as computer purchases. In other words, Newton "accepts gifts" of the items he has previously requested. The Institute definitely sees itself as the torch-bearer for FDR and his reputation. Most of the individuals involved there have ties to FDR in one way or another. These ties, and the resources flowing from them, become the "yes" in response to NARA's "no," allowing both "sides" to see themselves as political winners.

My request for information from the FERI was answered promptly and included a number of brochures, two issues of the substantial, thrice per year newsletter The View From Hyde Park:

The Newsletter of the Roosevelt Institute and Library, and a draft copy of the lengthy document titled "A Decade's Report, 1987-97." Despite all of this helpful information, I did not receive what I specifically requested - a financial statement showing exactly how much support FERI provided the FDR Library in the most recent year for which data are available.

FERI's reluctance to provide detailed financial information, particularly about its direct support for the FDR Library, is somewhat puzzling. One wonders why any non-profit foundation would be reluctant to reveal the good works it is engaged in. When I asked interviewees about this phenomenon, they tended to shrug their shoulders and say it would be hard to put a dollar amount on the support because so much of it is in the form of in-kind, rather than monetary, transactions. I suspect this situation is fostered as well by the library administrators who would just as soon shield their outside support from too much NARA scrutiny.

It *is* surprising that Congress has never insisted the information be provided. That may be because, under the legislative authority for the libraries up through the Ronald Reagan administration, there was no endowment requirement for the libraries. For all libraries prior to the new George Bush Library, once the library building was donated to NARA, all basic library operations became a federal responsibility, with or without private funding. Beginning with the Bush Library, all presidential libraries must have privately funded endowments in place from the moment they commence operations.

Throughout the research for this dissertation, this stance of secrecy about their finances was taken by most presidential library foundations. Limits of time prevented me from filing requests with the Internal Revenue Service under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) for the tax returns of these tax-exempt institutions, but that will definitely be a project I plan to undertake before pursuing the research for monographic publication. For our purposes here, today's politically contentious climate has obviously prompted these groups to try to avoid criticism and controversy by limiting public knowledge of their most sensitive information.

The FERI's Decade's Report opens with a mission statement "to inform new generations of the ideals and achievements of Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt…" and goes on to directly declare its goal to support the FDR Library in Hyde Park and the Roosevelt Study Center in the Netherlands as forums for research, teaching, and debate. The first section of the report focuses on the FDR Library and states that NARA regards FERI as the FDR Library's private-sector partner. The report acknowledges the Institute's role in selecting Verne Newton as Director and notes the constant communication between FERI and the Library.

FERI's president since 1984, former ambassador William J. vanden Heuvel, is portrayed as an active member of the National Archives Advisory Committee on Presidential Libraries, which advises the Archivist of the United States and the Deputy Archivist for Presidential Libraries on the direction and support for the presidential library system.

The eponymous Robert L. Beir Education Center established at the FDR Library in 1996 by the FERI Vice President is described. Other improvements at the Library are also noted, including the Aitken Gallery,  the new replication of the FDR White House Dining Room, the 1993 renovation of space for the Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. Research Room,  and most significantly,

FERI's commitment of $4 million in support of NARA's $13 million project to build a new Visitor's and Conference Center adjacent to the Library.

Educational and intellectual initiatives include the endowment of the Schlesinger Fellowship Program to provide stipends for historians working on FERI-commissioned projects, the Grants-in-Aid program, which has funded over $300,000 for 265 scholars to undertake research at the FDR Library, and the William R. Emerson Archival Internship program for annual stipends to undergraduate students interested in archival, manuscript, or research library careers. The FDR Library Fund makes available to the Library  unrestricted contributions of funds raised by FERI for such necessities as the purchase of computer hardware and software, books, and other items not possible to squeeze from the lean federal budget provided by NARA.

After six pages documenting the direct support for the FDR Library, the report goes on to enumerate support for the Roosevelt/Vanderbilt National Historic Site, Top Cottage, the New Deal Network (http://newdeal.feri.org) website, NEH Summer Institutes, and other endeavors. Many of the educational projects involve cooperation with the FDR Library's Education Specialist and conferences conducted at the Library.

Awards programs sponsored by FERI include the prestigious annual Four Freedoms Awards, with presentations alternating between the FDR Library in Hyde Park and the Roosevelt Study Center in Middelburg, the Netherlands; the FDR International Disability Award; the Theodore and Franklin D. Roosevelt Naval History Prize; and the Theodore Roosevelt American History Award.

The FERI President and CEO, who serves gratis, is responsible for carrying out the directives of the 100 member Board, as well as staffing the Institute. Nine paid FERI staff  are led by an Executive Director, John F. Sears, who has a Ph.D. in American civilization and is a former professor at Vassar College. The Institute has about 350 members and manages an endowment of over $9 million. Its policy is to spend only the interest and dividend income from these funds.

*Prominent Enemies*

NONE AT PRESENT

As noted in Chapter I, over the past 60 years there have been both critics and champions among the FDR Library user groups. Recent controversies have been few, perhaps because of the library's status as a "mature library," the fact that all of its FDR archival collections have been processed and opened to the public, and refinements in NARA's nationwide access policies. Nevertheless, the library must always be vigilant about maintaining its support among these prominent constituents. It is especially important that library staff implement access policies in a strictly impartial manner. Likewise, they should explain to users exactly why certain archival collections or artifacts may be restricted and temporarily or permanently unavailable for access. Potential controversies must be dealt with promptly, and administrators notified immediately for potential intervention.

*Summary of the FDR Library's External Polity*

The FDR Library's success in its relationship with the external political environment is directly related to the vitality of the FERI. Because the library staff, with the possible exception of the director, do not appear to be particularly well connected to external groups, the FERI's having effective connections with the larger political environment becomes even more important. Another key element in the FDR Library's ability to thrive is the NARA establishment itself, especially the central personnel committee, which passes judgment on whether vacancies at the libraries can be filled and/or new positions approved. In the era of shrinking staffs and flat budgets, this factor in a library's functionality is both political and economic. The decision at NARA to eliminate key positions at the FDR Library when the incumbents retired or left has had an impact on the library's ability to thrive. The elimination of the Exhibits Curator, Librarian, and Assistant Director positions has meant that the library is more and more dependent on the FERI for its survival and ability to launch new initiatives such as computerization. This situation also requires that the director spend a great deal of his time cultivating local and national visibility and support for the library through his own personal outreach activities.

An inventory of the FDR Library's political intervenors during the 1990s must include a powerful Senator and a former ambassador, now CEO of the FERI, who helped get the funding for a much needed addition. A former professor from Vassar became an effective Executive Director of the FERI. Simultaneously, the power and visibility of the library's potential foes, mostly disgruntled historians, diminished over the past several decades. The needs of more recent presidential libraries which have numerous prominent allies and crushing demands to get documents processed and available to the public as quickly as possible has diminished the FDR Library's ability to compete in getting staff vacancies retained and approved through NARA's personnel committee.

***FDR Library Political Economy Quadrants Summary Chart***

| ***Factors Affecting FDR Internal Economy*** | ***Factors Affecting FDR External Economy*** |
|---|---|
| • Physical plant is aging, but a new Visitor Center is forthcoming<br>• Major collections are processed and open<br>• Staffing is minimal, with little turnover for the past 15 years<br>• Decision-making is informal, decentralized.<br>• Interactions with other federal agencies are decentralized, dependent on personal contacts<br>• The federal budget sustains metabolism<br>• New initiatives are funded by FERI or grants<br>• A computer skills position is not authorized, so these efforts are ad hoc<br>• Archives, museum, and education functions occur in a stable, routine manner | • Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt Institute is vital and provides key private funding<br>• Government funding provides only basic metabolism<br>• The FDR Library is Hyde Park's leading "citizen"<br>• The local labor pool provides most of the staff<br>• Interest in the Roosevelts is expected to increase with the opening of the new FDR Memorial in D.C.<br>• The FDR Library's place in society is secure, but its ability to thrive depends on private support |
| ***Factors Affecting FDR Internal Polity*** | ***Factors Affecting FDR External Polity*** |
| • A shrinking staff with very low turnover appears stable and rather traditional<br>• Staff are isolated in that there are no regular staff meetings, nor serious strategic planning<br>• "New" projects such as computerization are done by volunteers and interns<br>• Laws and regulations such as the Presidential Records Act and E.O. 12958 do not have a direct effect on older libraries such as the FDR<br>• Allegiance to the Roosevelts, their principles, and the library is the common denominator among the staff | • The FDR Library never had a living former President to help with fund-raising and p.r.<br>• Roosevelt descendants are active in the FERI and support the library in numerous ways<br>• Direct Congressional relations are managed by NARA and appear cordial (i.e., funding for the Visitor Center was approved)<br>• Several current and former members of Congress sit on the FERI Board<br>• Relations with historians and other constituents appear calm at present |

### *Characteristics of The FDR Library As a Policy Subsystem*

The following description of the FDR Library was derived from applying the variable characteristics of a policy subsystem from Wamsley and Milward and Wamsley, numbers 4-11 from the list of characteristics in Chapter II. Note that numbers 1-3 (recall pp. 36-37) in the list are statements of fact, not variables, and they will be dealt with only in the conclusions section, Chapter VII. Each variable addressed below is either a dichotomy (for example, the FDR Library *is* or *is not* a system) or a continuum (for example, the FDR Library staff may be described along a continuum from collegial to adversarial).

Characteristic 4.

"Policy subsystems are systems in the sense that the variables that comprise them are interrelated so that a change in one variable results in a change in others. Members of policy subsystems are thus **functionally interdependent** or interrelated; in some, members have close symbiotic relationships, in others members have worked out guarded truces, while in still others members are engaged in open competition or aggressive interaction." Their general effects "generally do **not** represent conscious, planned centrally coordinated, **macro-rationality**." "The behavior of individuals within a policy subsystem exhibits **micro-rationality**; i.e., these individuals reflect functional activity of the subsystem and their roles; these roles provide determinate goals, rationales, and calculable strategies that are rational for the individual actors within the context of the subsystem." *(M&W #3, #12, #11)*

The first sentence is an hypothesis, which I judge to be correct, and a dichotomous *variable* (i.e., the Presidential Library System is or is not a system). The relationships are *variable* and they offer the opportunity to devise a Likert scale along the continuum from collegial relationships to adversarial. I must describe individuals' behavior and their relationships.

Yes, the FDR Library fits the definition of a system. For example, its ability to survive at all depends on its continuing functional relationship with NARA for filling staff vacancies and managing projects such as the visitor center addition and renovation. That building project itself started out as a simple and straightforward addition for the library, under its own discretion in consultation with NARA, an example of microrationality. Before long, the project became much more complex and its progress slowed when other interested parties with different microrationalities (the NPS, the NYSHPO, FERI, GSA, and others) became involved. Even with

all these interested parties, the project still would not have been funded without the support of a powerful member of Congress.

The FDR staff exhibit a moderate level of collegiality, despite some apparent isolation due to infrequent staff meetings and a status quo atmosphere. Again, participants operate on the basis of their individual microrationalities and roles within the subsystem. The limitations of space and flexibility in the current building, the fully processed and open status of almost all archival collections, and the inability to host temporary exhibits has meant pretty static staff roles with few opportunities for growth or new initiatives. The completion of the new facility and some impending retirements will  have an effect on these roles, for good or ill in terms of collegiality.


Characteristic 5.

"Policy subsystems in the American system cut across the conventional divisions of power (legislative, executive, and judicial) and levels of government with **varied internal distributions of power**." "The configuration of power within policy subsystems varies widely from one to another. Some are dominated by one or a few very powerful actors, but in others power may be relatively diffuse." *(M&W #5 and #6)*


*Variable*: The "internal distribution of power" can range from a narrowly dispersed distribution of internal power (very few powerful leaders) to widely dispersed powerful leaders.


The FDR Library exhibits very few powerful leaders, primarily the library director and the CEO of the FERI. The small size and geographic isolation of the library, along with the career stage of several key staff members (approaching retirement) appears to influence the personnel not to take an assertive role in the policy subsystem. Relationships with the local and state partners appear to be managed largely by the director, as are those with FERI. Relationships with most NARA contacts are handled in a decentralized manner, but those with GSA and NPS are handled at the director's level.


Characteristic 6.

"The structure of **functional differentiation**, or, in some cases, task interdependency, also varies; in some it is consciously structured and interrelated in complex ways, others will have much less interdependence or it will exist on an unconscious level." *(M&W #6)*


*Variable*: From consciously structured to unconsciously structured.

The FDR Library operates in a consciously structured manner as a traditionally organized institution, interrelated with its internal and external partners in a complex web of associations. There is a clear distinction between the museum and archival functions. Nevertheless, some staff, such as the museum aide and museum technician, are assigned to non-museum duties between 50 and 100 hours per month.

Lacking large assets in its NARA Trust Fund (at approximately $800,000.00 it is the fourth largest among the presidential libraries) and with shrinking federal staffing, the library has to constantly cultivate its relationships with FERI, Marist College, the local community, and other groups in order to fulfill its mission. This reliance on "outsiders" to carry out core functions such as computerization of files and world wide web outreach activities creates some tension within the organization. The activities necessary to sustain these relationships fall heavily on the director, with support from the Education Specialist.

Characteristic 7.

"Policy subsystems manifest a **normative order**. Some are replete with symbols, myths, rituals, and sometimes a special language which reflects the intersubjective reality of the members or their consensus as to what is important, desirable, and right. Referred to by some as a 'constitution,' it has the effect of legitimating and delegitimating behaviors, reaffirming intersubjective reality, and of enhancing exclusivity and autonomy." *(M&W #7)*

*Variable:* Each policy subsystem exhibits a visible normative order to a greater

or lesser extent.

The normative order at the FDR Library is quite visible and based on allegiance to both Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt and the principles they stood for. The staff are proud of being the first presidential library in the system and even more proud of their expert knowledge of the president and his wife, their lives, and the historical period they influenced. Another source of pride is the library's status as the "leading citizen" in town. The staff I interviewed, with the exception of the director, strongly support the decentralized nature of presidential libraries.

Nevertheless, staff appeared frustrated with the cramped and dated quarters they must survive in, which prevents them from undertaking exciting new projects such as exhibits and educational programs. The development of online and interactive systems (and the potential excitement and creativity inherent in that process) has been carried out primarily with volunteers and interns, not with permanent staff. The new building has been so slow in materializing, so staff find it hard to focus on it as a palpable solution to this problem.

Characteristic 8.

Policy subsystems are "comprised of actors seeking to influence the authoritative **allocation of values**, be it rewards (dollars, services, status, benign neglect) or deprivation (regulations, taxation, conscription, punishment, status denigration)" (W. p. 77-78). policy subsystems "have embedded in them an opportunity or incentive structure. Functional interaction holds forth the prospect of affecting public policy either in formulation or implementation, i.e., interaction has payoffs that, while by no means certain, nonetheless seem plausible to members." *(M&W #10)*

*Variable:* Each of the policy subsystems described in the dissertation, and the overall policy subsystem of the Presidential Library System, is more or less successful in influencing the "allocation of values" (i.e., does a better or worse job of taking advantage of its available resources in all sectors of government and the private sector to promote its health and viability, i.e. funding, clear mission, passionate supporters, etc.).

By "allocation of values" I mean basically what Congress approves for the budgets and authorizing legislation for the presidential libraries. These are the public funds which require for passage at least some agreement among various powerful actors. In turn, the work of the presidential library foundations is influenced by what happens with the public funding. It is a complex interweaving of what each sees as its particular responsibilities and what each is willing to pay for.

There can be little doubt that the players throughout the FDR Library subsystem have been successful in recent years in enhancing the status and resources of their library through every available means. The authorization to build the new Visitors Center with a combination of public and private funds is a prime example.

Among the players highlighted in these recent endeavors are the bureaucrats employed by the library and its parent agency, NARA; the approximately 350 members of FERI (especially the 100 members of its Board); Roosevelt scholars, who depend on the library for access to the archives; library volunteers; Marist College partners, who have fostered the library's presence on the world wide web; local merchants and tourism promoters, who depend on library visitors for at least some of their livelihoods; and many others.

Characteristic 9.

Policy subsystems are "heterogeneous, have variable **cohesion** and they exhibit internal **complexity**." (W., p. 78) "policy subsystems are comprised of multifarious actors: institutions, organizations, groups, and individuals linked on the basis of shared and salient interests in a particular policy. In the American polity these might include

bureaucratic agencies from all levels of government, interest groups, legislative committees and subcommittees, powerful individuals, or relevant others." *(M&W #8)*

Variable: Each library and the Presidential Library System have 1) more or less cohesion and 2) more or less internal complexity. It is possible for a library to have any level of combination of these two variables.

Given the FDR Library's small size in terms of physical space and staffing, one might assume it would exhibit a high level of cohesion among the staff, but that does not appear to be the case. The archival, exhibits, and gift shop staff seem to operate rather independently, while the education component is minuscule and almost totally dependent on private support from the FERI. The lack of regular staff meetings possibly exacerbates this situation. Relations with the National Park Service, which operates the Roosevelt home and the estate grounds, appear to be handled through the director's office for the most part. All these factors enhance the internal complexity of the organization, along with its isolation from similar institutions. Therefore, we have a library with a high degree of internal complexity, but a low degree of cohesion.

Characteristic 10.

Policy subsystems have "an unremitting drive for **functional autonomy** on the part of those interests which are dominant in a subsystem at any given point in time." (W. p. 78) "policy subsystems are subsystems of the larger political system; related to it but in varying degrees of intensity and richness. All have established some degree of autonomy from the larger system." *(M&W #4)* "Self perpetuation of the policy subsystem is the most consistently shared goal of participants. If authority and funding of its correlated programs or its functional autonomy are threatened, this will tend to enhance consensus." *(M&W #13)*

*Variable*: Each policy subsystem described is more or less autonomous at this

moment in terms of its balance of powers and functional activities in relation to its "larger political system"-NARA, and in terms of its feelings of security about its perpetuation.

One of the best examples of this phenomenon from the FDR Library is the planning for the new visitors and conference center at site. Although the library initially planned to undertake this project on its own, save with NARA's help in securing Congressional support and funding, that plan failed to take account of the other interested parties who wanted to influence the process and the outcome of any initiatives at the FDR Library. Among these parties were the National Park Service, the Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt

Institute, and the NY State Historic Preservation Office. Shifts in power and influence are constant, if sometimes subtle. I believe the complexity of the drive for functional autonomy among the various participants in the FDR Library policy subsystem has increased over the past decade with the revival of the FERI and plans for an addition to the complex. Therefore, the library has much less functional autonomy than it would like to have.


    Characteristic 11.

    Policy subsystems have "an identifiable core of **horizontal integration**. Unfortunately, most of the research tended to see this horizontal integration as confined to the agency or agencies with statutory responsibility, interest groups and relevant legislative committees or subcommittees. Thus they gave impetus to the oversimplistic metaphor of the 'iron triangle'." (W., p. 78) AND "**vertical integration** is a part of policy subsystems. Interest groups, program managers and program professionals can be found systematically linked through all layers of the federal government into what the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations called 'vertical functional autocracies'." (W., p. 78) "The linkages between units of a policy subsystem are vertical as well as horizontal so that a policy subsystem may consist of horizontal cluster at different levels which are liked to one another vertically to form the overall system. For example there can be linkages among health agencies in a city as well as each agency being linked to separate state and federal agencies." (M&W #9)


    *Variable*: Each policy subsystem described has more or less horizontal

    and vertical integration.


    Again, the descriptions in this chapter illustrate that the daily operations of the FDR Library do not allow it the luxury of dependence upon strict integration only within its agency (NARA), its interest group (FERI), or its congressional structure (the Government Operations Committee in Congress) alone to maintain its equilibrium. Rather, it must constantly search its overall environmental horizon for sources of support and potential obstacles to its success. One glance at the quarterly report submitted to NARA reveals the variety and complexity of the library's daily interactions with a variety of individuals and organizations outside the "iron triangle." For example, without the support of a local, unaffiliated institution, Marist College, the library would have been unable to launch its presence on the world wide web.

    In the case of the FDR Library's vertical integration within government, from the civil service sales store clerk at the FDR Library to the director, everyone seems keenly aware of being part of a larger federal system, of being the local representatives of that system in Hyde Park and Dutchess County; and most of them are at least marginally plugged into

the national network in which they operate. Those at the professional level, more so than those at lower levels in the hierarchy, have a fairly good sense of what is going on in the other presidential libraries. The program reviews and frequent consultations with the NARA program managers are reminder enough. Working with the National Park Service and GSA employees on local issues provides contact with other federal bureaucracies. Work on the new Visitors and Conference Center provides frequent opportunities for interaction with local, state, and federal bureaucracies.  The stable, if gradually diminishing, nature of the library's federal funding and staffing, although probably only barely adequate to sustain basic operations, may promote some level of complacency toward outreach up and down the layers of the federal government. Nevertheless, their dependence on the private sector for almost all discretionary operations such as educational outreach and programming promotes  the emphasis on relationships with their related interest group supporters, especially the FERI.

FERI President William J. vanden Heuvel's status as the former Deputy U.S. Permanent Representative to the United Nations from 1979-81, a prominent partner in a New York City law firm, and an active member of the United Nations Association, enhances the vertical integration of the FDR Library. His other activities, which provide enhanced status and exposure to the FERI and the FDR Library, include being appointed to such posts as National United Nations Day Chair in 1997. It is clear that his vitality and interest in the library is one of the keys to the health of the institution.


### *Answers to Stein and Bickers' Three Key Question*


The three questions around which Stein and Bickers focused their discussions of policy subsystems were: 1) to whom is the policy subsystem accountable? 2) whose interests does it serve? and 3) how is the connection between the public and its elected representatives distorted by the policy subsystem?  Answers to these questions for the FDR Library follow. Part of the purpose of addressing these questions is to see whether, indeed, this policy subsystem "exists within the context of democratic institutions and practices in America" (Stein & Bickers, 1995,  p. 151), as the authors believe most such subsystems do.

1) *To whom is the FDR Library policy subsystem accountable?* It is clear from interviewing the director and staff of the FDR Library, along with staff at the Office of Presidential Libraries, that the library is primarily accountable to its parent agency, NARA, which is itself an independent executive branch agency. Although the FDR Library depends heavily on the FERI for support in key areas such as educational programming, fellowships for visiting scholars, and special exhibits; its core funding, overall direction, and basic survival comes through NARA. Library staff are very conscious of being federal employees and representatives of the federal government in their small town.

2)*Whose interests does the FDR Library serve?* Obviously, the library

directly serves a variety of constituencies through its archives and museums functions. In fiscal year 1995 the library served 600 researchers in person, responded to 9,101 oral and written inquiries, hosted 12,120 participants for public and outreach programs, and welcomed 171,307 museum visitors. Even assuming that the same person may have been counted more than once, the number of people served directly, not counting those who accessed the FDR Library's web page on the Internet, is impressive.

Likewise, the 300 members of the FERI represent a constituency whose personal interests are served by the library. These individuals pay dues in the Institute to show their support for Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt and the Library established in their honor. The small town of Hyde Park and Dutchess County are very interested in the FDR Library and its vitality, which has a direct impact on the town's tourism income. The imminent construction of a new Visitors and Conference Center adjacent to the library will bring dollars and jobs into the local economy in the short term, and in the long term more group meetings and tours can be accommodated.

3) *How is the connection between the public and its elected representatives distorted by the policy subsystem?* As far as I can tell, the FDR Library policy subsystem does not distort the relationship between the public and its elected representatives. The Congressmen and local elected officials who have supported first the establishment and then the expansion of facilities at the FDR Library and similar projects over the years could be seen as indulging in "pork barrel" politics, but they obviously had to persuade their colleagues to agree in order to get the measures approved. Besides, local support for the FDR Library has not been universal. Witness the distress of Congressman Fish (R-NY), whose district included Hyde Park, when the library was first proposed. Fish was quoted in the Congressional Record (77th Congress, 1st session, 1939, p. 9040) as follows:

> Establishing a memorial to a living man…is utterly un-American, utterly undemocratic. It goes back to the days of the Pharaohs, who built their own images and their own obelisks. It goes back to the days of the Caesars, who put up monuments of themselves and crowned them with laurel leaves, and posed as gods. (O'Neil, 1973, p. 346)

Nevertheless, the prevailing opinion was that the monument represented by a presidential library is one acceptable to the American Congress and the American people.

# Chapter 4 Gerald R. Ford Library

*Description and Background Information*

The Gerald R. Ford Library and Museum are physically separate entities. They are the only ones in the Presidential Library System located in different cities. The library is in Ann Arbor, Michigan, and the museum is 130 miles west in Grand Rapids. Given this physical separation, when referring to one entity alone, I use the term "library" or "museum", as appropriate,. When referring to the Gerald R. Ford Library and Museum as a single administrative unit within NARA, I use the phrase "Ford Library."

In the early 1960s, before anyone contemplated his becoming President, Congressman Gerald R. Ford (R-MI) began depositing his papers and archival materials at the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor, his alma mater. After Ford unexpectedly succeeded Richard Nixon as President in 1974, he wanted to continue giving his papers to the university, but he also wanted his home town of Grand Rapids to be the site of his presidential museum. Meanwhile, the university expressed indifference toward hosting the museum component of the Gerald R. Ford Library. Therefore, despite NARA's objections that splitting the two facilities would create administrative inefficiency, President Ford and his advisors decided to sponsor the construction of a new library building in Ann Arbor and a museum in Grand Rapids. At the time, this divided arrangement for the library and museum created public controversy, and some discontent on this point still remains among Presidential Library System critics. Largely because of such complaints, the split arrangement will not be repeated, as specified in subsequent federal law.

Key interviews I conducted at the Ford Library included the director, Richard Norton Smith, and the curator, James R. Kratsas, in Grand Rapids; and the  supervisory archivist, David A. Horrocks, in Ann Arbor.

The Gerald R. Ford Museum is located on the banks of the Grand River in downtown Grand Rapids, about 30 miles east of Lake Michigan. It sits in a park-like setting  overlooking the river ladders provided for spawning fish. The Ford Museum is across the street from the Grand Rapids city museum, also a modern, surprisingly large institution for a relatively small city.  The Ford Museum opened the same day as the elegant, highrise Grand Amway Plaza Hotel just across the river via a short roadway bridge. From talking to long-time residents, it seems over the past 20 years the two museums and the Amway company have collaborated to  revitalize the city's downtown.

The Ford museum's exhibits are lively. Adjacent to the entrance visitors immediately encounter a multimedia exhibit on the 1970s - very evocative and colorful. Visitors, especially retirees and young families, are everywhere. The museum is a major tourist attraction for the area. Of the Ford Museum's approximately 100,000 annual visitors, 60% are from outside the area. Sources here say that one reason the museum is in Grand Rapids, rather than Ann Arbor, is that

President Ford feared his museum would just get lost on the huge University of Michigan campus, whereas it could make a real contribution in his hometown. It has clearly done that.

Richard Norton Smith, Director of the Ford Museum and Library, makes his headquarters in Grand Rapids, visiting the library in Ann Arbor when necessary. The fact that Smith does not drive makes those visits a little more difficult than they might otherwise be. David Horrocks, Supervisory Archivist at the Ford Library, manages day-to-day operations in Ann Arbor.  Smith's home base in Grand Rapids is a departure from previous Ford Library directors, who tended to be more archives-oriented than museum-oriented. Earlier directors made their primary location Ann Arbor. I visited both sites during my August, 1997 research.

Smith is unique among presidential library directors in having headed four different libraries over the past 10 years - the Hoover, Eisenhower, Reagan, and Ford presidential libraries. He has a reputation for taking moribund presidential libraries and reviving them through a combination of active publicity campaigns, public programming, and outreach activities - what Smith himself describes as "creativity." Among the other library directors and some NARA staff there appears to be some envy of Smith's political and fund-raising clout and his overall accomplishments at the presidential libraries where he  has served. Despite the occasional grousing, most interviewees throughout the country  exhibited a sense of humor and even pride about Smith's success. One interviewee good-naturedly called Smith "the P.T. Barnum of presidential libraries."

Smith's career path toward directing presidential libraries was not the traditional one of rising through the archival ranks. Smith wrote a biography of Herbert Hoover and was a historian/biographer/speechwriter on Capitol Hill. He worked for Republican Senator Pete Wilson (now Governor of California). He wrote the joint biography of Robert and Elizabeth Dole. He is still close friends with the Doles and other influential, moderate Republicans. He describes himself as a "Rockefeller Republican."

A superb story-teller, Smith related a story about how he had been forever influenced, as a 10 year-old, by seeing the Goldwater victory in the 1964 presidential nomination on television. Even at that young age, he was struck by the winners' rudeness and ungraciousness in victory, and it prompted him to identify more with the moderate wing of the Republican party, than with the far right wing.

A decade ago Richard Smith jumped at the chance to go to the Hoover Library as director, because he believed it offered one of the few chances in federal government service to show real creativity and use the influence available to him (i.e., the influence of the former President and his supporters) to educate people. At the time of his initial appointment, NARA was willing to try something new. When Smith came to the Hoover Library, John Fawcett was director of the Office of Presidential Libraries and Don Wilson was Archivist of the U.S. Most presidential library directors had been academics who defined their constituencies somewhat narrowly. Smith has a strong belief in public history, and he rejuvenated both the Hoover and Eisenhower libraries to help fulfill this mission. For example, Smith promotes conferences of historical practitioners, which he says should be like good dinner parties, bringing together unlikely, but lively, guests. He concentrates on the public face of the institutions, rather than concentrating on the researchers.

Smith met with me in President Ford's glass-walled office overlooking the river and the city of Grand Rapids. Since President Ford is now in his mid-80s and lives in California, he makes only occasional visits to Michigan for special events. Smith described Ford as very supportive of activities at the museum and the library.

The atmosphere at the Ford Library is almost the opposite of the museum. It sits coolly and quietly on the North Campus of the University of Michigan, considered rather remote by some locals, students, and faculty. One enters the library on the deserted- looking ground floor, which houses empty display cases. Jim Kratsas said the museum plans to place exhibits in these very soon. There are meeting rooms around the perimeter of the entry level, and the glass wall at the rear looks out on a pretty garden. New buildings set in spacious grounds line the access road, including the impressive-looking U. of Michigan School of Engineering.

David Horrocks was very approachable, generous with his time, and dedicated to the existing concept of presidential libraries.

### *Internal Economy* (Routine)

*Internal Economy: Administration (Decision-making, Staffing, Budgeting, Revenue Generation, Reports Filed with NARA, Information Systems and Technologies, and Service Policies)*

DECISION-MAKING

I use decision-making to mean policy-setting, as opposed to policy implementation, which happens during day-to-day problem-solving. Interestingly, Smith noted that the presidential library directorship is one of the few jobs in the federal bureaucracy with some real autonomy, and that is one thing that attracted him to the job.

As the museum Director Smith appears to take an active role in most decision-making and policy-setting. He clearly relishes putting his own stamp on the operations at the museum and, while following the spirit of federal policies, he professes a refusal to be stifled by process-oriented bureaucratic details. Given that his day-to-day work is primarily with the Ford Library's museum operations, there are fewer required federal processes and procedures than there are in the archival operations. Smith's emphasis on converting the traditional academic colloquia to conferences with popular and media appeal is only one example of his autonomous approach to running a presidential library. Likewise, Smith's decision to divert funds from the admissions and gift shop revenues to fill the museum's vacant Exhibit Specialist position after NARA decided not to continue it as a federally funded position. Smith and the Ford Library seem to be a good match.

Of the eleven staff at the museum, four work rather autonomously in the gift shop operation, which also handles museum admissions and audio-visual support. Curator Kratsas and the Registrar work with the museum collections on a daily basis and work with Smith to plan and

mount new exhibits. The Special Events Coordinator and Education Specialist stay busy carrying out the expanded outreach vision fostered by Smith.

Given the geographic distance between the museum and the library, Smith has delegated enormous responsibility to Horrocks for the Ann Arbor site. The focus at the library is directly tied to the actual archives, and all ten staff there fall into some type of archival classification. Horrocks sends Smith informal e-mail reports every Tuesday to keep him updated.

Unlike the move to team operations at other presidential library archives, such as the Reagan Library, at this library prioritizing the work for the archivists now means more specialization than in the past. One person handles all reference correspondence. In the early summer of 1997 Horrocks and the archivists set timeline goals for their work. For example, one archivist spends three days per week preparing for the next declassification visit from NARA, while another archivist spends one. Horrocks and the archivists have temporarily called a halt to website development, in favor of maintenance only. The preservation process is on hold. Audio-visual processing is on hold. They are trying to develop more audio-visual resources online with a database, in hopes of reducing the amount of personal service they have to provide for this collection.

STAFFING

The Gerald R. Ford Museum has 11 staff, ranging from sales store clerks to the director, Richard Norton Smith. The Gerald R. Ford Library has 10 staff, ranging from archives aides to the supervisory archivist, David Horrocks. Of the 21 total staff, only three are actually museum-oriented, and that includes Smith himself. The trend seems to be that NARA will only pay for a curator and a registrar at each museum, no more than that. This parsimony definitely represents retrenchment from previous staffing levels. It is interesting to note that the Ford Library and Museum run two separate facilities with fewer staff (21) than the FDR Library does for one facility (25 staff).

The constraints on hiring new personnel and filling vacant positions is seen as a big problem. Smith gave the example of trying to fill the vacant exhibit specialist position. Just before the reopening of the museum in April, 1997, NARA told Smith he could fill the position. The day after the celebration, Smith was told "sorry, it was a mistake, you cannot fill the position." Smith was incensed that the Foundation had just spent $5 million on the museum renovations, but that NARA could not fill a vacant position already in the budget. Revenues from admission fees and the museum store will now have to be diverted from other projects to fund the position. Not surprisingly, Smith declared that this kind of behavior by NARA undercuts the federal government's credibility with the Foundation.

The Ford Library's secretary resigned in May, 1997 after eight years in the position to pursue a new career as a technical editor. Pending the lengthy approval process at NARA for filling the position, three archivists are sharing her duties, in addition to their regular assignments.

The archivists are sometimes accused of fitting the stack rat stereotype, saving every scrap of paper and treating it like the magna carta.

There is an inevitable DC versus field-office tension, especially in light of funding restrictions, concern with standardization, and oversight responsibilities assigned to the headquarters staff. Nevertheless, Smith says this creates no real problem for him. He sees it as normal.

Jim Kratsas, Exhibits Curator, took a promotion to come here from the Carter Library in Atlanta. The Ford Library director lived in Ann Arbor, and Jim was placed in charge of the museum in Grand Rapids. Jim then served as Acting Director while the directorship was vacant before Smith's arrival. When Smith came and decided to make his headquarters in Grand Rapids, rather than Ann Arbor, Kratsas' duties changed accordingly. Kratsas described Smith as a mover and shaker, who puts the emphasis on the public. Kratsas also expressed his happiness at having a museum and public program-oriented director now.

While Smith worked on the re-opening of the Museum after a complete renovation started 4 years ago, Kratsas worked on revising all of the permanent exhibits and organizing the current changing exhibit on the Civil War. Kratsas now spends most of his time working with the other presidential libraries on exhibits and loans.

Kratsas noted that the Ford Museum has had only one vacancy in his area of responsibility since Smith came. They had to send the list of applicants for the vacancy back to Washington three times before they got an acceptable exhibits person. To fill a vacancy you have to justify it beyond all expectations. Due to downsizing in the federal government, the displaced workers have first rights to bid on any openings. Jim has found he has to send the whole list back and start over to eventually get what he wants.

Horrocks observed that even with staff vacancies on the lowest levels, he must first justify filling it to his own director, then the request goes to the Office of Presidential Libraries for support, then it must go to the Leadership Council meeting of NARA. This is a very cumbersome process, which puts positions in the older presidential libraries up against the pressing needs of projects such as opening a new library.

Horrocks believes NARA needs to do more to promote the younger staff by setting up situations for them to meet each other and encouraging them to move around when vacancies occur anywhere in the system. Horrocks's biggest headache is the isolation, since there are only eight archivists and one technician.

Curiously, unlike many other presidential libraries, this library does not maintain a list of consultants (referred to here as "surrogate researchers") to whom they can refer patrons for longer, more involved searches. They have had a pilot project to initiate this service, yet presently, the archivists do all the work themselves. Archivists see their strength as their reference services and specialized knowledge and skills. They get 1,000-1,500 inquiries/year from researchers and correspondence, and about 700 researcher visits/year. Horrocks thinks the release of foreign affairs materials will increase these numbers.

Horrocks noted that, while the archivists in presidential libraries are all very professional in their outlook and actions, the major archival professional organizations do not have much appreciation for the unique characteristics of presidential libraries. Therefore, the presidential library archivists are not very involved in those organizations. This lack of understanding and appreciation may stem from the fact that archival procedures in presidential library archives are proscribed by the nature of presidential papers as both personal and government-owned documents. Declassification activities in particular are not common in other archival collections.

BUDGETING

Budgeting in the Ford Museum and Library under the NARA rubric appears to be straightforward and incremental from year-to-year. The library's minuscule portion of the federal budget has permanent authorization and goes through Congress via the annual appropriations bill for independent agencies, of which NARA is one. In FY 1997, the library and museum's total costs to taxpayers was $2,490,000.00, almost all of which went to cover salaries and fixed costs, such as maintenance and repair of facilities. The Director has only about $58,000 to spend on discretionary items, but most of those are very basic, such as office supplies.

Program costs were $1,099,000.00 and building operations were $1,391,000.00 for both facilities. These figures are very similar to those of the Reagan and Eisenhower libraries; more than those of the Hoover, Roosevelt, Truman, and Carter libraries; but less than those of the Kennedy and Johnson libraries.

The more interesting budgeting activity involves the library's relationship with the Foundation. The Gerald R. Ford Foundation's support is critical to the library and museum in providing almost all exhibit, educational, and outreach programs. The non-profit foundation, formed in 1981, touts its support for exhibits, community affairs, educational programs, conferences, symposia, research grants, and special projects. Its website is part of the Ford Library site hosted by the LBJ Library at the University of Texas. The web page highlights the Gerald R. Ford Colloquium, the Research Grants Program, the Gerald R. Ford Journalism Prizes, and the William E. Simon Lecture. None of the interviewees seemed to recognize any potential conflict in a "Democratic" library hosting the site of a "Republican" library. There appear to have been no problems to date with one library or university hosting another's web site, but sources at NARA say the issue is now beginning to be raised by library foundations that do not like having their name "intermingled" with that of another institution. Despite a general presence on the world wide web, Ford Library Foundation Chair Martin J. Allen, Jr. stated that the group's policy is not to give out their financial statements, and they do not prepare an annual report of any kind.

REVENUE GENERATION

In FY 1997, the Ford Library generated $144,096 in admissions income. Over-the-counter sales in the gift shop (Grand Rapids) generated $147,228. Reproduction services generated $11,525. All of these revenues go into NARA's Trust Fund designated for support of the Ford

Library. The cost of goods and services (including gift shop staffing) is deducted from the same source, leaving some surplus from most years' income to provide additional support for the library's other activities. The Ford Library also had investment income of $20,232. The prior year expense of $70,398 was offset by an adjustment for '96 of $70,000.  Therefore, in FY 1997 the library's net income was $102,140.

Museum revenue went up 70% the first year Smith came to Grand Rapids, and it will be up another 40% this year. The income will now have to be used to help pay for the exhibit specialist position vacancy rejected by NARA. Thus a surplus internal economy will make up for a lack of support from the external economy.

REPORTS FILED WITH NARA

The latest one-year and five-year Ford Library plans on file at the Office of Presidential Libraries are dated November, 1994 for fiscal year 1995. This was before Smith became director of the Ford Library, and it indicates the low priority attached to such reports.

Horrocks noted that although the *Presidential Libraries Handbook* calls for each library to submit to NARA a 1-year and a 5-year plan annually, they have not always been done. He remarked wryly that in some cases there would not have been anyone at the Office of Presidential Libraries to request the reports or read them anyway. He was referring to the tumultuous mid-1990s when there was only an Acting Archivist of the U.S. and an Acting Director of the Office of Presidential Libraries. The Ford Library has pretty consistently written quarterly narrative reports with statistics included. Staff here expressed their opinion that there is no really good management planning tool for the Ford Library, and perhaps not even at the Office of Presidential Libraries. This lack of real planning procedures and tools limits meaningful planning endeavors, although things do seem to be changing on this score now that John Carlin is Archivist of the U.S. and David Peterson has been appointed Director of the Office of Presidential Libraries.

The quarterly narrative report for April-June, 1997 submitted by the Gerald R. Ford Library and Museum clearly has Richard Norton Smith's stamp on it. The language is punchy, with words like "stupendous" sprinkled throughout, and the items recommended for the Archivist of the U.S.'s report are asterisked. Smith's background as a journalist, speechwriter, and biographer comes through. Details from this quarterly report are included in appropriate subheadings of this chapter.

INFORMATION SYSTEMS AND TECHNOLOGIES

Ford Library Archivist William McNitt redesigned the Ford Museum and Library's Website during the third quarter of FY97, adding search options, updating museum pages, and adding the *President Ford '76 Factbook* and selected speech texts. Meanwhile, library staff created a database using Access software to handle the Foundation Newsletter and other mailing lists.

According to Horrocks, the Ford Library was in the vanguard in the mid-80s with the development of PresNet. The original automation contract was let to American Management Systems (AMS) to develop a complete system from top to bottom called PresNet. The product of that effort is in use at the Carter and Ford Libraries. At the Ford Library, the database contains over 60,000 folder titles and other descriptive information for 85% of the historical materials available for research as of September 1995. Searching is done by the archivists in consultation with the researcher. The libraries that predate the Ford are not using PresNet, because they are either using their own, older, system or have switched to newer technologies. The libraries after Carter have used the technologies developed by the White House. The reference database is the best part of PresNet according to staff who use it. The other features are not very effective: for example, there are better resources for solicitation. The Carter Library's PresNet information is now on the world wide web via NARA's NAIL database (the pilot project scheduled to become the Archives Resource Catalog). It would require enormous software upgrades to accomplish that at the Ford Library, where the PresNet database is more extensive and complex.

The library does have all of its traditional finding aids on the web in a searchable format. The library has had a 50% increase in e-mail reference in the last 12 months. Obviously, the library is now reaching a new group. Since no computer technologist positions have been approved by NARA for the presidential libraries, the Ford library has relied upon one of its archivists, Bill McNitt, who has the personal interest and computer aptitude, to carry out its conversion to the web. This conversation was serendipitous, not planned. This situation is similar to those at the Johnson Library, where the computer "guru" turns out to be the building manager, and at the Kennedy Library, where the "guru" is a librarian. In the long run, presidential libraries will definitely need more institutional support for the computer operations. If the Ford Library asked for a dedicated computer position now, they would not get it. Some training is available through NARA, but nothing more.

During the third quarter of FY1997, Archivist McNitt conducted a random one-week survey of Ford Library Website usage and found that over 9,500 server requests were recorded, with the online photo section leading the site at 38% of the requests, followed by the finding aids with 19%. In the manuscript department inquiries increased 120% during the third quarter of FY 1997, and e-mail inquiries increased 500%, accounting for 53% of all manuscript inquiries during the quarter. Given researcher site visits of well under 1,000 per year and a museum visitorship of 118,000 in FY 1997, the number of virtual visits via e-mail and the website indicate a strong potential for these avenues of improving public access mechanisms.

SERVICE POLICIES

Like respondents at other libraries, Ford Library personnel believe the Presidential Library System has built a great system, with its hallmark being a reputation for unparalleled service to researchers in geographically dispersed libraries. Smith's enthusiasm is contagious, and it appears to derive from his stated sense that being director of a presidential library is one of the few high level jobs within the federal bureaucracy that allows creative work, few bureaucratic constraints, and a pleasant and distinctive work atmosphere. Smith gave his definition of a bureaucrat as one

who spends 50% of his time on process and 50% on results. (I don't think this was meant as a compliment!)

The Ford Library appears to be thriving under Smith's leadership, with outreach efforts being a priority. The geographic split of the museum and library, for all its potential inefficiencies in staffing and physical plant, does allow each operation to concentrate on what it does best, i.e., serve its particular clientele with maximum effectiveness.

*Internal Economy: Archives Functions*

During the April-June quarter of 1997, the following archival functions occupied the Ford Library staff. Archivists issued 42 research cards and researchers made 88 visits. Archival staff answered 487 written inquiries, 150 of which were received by e-mail. There were 176 oral inquiries. Approximately 10,000 pages of manuscript reproductions were provided, along with 234 audiovisual copies.

Processing activity in the archives during the same period was devoted to full arrangement and description of foreign relations and defense collections in anticipation of Executive Order 12958 requirements for declassification of materials within 25 years of their initial creation. A master work plan for this project was prepared by involving all library staff. Similarly, during the quarter the library submitted on behalf of two requesters 14 documents (233 pages) for mandatory declassification review. Federal agencies, which originated the classification of documents, acted on 88 documents (451 pages) with 63 documents (338 pages) being declassified in full; 11 documents (69 pages) declassified in part; and 14 documents (44 pages) being exempted in full. Topics covered in these documents include the 1972 Vietnam peace negotiations, U.S. relations with Mexico regarding narcotics, electronic surveillance activities, and South Korean nuclear reprocessing activities.

According to Horrocks, E.O. 12958 grew out of lobbying by professional historians and journalists, who want access to the materials sooner rather than later. For the Ford Library the target date for full declassification is 2001. Much work remains to reach that goal. Therefore, the staff are doing less outreach until it is done. From another viewpoint, this E.O. presents a window of opportunity to get materials declassified and available once and for all. Classified documents are often considered the most interesting material, with the greatest potential for public programming.

Staff here believe one of the advantages of the decentralization of presidential libraries, specifically the split of the Ford museum and archival facilities, is the focused processing program for the archival materials, including the automated systems. Researchers with various political positions feel more confident that they are getting neutral information and assistance because the university is seen as a natural partner in their research. Also, Ann Arbor is a congenial place for the archival staff to live.

Between April and June, 1997 the library formally accessioned (added) the following significant gift collections to its archival holdings. William J. Baroody, Jr.'s papers (1966-1988)

include the period when he served as legislative and press assistant to Representative Melvin Laird (R-WI), as research director for the House Republican Conference, as aide to Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird, as public liaison to the Nixon White House, and as President Ford's Assistant for Public Liaison.  In addition, he and his father were both leaders of the American Enterprise Institute. Carla A. Hills' speeches delivered while she was Secretary of Housing and Urban Development from 1975-1977 were added to the library's collections. Press releases, interview and press briefing transcripts, speech texts and clippings related to the presidencies of Richard Nixon and Gerald Ford came to the library from Gerald L. Warren, President Ford's Deputy Press Secretary and Director of Communications. President Ford himself sent the library 200 pages of comments on drafts of the new book, A Time to Heal, by Brent Scowcroft, John Marsh, and Dean Burch.

Addition of such collections is an ongoing process of working with individuals, now outside of government, who have a contribution to make to history and also to the Ford Library and Museum.  Through their donations and advocacy of the institution and its activities, such individuals enhance the Ford Library's visibility and continuing vitality.


*Internal Economy: Exhibits/Museum Functions*

During the April-June 1997 quarter, the museum admitted a total of 38,391 visitors, including 43 organized groups. Paid visitors increased 158% over the same quarter last year, and free visitors by 126%.

On April 17, 1997, the Ford Museum opened its "stupendous" (Smith's word) new core exhibition after three and a half years of renovations funded by the Gerald R. Ford Foundation and accomplished through tremendous efforts by the small staff. On that day, 1,594 individuals toured the new exhibits, and another 1,580 visitors came the following weekend. President Ford was on hand for activities throughout the week.

The ten adjoining galleries draw on the latest advances in exhibit technology to "reinvent" the presidential museum by making visitors participants—not mere observers—in the Ford presidency. Multiple television screens surround visitors with the sights and sounds of the 1970s, visitors attend a White House State Dinner, deliver a campaign speech with a teleprompter, take a holographic tour of eleven White House rooms, experience a day in the Oval Office, and see the original Gerald Ford White House switchboard light up as callers reacted to the pardon of President Nixon in September, 1974.  A new temporary exhibit, *The Blue and the Gray*, opened for a six month run. The latter exhibit includes hundreds of items, such as John Brown's musket, Clara Barton's truck/bed, Union and Confederate uniforms, shells fired at Fort Sumter, artifacts from the *Monitor*, and General Lee's postwar Oath of Allegiance (signed to regain his U.S. citizenship, which was not finally granted until the Gerald Ford administration!). Successor temporary exhibits into the fall of 1998 will include *Presidents and Paisanos: Italian Gifts to the United States*, *Grandma Moses*, and *The Great War*.

*Internal Economy: Education/Outreach*

Education and outreach activities center around the "new" museum, its exhibits, and promotional endeavors. Many of these activities are noted on the Ford Library web page. In conjunction with the rededication of the museum in 1997, Education Specialist Barbara Packer authored a section of the website on this topic (Packer, 1997). The document begins by asserting that the "Ford Museum is poised on the brink of an exciting and challenging new era." The second paragraph begins, "Our new educational programs, like the exhibits they are based on, will set a new standard within the Presidential Library System." She offers the following illustrations of her point.

A series of gallery-based activities called *President for a Day* has been developed by local educators in cooperation with the museum staff to cover the educational spectrum from simple everyday life activities of the White House for early elementary children through presidential decision-making simulations for high school students. Supplemental programs include a Haunted White House Halloween complete with ghosts and a *Camp David* day camp. A major program and exhibit in collaboration with Grand Rapids' Vietnamese community is underway, along with informal learning activities for families such as President Ford's Birthday Bash and the annual White House Weekend.

Packer's announcements conclude with future possibilities for the museum, such as expanded scouting programs and state-of-the-art technology-based programs such as a museum curriculum on the Internet and full distance learning. The final sentence summarizes an essential feature of the Ford Library's internal economy: "Thanks to the Gerald R. Ford Foundation for making such educational initiatives possible at a time of declining federal support."


*Summary of the Ford Library's Internal Economy*

The internal economy of the Ford Library and Museum may be described as energized in recent years with the arrival of Richard Norton Smith as Director and the opening of the completely renovated museum. There is a sense of excitement and work satisfaction among staff at each location. The separate locations for the museum and the library seem to let staff concentrate on the things they do best. Public programs are numerous and lively, although more obvious at the museum than the library. Archival collections are largely processed and open to the public. Some desirable projects at the library are necessarily being delayed or postponed indefinitely by the requirements of E.O. 12958, which requires mandatory, and resource-draining, declassification of many documents.

The availability and willingness of President and Mrs. Ford to promote key programs and initiatives, along with a prominent and politically well-connected director, enhances the institution's ability to thrive.

Administrative processes are mainly carried out in a rather traditional, hierarchical manner, with location functioning autonomously. Not only is system maintenance assured, but expansive

and exciting new projects are underway with support from the Gerald R. Ford Foundation, albeit more so at the museum than at the library.

Several key staff have had experience at one or more other presidential libraries, which gives them a sense of perspective and appreciation for their relatively prosperous situation. Most seem proud of their active and productive director. Key players such as Smith, Kratsas, and Horrocks have established fine cooperative relationships with their respective communities. The Gerald R. Ford Foundation is effective in supporting the museum and library in all respects, and appears not to be distracted by any priorities other than support of the museum, the library, and related educational/outreach activities.

Despite some discontent with the minimal level of federal support, the internal economy of the institution functions well, and interested groups are able to achieve their shared desire to affect public policy in support of the library. Smith has access to sufficient outside funding resources to achieve his and the institution's major goals and many of the peripheral ones as well.

### *Internal Polity*(Non-Routine)

*Internal Polity: Normative Structure (Incentive Structures, Dominant Coalition, Socialization, and Interest Articulation and Aggregation)*

INCENTIVE STRUCTURES

Incentive structures for anything other than maintaining equilibrium all seem to lie outside the "core" programs funded by the federal government. Fortunately, the Ford Library's access to outside resources is healthy and appears sufficient for system vigor.

In anticipation of the opening of the George Bush Library at Texas A&M University, in November, 1997 the director of that library, David Alsobrook, and Don W. Wilson, George Bush Presidential Library Foundation Director and former Archivist of the U.S., visited the Ford Museum and the Library in May 1997. Ford staff expressed finding this visit flattering to them and their work. Similarly, their discovery during the quarter that the Jimmy Carter Library had borrowed in detail most of the Ford Library's Website format and generic content was a confirmation of the excellent work of the staff, despite the lack of formal training in this area. Such affirmation of their success coming from other presidential libraries is a powerful motivator for continued productivity.

The energy level and legendary workaholism of Richard Smith appears to help motivate some of the staff to high productivity. Also, Smith's views toward creativity and his refusal to be hindered by the process-orientation of some federal policies and procedures encourage similar attitudes among his staff. Smith said of his experience at the Eisenhower Library, "We challenged the staff to do things that they'd never done before and in the process I think made them realize

how capable they were." That pretty much sums up the current situation at the Ford Library as well in terms of what serves as an incentive to the staff.

DOMINANT COALITION

The geographic split between the Ford library and the museum creates a situation somewhat different from that at other presidential libraries regarding the existence of a dominant coalition. Although each of the facilities operates rather autonomously, the dominant coalition at any particular time is at least partially related to where the director establishes his home base and where the staffing and financial resources are being directed.

At present, the emphasis at the Ford Library and Museum is on the museum and related educational and outreach programs. Smith devotes most of his time to the Grand Rapids operations, leaving the archivists to serve researchers in their usual effective manner. Nevertheless, there are some new archival initiatives. For example, the first phase of the new oral history program was completed in the spring of 1997 by archivists. It included interviews with prominent individuals associated with the Ford administration, such as Carla Hills, Anne Armstrong, Daniel Patrick Moynihan (D-NY), Elliot Richardson, Hugh Sidey, and Caspar Weinberger.

Smith's prominence, clout, and willingness to take risks enable him to pursue projects that would be difficult or impossible at some of the other presidential libraries. He quickly built an effective coalition of supporters through the Gerald R. Ford Foundation and his personal relationships with moderate Republicans. He is able to draw money and talent to Grand Rapids and Ann Arbor for conferences, all the while building support among the local citizens with holiday and other events designed to attract a general audience.

An episode illustrating the internal power struggles and the sometimes contentious relationships between a field office (the Ford Library) and its central office (NARA) occurred just prior to Smith's arrival as director. In the mid-1990s, a previous NARA Inspector General's (IG) investigated Jim Kratsas and the former Ford Library director, Frank Mackaman, on charges of violating the government's conflict-of-interest policies (which have since been changed). The charges revolved around the appropriateness of adjunct teaching and the use of Ford Museum meeting room space and facilities for meetings/conferences. The case was eventually settled and no serious wrongdoing revealed, but the bitter after effects of having staff integrity questioned remain.

In Ann Arbor, Horrocks offered this opinion about the libraries' relationship with NARA: the libraries need program support, but they do not need more rules and a straight- jacket atmosphere.

As Smith observed, the very visibility and relative political clout of presidential libraries is sometimes resented in an agency dominated by archivists, whose role is largely invisible and misunderstood, even within their own hierarchy.

SOCIALIZATION

Again, the split arrangement for the Ford Library and Museum has led to separate socialization patterns at the two sites. Since Smith's arrival, with his high energy level and obvious enthusiasm for the institution and its mission, socialization at the museum flows from that source. When a director says early and often, "I think the libraries are among the least bureaucratic, most distinctive, most creative, institutions in government," and "I think it's [the Presidential Library System] one of the glories of the federal government and unfashionable as it may be to say, I think it's the crown jewel in the National Archives," it is bound to have a positive effect on those around him. When the sales store staff member who escorted me up to the director's office observed that "He [Smith] never sleeps. He is wearing us out!," it was meant as a compliment.

Meanwhile, in Ann Arbor, the archivists are free to concentrate on their scholarly research mission and follow their natural inclination to focus on the collections and service to users. The library's setting on a large university campus fosters a sense of comfort here not always apparent at other presidential libraries. Staff appear to be thriving under the leadership of Horrocks, an experienced and respected member of their own profession.

The Ford Library has a distinct advantage in its three top administrators' having experience at other presidential libraries. Smith, Kratsas, and Horrocks bring a sense of perspective and outlook on the broader system, which appears healthy for the organizational environment and socialization of the rest of the staff.

INTEREST ARTICULATION AND AGGREGATION

Smith said that his decade with the system has witnessed a "realization on the part of friends of presidential libraries that there is no more federal money. Staffs are not going to be any larger. We're going to have to do more with less. Yet this co-exists with a real move to be imaginative in public programs, to do major temporary exhibits, to do a lot more in terms of educational outreach. In other words, instead of being an archival warehouse to be a dynamic, lively, creative classroom of democracy and to serve various audiences, whether it's onsite researchers, Internet users, tourists, or teachers and school kids, as well as scholars."

"That's why the foundations have taken on a greater role than ever before. Again, I would think that Washington would get down on its knees and say hallelujah that you have these generous, public-spirited individuals, who have not in any case that I'm aware of, tried to exert any type of intellectual control over the institutions, but who for a number of reasons - initially out of friendship and admiration for the president - but over time a much more disinterested, if you will, support of the institution itself and its goals give of their time and talent and money."

Clearly, the Ford Museum's relationship with its foundation and with the city of Grand Rapids is not only cordial, but mutually supportive. Similarly, the Ford Library has a comfortable, if rather quiet, relationship with the university and the city of Ann Arbor. The interests of both entities are well articulated and fostered by their leaders.

*Internal Polity: Leadership Attributes of the Director*

As well illustrated above, Richard Norton Smith is a dynamic, enthusiastic, opinionated leader for the Ford Library. This respected biographer of George Washington, Thomas E. Dewey, Herbert Hoover, and Robert R. McCormick has an infectious sense of mission, "taking history to the people," and of the importance of what presidential libraries contribute to our democratic form of government. These traits, undoubtedly in addition to Smith's ability to raise large sums of money from his influential friends, have rejuvenated the library and museum after a period of turmoil that coincided with similar turmoil for NARA and the Office of Presidential Libraries.

The atmosphere at the Ford Library is more lively and exciting that either the Roosevelt or Reagan libraries. In this way it is more similar to the Kennedy Library. This atmosphere, as I will argue in my conclusions chapter, is more than slightly related to the attributes of the director.

*Internal Polity: Rule-making, Application, and Adjudication Mechanisms*

As in all presidential libraries, at the Ford Library numerous federal government rules and regulations must be complied with every day. Procurement procedures and compliance with federal personnel guidelines are obvious examples. Frustration with some of the constraints, especially in the area of filling staff vacancies, is evident. The saving grace at the Ford Library is Smith's ready willingness to look outside government funding,  when necessary, to meet his objectives.  Overall, federal rules and regulations seem to have more applicability to and impact on the archival functions than on the museum functions of any presidential library.

As a "middle-aged" presidential library, the Ford Library's situation regarding archival compliance is more like that of the FDR Library than like the Reagan Library. Collections here were donated by deed-of-gift, and many are already fully processed.  Nevertheless, the impact of E.O. 12958 on declassification of records is having a significant impact at the Ford Library. The 25-year "deadline" for declassification of all documents required by the order will come in 2001 for the Ford Library. As noted earlier, the Ford Library archival operations have had to put numerous other projects on hold in order to try to meet this target. Staff express frustration that this is another "unfunded mandate,"  to borrow a phrase from the state vs. federal political arena.

Compliance with NARA's information technologies initiatives is illustrated at the Ford Library by its participation in the PresNet project for complete automation of its archival holdings. The Ford Library was the development site for the PresNet system, which is now also in use at the Carter Library. The original goal was to automate the entire life cycle of archival materials from solicitation through access via the reference database. It has been something of a mixed blessing, with the reference module being the best and most used portion of the system. Meanwhile, newer technologies are superseding some parts of PresNet. It is ironic for an institution which is a unit of the National Archives and sits on the University of Michigan campus to find the Ford Library website residing on the LBJ Library/University of Texas host computer, and the webmaster for the library an archivist without formal training in this automation area. This oddity mirrors the

situation at the other presidential libraries and displays again NARA's lack of planning and foresight in technology developments.

*Summary of the Ford Library's Internal Polity*

At this time, as we will see, the external economic and political environments of the Ford Library and Museum are definitely consonant enough with the internal political structure and processes to provide more than adequate stability and functionality. Staff size is holding steady, although funding for some positions must come from Trust Fund revenues, rather than from ongoing, authorized federal position slots. Even more so than in some other presidential libraries, because of the split museum and archives facilities, staff roles are well-defined, and they appear comfortable to most incumbents. Everyone understands the institutional mission and their role in fulfilling it. Despite these types of advantages fostered by the split of the museum and library functions, the inefficiencies of running two buildings and the federal government's dependence upon private funding to build presidential libraries, the model will not be repeated.

With the arrival of Smith as director, the turmoil and uncertainties of the few previous years appear to have abated. Struggles within the internal polity seem minimal. The sense of rejuvenation which came with the dynamic rededication of the museum in April 1997 solidified the institution's sense of purpose and the legitimacy of its functions.

**External Economy (Routine)**

*External Economy: Local Economy including the Labor Pool and Employment Rate*

The local economies in both Ann Arbor and Grand Rapids are very healthy at the moment. Horrocks mentioned having difficulty filling even low level positions because there are lots more jobs now than applicants in Ann Arbor. In a university town it is also hard to find someone who will stay at the Library more than a year or two. The situation is similar in Grand Rapids, where the spring of 1997 saw vacancies for an exhibit specialist and a secretary. The latter left the museum after eight years to pursue a new career as a technical editor. Staff vacancies create a serious problem on two grounds, the difficulty of getting NARA to approve replacements and the difficulty of filling the openings in a tight job market.

The flip side of this coin is a relatively high level of tourism and travel which increases attendance at the library and the museum. Likewise, private support through the foundation has never been stronger, another possible side-effect of a robust economy and personal discretionary money to support charitable endeavors. The institution's heavy private support is undoubtedly also attributable to Smith's fund-raising expertise. The impact of these private funds is more apparent at the museum than at the library, since many more of its functions are supported by foundation money than are the archival functions.

Kratsas noted that one of the problems with the recurring suggestion for centralization of the presidential libraries would be the negative impact on the local economies where these institutions are located, in addition to the excessive cost involved in  NARA trying to run this operation in Washington, DC. The Ford Museum in Grand Rapids is a good example of an institution which is crucial to its local economy.

When Smith was thinking of leaving the Reagan Library,  the Ford Library directorship was open, and the museum was being rebuilt after being gutted. The robustness of the museum and its healthy funding base obviously appealed to him. He also believed the Ford opportunity offered him a much better way to spend the "best years of his professional life." Also, he seems much more comfortable with the philosophy of Ford and his followers than he is with Reagan's supporters.


*External Economy: Stability and Vitality of the General Economy*

A snapshot of the current general economic climate and its effect on the Ford Library follows. The current strong economy's impact on the library is probably best illustrated by the elaborate April 1997 festivities surrounding the rededication of the Ford Museum after a total renovation project. Both the renovations and the festivities surrounding the rededication were underwritten by the Gerald R. Ford Foundation's private funds to the tune of about $5 million.

On April 16, 1997, the Gerald R. Ford Foundation sponsored a *50th Anniversary Commemoration of the Marshall Plan.*  The keynoter, Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, was introduced by President Ford, and the subsequent discussion featured former Secretaries of State Henry Kissinger and Al Haig, former national security advisors Brent Scowcroft and Zbigniew Brzezinski, and former Secretary of Defense Dick Cheney. Three hundred people attended the event, which was broadcast live on the local PBS affiliate from the museum auditorium. That evening President and Mrs. Ford were joined by George and Barbara Bush, Jimmy and Rosalynn Carter, and Lady Bird Johnson in hosting a "recreated" White House dinner and reception in the Amway Grand Plaza Hotel's ballroom. More than 400 friends attended, including Carolyn B. Kennedy (wife of John F. Kennedy, Jr.), Henry Kissinger, Bill Simon, Carla Hills, David Matthews, and Bill Usery.

Early on April 17th, President Ford's press secretary, Ron Nessen, held a press conference where 250 middle and high school students from throughout western Michigan asked questions of Presidents Ford, Carter, and Bush. Later that same morning the three Presidents and their wives participated with Michigan Governor Engler, Archivist of the U.S. John Carlin, and members of the Ford family in the outdoor public rededication ceremony. More than 5,000 visitors attended despite the 40-degree weather. All of these events were broadcast in whole or in part by C-SPAN, NBC, and three local television stations.

Visitorship and gift shop sales have risen dramatically in the past two years, presumably due to both the publicity surrounding the new museum and the healthy economy, which promotes tourism. The funds generated this way help fund positions denied by NARA.

*External Economy: Overall Perception of "What We Can Afford" As a Country*

Despite lingering complaints from some critics of the Presidential Library System about having two facilities for the Ford Library, the institution does not employ more staff than its sister institutions, which operate out of one facility; the issue was in any case settled by 1986, when the new Presidential Libraries Act placed limits on the size and characteristics of subsequent libraries. According to Horrocks, the disadvantages of the separation of the Ford Library and Museum are some extra administrative overhead costs and the fact that the Ford Library archival operation does not have much of a public face, making it is hard to solicit donors and oral history subjects without a museum directly attached to the archival collection. There is a need for public programs, especially outreach with the schools, in Ann Arbor. This is hard to achieve with the museum and its staff being elsewhere. The public face and programs foster the collection of archives and oral history. From the public's commonsense point of view, we should not build these big buildings with a public mission, and then not "use" them.

Despite these problems, it is obvious our society can and will continue to "afford" the basic operations of the Ford Library, which will depend on the Gerald R. Ford Foundation to support most of the institution's public face.

*External Economy: Government Funding for the Library/PLS*

Regarding their need for a small addition to the museum for storage so they can consolidate their artifacts in Grand Rapids, Smith said he thought that is NARA's responsibility. Since the Foundations gave these buildings to the government with the understanding that they would be maintained and sustained in perpetuity, the federal government, Smith felt, must keep the funding flowing adequately, or one of the Foundations could simply "repossess" its donation!

It is obvious there will be no more federal money than there is now, no new staff, everyone must do more with less. Smith's view is that each library needs to do more with public programs and education. Since they must serve as classrooms of democracy and they need to recruit diverse audiences to remain vital members of their communities, these projects will simply have to be funded with private money.

The constant proposal for a centralized facility for presidential libraries ("a marble palace in DC" according to Smith) flies in the face of today's trends toward reinventing government and the idea that smaller is better. Besides, the GSA report showed years ago that a central facility would actually cost more than the present system. Smith says presidential libraries were "reinventing government" long before everyone else got on the bandwagon.

The internal-external issues regarding fulfilling their mission and the funding base are a slippery slope for NARA. All of their public face is paid for with private funds. Only the base funding is federal. The perennial question is: what is the base? The presidential library foundations are reluctant to pay for what they feel the federal government is obligated to pay for. The federal

government accepted these facilities with the understanding that it would maintain and staff them. The perennial question is whether the government is failing to fulfill that obligation.

I was somewhat surprised that Smith made several remarks about being in a "Republican" library. Of course, all four libraries he has directed were built for Republican presidents. He was the only director to use this party-specific language in conjunction with a presidential library. For example, he said when one of "his" libraries needs money, they get it the old fashioned way, they go out and raise it, implying that this is the Republican way to do it. I am not sure other library directors would agree with that assessment, but all would agree that the level of government funding for presidential libraries is minimal at best.

*Summary of the Ford Library's External Economy*

The Ford Library's external economy is robust at the moment, and it provides adequate inputs to allow the library to perform its functions effectively. The Gerald R. Ford Foundation is the key element in its continuing health. The survival of a popular president, his wife, family, wealthy friends, and colleagues plays no small role in this rosy picture. The next big test for the Ford Library will probably come with the death of President and Mrs. Ford. Even then, given Smith's track record at three other libraries, I believe as long as he remains director of the Ford Library, it and the Gerald R. Ford Foundation will remain financially sound with a productive and mutually beneficial relationship.

**External Polity (Non-routine)**

*External Polity: Relations with the Former President and/or His Family*

The Ford Museum and Library benefit greatly from having the active interest and support of President and Mrs. Ford. Their children also play a useful part in supporting the institution. Daughter Susan Ford Bales serves as Vice Chairman of the Gerald R. Ford Foundation, and the Ford sons serve as members of the foundation board. According to Smith, despite their age (mid 80s), President and Mrs. Ford are still willing to travel to Michigan from their home in Palm Springs for special events, such as the rededication of the renovated museum in 1997. Their children usually participate in major events as well. All of this involvement on the part of the Ford family brings publicity, and even more important, funding, to support the non-core activities of the Ford Library. David Horrocks (1994, p. 63) stated,

> No partner is more vital than former President Ford. His active support through the foundation, especially in fundraising and in public programs, his active participation in the library's collection solicitation program, and his public and private expressions of support have been critical components of the library's success.

Kratsas noted that Ford and his museum are very well liked in Grand Rapids. Likewise, Ford's presence in Ann Arbor helps highlight events, such as the November 1997 conference titled "Does America Need the CIA?"

One of the challenges facing the Ford Library in the next decade will be maintaining its support levels without the active involvement of President and Mrs. Ford. At the moment, the future looks rather bright in this arena because of the Ford children's involvement and the popularity of the museum in western Michigan. Another issue the library will have to deal with is the amount space it will need to accommodate the materials it will inherit upon the Fords' deaths. It is safe to assume the federal government will not be willing to fund a major addition to either the museum or library, so this will put another responsibility on the foundation.

*External Polity: Relations with Congress*

When asked whether the library directors are involved in direct lobbying on Capitol Hill, Smith said absolutely not. There is a wall between the directors and the political process. Federal law does not allow lobbying by individual library  directors. The directors cannot use their personal connections to get funding for their own individual projects. The few who have tried it have lost in the end. Smith acknowledged that, given his background, he is not a political naif. But, he has done no direct lobbying with Congress for his libraries. That is what the foundations are for.

Smith also noted that whatever Washington may think of the museums, in reality the directors must go to their private supporters, specifically the foundations, and not Congress, to realize the potential of their institutions. In this Smith excels. He concluded this topic by saying

> At least I don't have unrealistic expectations. My basic desire is - leave us alone! Let us do what we demonstrably do very well and then you [NARA] can take the credit. You can go up to Capitol Hill and take all the credit in the world. If that gets you more money for digitizing records - great, so be it. Just don't muck around. Don't ruin one of the great success stories of American government. (Smith interview, August,12, 1997)

*Prominent Friends*

GERALD R. FORD FOUNDATION

The Gerald R. Ford Foundation is a private, non-profit corporation founded in 1981 when the building phase of the Ford Museum and Library was completed. The foundation supports community affairs, educational programs, conferences, symposia, research grants, and exhibits

honoring President Ford's "lifelong commitment to public service."  The foundation is chaired by Martin J. Allen, Jr., and Robert M. Warner serves as Secretary, continuing the involvement he has had with the institution since his service as chair of the original building committee. Housed in the Ford Museum, the foundation's programs reflect President Ford's "steadfast belief that private funding should be available for educational and public programs to complement the government-financed operation of the facilities." (http://www.lbjlib.utexas.edu/ford/foundati/found.htm) The foundation's functions are clearly integrated into the operations of Ford Library Director Smith's daily operations at the museum.

   According to Smith, one can make a strong case for combining the functions of the library director and the executive director of the foundation. Of course, the day-to-day operations of the foundation are run by others, but the leadership can come from the same person. Smith has combined these roles several times during his career with remarkable success. When I asked whether these simultaneous roles can be viewed as a potential conflict-of-interest, Smith said no, because the private money flows in to support federal programs, rather than the other way around.

   Examples of events sponsored by the foundation include the following recent ones. The November 1996 "Do We Need the CIA?" conference in Ann Arbor brought together many different points of view. President Ford attended, along with Bob Woodward of the <u>Washington Post</u>, Jim Baker, and the current CIA Director. At the same time, the museum opened "Christmas on the Grand" in Grand Rapids with President Ford lighting the holiday trees. An exhibit on gifts to American Presidents from Italy called "Presidents and Paisanos" also opened simultaneously.

   Smith believes there is an inadequate understanding among the general public of what the presidential libraries are. They are not exactly libraries, but rather archives and museums. He insists on using the joint term Museum/Library. Smith touts the Presidential Library System as one of the glories of the federal government. It is certainly the crown jewel of NARA. It takes presidential history beyond Washington, DC and shares it with millions of people around the country. The outreach necessary to bring these treasures (both archival materials and museum artifacts) to the public's attention  is possible only because of the foundation's support.

   Smith has found no attempt at intellectual control over the institutions by their respective foundations. For example, he helped the Hoover Library foundation raise $3 million to renovate the museum, and they piggybacked on that for renewal of fellowships, grants, conference series, and publications. Yet, with all of that support, there was no attempt to control the intellectual content of these endeavors. This example refutes the  notion among some presidential library critics that one institution cannot serve both researchers and museum visitors simultaneously.


*Prominent Enemies*

NONE AT PRESENT

Within the past few years since Smith's arrival there do not appear to have been any prominent enemies of the Ford Library and Museum.


*Summary of the Ford Library's External Polity*

The Ford Library's success in its relationship with the external political environment is directly related to the continuing support of an active and interested former President and the vitality of the Gerald R. Ford Foundation. In addition, the directorship of the well-connected Richard Norton Smith provides a direct, positive link to the wide world of moderate Republican and bipartisan support for the museum and the library. Relationships with the communities of Grand Rapids and Ann Arbor are also very positive, and the museum and the library respectively provide positive visibility.

Despite stable (at best) or declining federal support in terms of dollars and staffing, the Ford Library is able to thrive and to engage in numerous outreach activities because of its excellent relationship with its external political environment.

## Ford Library Political Economy Quadrants Summary Chart

| ***Internal Economy*** | ***External Economy*** |
|---|---|
| • The Library and newly renovated Museum are in good physical condition<br>• Major collections are processed and open<br>• Staffing is minimal, but moderate turnover in the past 4-5 years has brought vitality<br>• Decision-making is informal, decentralized<br>• Interactions with other federal agencies are decentralized, dependent on personal contacts<br>• The federal budget sustains only metabolism<br>• New initiatives are funded by the foundation<br>• Archives functions are stable and routine, with emphasis now on declassification<br>• Museum and education functions are very lively under Smith's leadership | • The Gerald R. Ford Foundation is vital and provides key private funding under the surviving President and First Lady<br>• Government funding provides only basic metabolism<br>• The Ford Museum & Library are well liked in Grand Rapids and Ann Arbor<br>• The local labor markets have more vacancies than applicants, making hiring difficult<br>• The "new" museum has increased attention to and interest in the institution<br>• The Ford Library's place in American culture is secure, but its ability to thrive depends heavily on private support<br>• The Fords' deaths will present challenges |
| ***Internal Polity*** | ***External Polity*** |
| • Staff roles are well-defined and comfortable, especially so because of the split locations<br>• The Presidential Records Act does not apply here, but E.O. 12958 has a significant impact on archival activities/priorities.<br>• The interest and support of the Fords for both the museum and the library is a positive common denominator for the staff<br>• Director Smith is entrepreneurial and unafraid to challenge the status quo<br>• Struggles within the internal polity are minimal at present | • President and Mrs. Ford are active in supporting the Ford Library<br>• The Gerald R. Ford Foundation is very robust and supportive of the Ford Library<br>• The Ford children are active in the foundation and support the library in numerous ways<br>• Director Smith is very well connected politically and this provides enormous support for the Ford Library<br>• Direct Congressional relations are managed by NARA and are cordial<br>• Relations with historians and other constituents appear calm at present |

*Characteristics of the Ford Library as a Policy Subsystem*


The Ford Library's uniqueness, according to Horrocks, is related to the brevity of the administration and the fallout effects of Watergate. The collection is focused on just those 2.5 years from August 1974 to January 1977. Many who served in the administration had ties to Nixon, some with very few ties to Ford himself.



The following description of the Ford Library was derived from applying the variable characteristics of a policy subsystem from Wamsley and Milward and Wamsley, numbers 4-11 from the list of characteristics in Chapter II. Note that numbers 1-3 (recall pp. 36-37) in the list are statements of fact, not variables, and they will be dealt with only in the conclusions section, Chapter VII. Each variable addressed below is either a dichotomy (for example, the Ford Library *is* or *is not* a system) or a continuum (for example, the Ford Library staff may be described along a continuum from collegial to adversarial).


Characteristic 4.

"Policy subsystems are systems in the sense that the variables that comprise them are interrelated so that a change in one variable results in a change in others. Members of policy subsystems are thus **functionally interdependent** or interrelated; in some, members have close symbiotic relationships, in others members have worked out guarded truces, while in still others members are engaged in open competition or aggressive interaction." Their general effects "generally do **not** represent conscious, planned centrally coordinated, **macro-rationality**." "The behavior of individuals within a policy subsystem exhibits **micro-rationality**; i.e., these individuals reflect functional activity of the subsystem and their roles; these roles provide determinate goals, rationales, and calculable strategies that are rational for the individual actors within the context of the subsystem." *(M&W #3, #12, #11)*


The first sentence is an hypothesis, which I judge to be correct, and a dichotomous *variable* (i.e., the Presidential Library System is or is not a system). The relationships are *variable* and they offer the opportunity to devise a Likert scale along the continuum from collegial relationships to adversarial. I must describe individuals' behavior and their relationships.


Yes, the Ford Library fits the description of a system. For example, the options for filling the vacant exhibits specialist position were fairly limited and they fell within NARA hiring constraints.

When the position was denied by NARA, Smith turned to the Library's Trust Fund earnings to pay for it, thereby cutting back on the other uses for that money, which totaled approximately $80,000.00 last year. At the Ford Library the museum and library are less tied together and interdependent than at other presidential libraries because of their geographic separation. Nevertheless, Smith's leadership does tie the two units together.

Staff exhibit a high level of collegiality within each site, and to some extent even between the two sites. The overall rejuvenation due to the recent re-opening of the museum and Smith's high energy level in evidence there seems to inspire a fairly high level of creativity and productivity. The library's response to E.O. 12958 on declassification is having the effect of reducing the number of other (sometimes more interesting) projects the archivists can undertake. This project may present some morale problems until it ends, it is hoped by the 2001 target date.


Characteristic 5.

"Policy subsystems in the American system cut across the conventional divisions of power (legislative, executive, and judicial) and levels of government with **varied internal distributions of power**." "The configuration of power within policy subsystems varies widely from one to another. Some are dominated by one or a few very powerful actors, but in others power may be relatively diffuse." *(M&W #5 and #6)*


*Variable*: The "internal distribution of power" can range from a narrowly dispersed distribution of internal power (very few powerful leaders) to widely dispersed powerful leaders.


The Ford Library exhibits a narrowly dispersed distribution of power with only a few powerful leaders who cooperate to ensure system maintenance; foremost among them are the following. President Ford plays the role of standard-bearer and symbolic rallying point for publicity and fund-raising. Library Director Smith orchestrates functions in both locations and taps his own significant political clout for fund raising and programming. The chief archivist keeps everything running in Ann Arbor and in compliance with federal archival rules and regulations. The foundation chairman and board members all exert influence on behalf of the institution. The Ford Library must negotiate relationships with two city governments, again requiring effective leaders in both locations who can exert some power locally. At the moment, that appears to be handled to the satisfaction of everyone. Relationships with most NARA contacts are handled in a decentralized manner.


Characteristic 6.

"The structure of **functional differentiation**, or, in some cases, task interdependency, also varies; in some it is consciously structured and interrelated in complex ways, others will have much less interdependence or it will exist on an unconscious level." *(M&W #6)*

*Variable*: From consciously structured to unconsciously structured.

The Ford Library operates in a consciously structured, although dispersed manner as a traditionally organized institution, interrelated with its two internal and external sets of partners in a complex web of associations. There is obviously a clear distinction between the museum and archival functions because of the two locations and staff being devoted exclusively to one or the other.

With its small NARA Trust Fund assets (about $585,000 and the third smallest out of ten presidential libraries, exceeding only the Johnson and Carter libraries) and diminished staffing level in recent years, the library is dependent on the foundation and Smith's legendary public relations skills to fulfill its mission. This reliance on outside funding to carry out major functions does not seem to cause much anxiety at the Ford Library. Smith's high energy and the support he gets from the foundation, Kratsas, Horrocks, and others enables the two entities to thrive.

Characteristic 7.

"Policy subsystems manifest a **normative order**. Some are replete with symbols, myths, rituals, and sometimes a special language which reflects the intersubjective reality of the members or their consensus as to what is important, desirable, and right. Referred to by some as a 'constitution,' it has the effect of legitimating and delegitimating behaviors, reaffirming intersubjective reality, and of enhancing exclusivity and autonomy." *(M&W #7)*

*Variable:* Each policy subsystem exhibits a visible normative order to a greater

or lesser extent.

The normative order at the Ford Museum and at the Library has recovered its equilibrium from the upheavals of the early 90s, when the director and other staff were investigated by the NARA Inspector General on charges of conflicts-of-interest. Likewise, NARA's stability has increased from the mid-90s, when there was an acting Archivist of the U.S. and an acting Director of the Office of Presidential Libraries. According to one Ford Library employee, now at least there is someone in DC to read the reports the museum and library submit.

The Ford staff are proud of the new museum and the good publicity they have received in conjunction with its opening. They like the fact that the two cities appreciate their institutions,

although the museum is obviously more of a player in Grand Rapids than the library is in Ann Arbor. The separation of the two facilities enhances each staff's allegiance to the normative structure typical of either a museum or an archival facility. Everyone in Ann Arbor is directly related to the archivists' point-of-view, while everyone in Grand Rapids is oriented toward the museum viewpoint. The professionalism attendant to each function is apparent.

The continuing involvement of President and Mrs. Ford in activities at the institution is a particular source of pride. They are most visible at the museum, where they continue to celebrate special occasions well into their eighties and symbolize the values of achievement, despite adversities, and effective public service.

Characteristic 8.

Policy subsystems are "comprised of actors seeking to influence the authoritative **allocation of values**, be it rewards (dollars, services, status, benign neglect) or deprivation (regulations, taxation, conscription, punishment, status denigration)" (W. p. 77-78). policy subsystems "have embedded in them an opportunity or incentive structure. Functional interaction holds forth the prospect of affecting public policy either in formulation or implementation, i.e., interaction has payoffs that, while by no means certain, nonetheless seem plausible to members." *(M&W #10)*

*Variable:* Each of the policy subsystems described in the dissertation, and the overall policy subsystem of the Presidential Library System, is more or less successful in influencing the "allocation of values" (i.e., does a better or worse job of taking advantage of its available resources in all sectors of government and the private sector to promote its health and viability, i.e. funding, clear mission, passionate supporters, etc.).

By "allocation of values" I mean basically what Congress approves for the budgets and authorizing legislation for the presidential libraries. These are the public funds which require for passage at least some agreement among various powerful actors. In turn, the work of the presidential library foundations is influenced by what happens with the public funding. It is a complex interweaving of what each sees as its particular responsibilities and what each is willing to pay for.

Players throughout the Ford Library subsystem have been very successful in recent years in enhancing the status and resources of their library through every available means. The opening of the new museum and the ability to attract prominent participants for numerous special events is evidence enough of this fact.

Among the players highlighted in these recent endeavors are the bureaucrats employed by the library and NARA; the members of the Gerald R. Ford Foundation, particularly its board; museum visitors; scholars, who depend on the library for access to the archives; the university,

which hosts the library and provides a most congenial atmosphere for an archive; the two localities and their tourism promoters who derive income from the visitors. Nevertheless, Smith is vocal in his irritation that the library's federal funding is minimal, and perhaps not even adequate to support the functions that became the government's responsibility when it accepted the facilities.

Characteristic 9.

Policy subsystems are "heterogeneous, have variable **cohesion** and they exhibit internal **complexity**." (W., p. 78) "policy subsystems are comprised of multifarious actors: institutions, organizations, groups, and individuals linked on the basis of shared and salient interests in a particular policy. In the American polity these might include bureaucratic agencies from all levels of government, interest groups, legislative committees and subcommittees, powerful individuals, or relevant others." *(M&W #8)*

Variable: Each library and the Presidential Library System have 1) more or less cohesion and 2) more or less internal complexity. It is possible for a library to have any level of combination of these two variables.

Within each facility definitely, and to a lesser extent within the overall organization, the Ford Library staff exhibits a high level of cohesion. Although the library and museum operate independently and autonomously under Smith's overall direction, there appears to be a fairly high level of appreciation for and understanding of the overall operation. Perhaps not surprisingly, the level of internal complexity is less within each site of the Ford Library than at other presidential libraries, where the museum and archives share close quarters. Each entity is focused on what it does best, with little confusion over roles or functions. Therefore, the Ford Library exhibits a low degree of internal complexity, and a high degree of cohesion.

Characteristic 10.

Policy subsystems have "an unremitting drive for **functional autonomy** on the part of those interests which are dominant in a subsystem at any given point in time." (W. p. 78) "policy subsystems are subsystems of the larger political system; related to it but in varying degrees of intensity and richness. All have established some degree of autonomy from the larger system." *(M&W #4)* "Self perpetuation of the policy subsystem is the most consistently shared goal of participants. If authority and funding of its correlated programs or its functional autonomy are threatened, this will tend to enhance consensus." *(M&W #13)*

*Variable*: Each policy subsystem described is more or less autonomous at this

moment in terms of its balance of powers and functional activities in relation to its "larger political system"-NARA, and in terms of its feelings of security about its perpetuation.

The Ford Library under Richard Norton Smith has a high degree of autonomy and credibility in its relations with its parent agency, NARA. Smith is a respected director with a proven track record of re-vitalizing older libraries. Although the renovation of the Ford Museum was planned before he came to Grand Rapids, his stamp is clearly on the final outcome of the project. Relations with the foundation appear excellent, and this foundation is not "distracted" by other priorities. It is free to concentrate on supporting the Ford Museum and Library, which it does very well. The future of the museum in Grand Rapids is very secure, as is that of the library in Ann Arbor. Although the staff is small and they have to operate two facilities, they like their communities, they relish their autonomy, and they are confident that private money will be available to conduct activities not possible with federal support alone.

Characteristic 11.

Policy subsystems have "an identifiable core of **horizontal integration**. Unfortunately, most of the research tended to see this horizontal integration as confined to the agency or agencies with statutory responsibility, interest groups and relevant legislative committees or subcommittees. Thus they gave impetus to the oversimplistic metaphor of the 'iron triangle'." (W., p. 78)  AND "**vertical integration** is a part of policy subsystems. Interest groups, program managers and program professionals can be found systematically linked through all layers of the federal government into what the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations called 'vertical functional autocracies'." (W., p. 78) "The linkages between units of a policy subsystem are vertical as well as horizontal so that a policy subsystem may consist of horizontal cluster at different levels which are liked to one another vertically to form the overall system. For example there can be linkages among health agencies in a city as well as each agency being linked to separate state and federal agencies." (M&W #9)

*Variable*: Each policy subsystem described has more or less horizontal

and vertical integration.

The extent of vertical and horizontal integration varies for the museum and the library. At the library, integration is more vertical between NARA and Ann Arbor because functions are restricted to archival ones. Concern with NARA's archival rules and regulations is the driving force in Ann Arbor. Also, the library is more similar to other NARA operations than is the museum. Although the library engages in some outreach activities, especially working with

University of Michigan classes, the emphasis here at present is on compliance with E.O. 12958, with secondary emphasis on processing new collections donated by individuals associated with President Ford. All staff are very aware of being part of a larger federal system.

At the museum, in contrast, there is much more horizontal integration with groups and individuals across a broad spectrum of government and the private sector. Outreach efforts with local, state, and national audiences are well-documented in recent quarterly reports. Richard Norton Smith's book tours for his latest biography (of the Chicago Tribune's Colonel McCormick) have brought publicity and recognition to the Ford Library. His deep connections within moderate Republican circles bring prominent individuals to Grand Rapids and Ann Arbor for exhibit openings at the museum and lectures/conferences at the library. Nevertheless, audiences of common people are not neglected either. Exhibits with titles like "Presidents and Paisanos" and "Grandma Moses" are clearly designed to attract groups who might not be interested in the William E. Simon Lecture or a conference on "Does America Need the CIA?" Activities such as "Christmas on the Grand" require close cooperation with local authorities and civic groups. Relations with the Gerald R. Ford Foundation are very close, and the foundation operates out of the library with Norton's help and guidance.   Staff at the museum are obviously aware of being federal employees, but somehow the connection seems less direct than at the library. Smith gives the impression that he can almost always find ways through the private sector to do what he believes needs to be done, with or without NARA's cooperation.

### Answers to Stein and Bickers' Three Key Questions

The three questions around which Stein and Bickers focused their discussions of policy subsystems were: 1) to whom is the policy subsystem accountable? 2) whose interests does it serve? and 3) how is the connection between the public and its elected representatives distorted by the policy subsystem?  Answers to these questions for the Ford Library follow. Part of the purpose of addressing these questions is to see whether, indeed, this policy subsystem "exists within the context of democratic institutions and practices in America" (Stein & Bickers, 1995,  p. 151), as the authors believe most such subsystems do.

1) *To whom is the Ford Library policy subsystem accountable?*

Although the Ford Library is clearly accountable first to NARA, as are all presidential libraries, at present somewhat less emphasis is placed on this relationship here than at the FDR Library. There are several possible explanations for this observation. First, Smith sets a tone of creativity and emphasis on high levels of productivity, rather than compliance with bureaucratic procedures.  In other word, he is more outcomes-oriented than process-oriented. Accountability to the Gerald R. Ford Foundation, the city and citizens of Grand Rapids (and to a lesser extent Ann Arbor), and to the public on a national scale are emphasized here. Smith has an expansive vision of what a presidential library's mission is, and this vision seems to permeate the atmosphere here. It is not an exaggeration to say he believes all presidential libraries have a responsibility to be classrooms

of democracy, and the only way one can do that is to get people in the doors. That is what he holds himself accountable for.

2) *Whose interests does the Ford Library serve?* At the Ford Library the dichotomy of clienteles is very obvious because of the split locations. In fiscal year 1997 the library served 468 researchers in person, the lowest number since 1982, and the lowest of any presidential library. Nevertheless, oral and written inquiries (especially e-mail correspondence) continued to increase. For example, in one week the library's website received over 9,500 "hits" on its server. Conversely, the museum visitors increased from approximately 90,000 to 118,000. This attendance exceeded that for the Hoover, Eisenhower, and Carter libraries.

The city of Grand Rapids obviously has a direct stake in the vitality of the Ford Museum, and the city works with the institution to promote its continuing health. Cooperation is high, and mutual support is evident. To a somewhat lesser extent the Ford Library, the University of Michigan, and the city of Ann Arbor are mutually intertwined. Nevertheless, the library's integration into the life of the university, especially the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research - ICPSR, is moderately well-developed. The library pays the university for maintenance and security services and provides a setting for some university special events.

3) *How is the connection between the public and its elected representatives distorted by the policy subsystem?* As with the FDR Library policy subsystem, I do not believe the Ford Library policy subsystem distorts the relationship between the public and its elected representatives. In fact, I find it quite the opposite. The two cities that host the library and the museum, their representatives in local and state government and in Congress and the University of Michigan, have cooperated to provide services they deem important to all interested citizens of the U.S. and from abroad. Although some archival users may be frustrated by restrictions on classified materials or personal donations, that situation will largely be resolved with the arrival of complete declassification early in the next century. Besides, that is not a problem unique to presidential libraries, but rather the federal government's system of classifying documents in the first place. "Whereas the library makes available information from and about the government, the museum uses exhibits and events to excite interest and stimulate learning about government and society by people of all ages and backgrounds." (Horrocks, 1994, p. 63)

# Chapter 5 Ronald W. Reagan Library

*Description and Background Information*

The Ronald Reagan Library is located in Simi Valley, California, about 40 miles northeast of Los Angeles. Sited at the crest of a prominent hill, the beautiful, Spanish-style library is well suited to its location and fits the landscape. It is a one- and two-storied, tile-roofed, stucco building built around a courtyard with a burbling fountain. The landscaping is perfect, with blooming annuals, such as impatiens, interspersed with the native flora, including cacti and bougainvillea. When I visited in July 1997, there was a steady, gentle breeze and the apparently typical summer haze that obscures the view of the Pacific some miles away. The first impression is one of quiet and spaciousness. No other researchers used the facilities during my two-day visit. I had lunch both days on the terrace overlooking the valley and mountains beyond - it was gorgeous.

A traveling exhibit called "Tokens & Treasures: Gifts to Twelve Presidents," which originated at NARA in DC, was on display. The exhibit is not Reagan-specific. The standard presidential library exhibits on Ronald and Nancy Reagan are routine, with troublesome aspects of the family history glossed over or absent altogether (such as Reagan's first marriage, his children with Jane Wyman, and prominent public disagreements with his children by Nancy). Perhaps these omissions are not so surprising, given that the FDR and JFK library exhibits did not touch on difficult issues in those presidents' lives, either.

I am not the only person to notice these difficulties with the Reagan exhibits. For example, Edmund Morris wrote a long New Yorker article along these lines, "A Celebration of Reagan: What the Presidential library reveals about the man," in the February 16, 1998 issue. Morris referenced previous Reagan Library Director, Richard Norton Smith, as having relieved the previously hagiographical exhibits and "revised much of the display text and the audiovisual scripts so as not to insult the curiosity of intelligent patrons" (Morris, 1998, p. 54). Nevertheless, Smith was unable to correct "the most obvious dereliction. Only eight and a half by ten inches of its fifteen thousand square feet of exhibit space are devoted to the first Mrs. Reagan…So much for the woman who shared his life for seven years, bore him not one but two daughters (the second, delivered prematurely, lived just a day), and joined him in adopting a son to perpetuate the Reagan name" (Morris, 1998, p. 54). Morris asserts, "But until the museum can devote at least a cabinet to Miss Wyman, to balance the whole gallery accorded Nancy Reagan, it can never call itself a mature institution" (Morris, 1998, p. 54). It is probably safe to assume that will not be for some years to come.

Like my visits to the previous two libraries, I found that the museum here promotes and "polishes" the image of the president, while the archives adopts a professional attitude by providing equal access to all researchers and points of view. The professional archivists pride themselves on this attitude and went out of their way to tell me about it. They also seem

committed to getting the documents open to users as soon as possible, and they express frustration that they can not do so faster.

This site was not the Reagans' first choice, which was Stanford University. In the mid- 1980s, after significant controversy on the campus and in the community, Stanford declined to host the library. The Simi Valley site is a compromise location donated by a development firm, Blakeley-Swartz, in Ventura County. Everyone I spoke to at the library acknowledges that the site is (or is perceived to be) remote from the population centers of southern California. There is no direct affiliation with any university, but the library has good working relationships with nearby institutions such as California Lutheran University, California State University at Northridge, and Pepperdine University. Every year those universities bring classes to use the library's primary research sources for completing course requirements.

I interviewed Director Mark Hunt, Assistant Director Dennis Daellenbach, and Archivist Sherrie Fletcher. Their comments comprise the source materials for most of the analysis below.

I also learned some things about the Reagan Library from former director, Richard Norton Smith, who now heads the Ford Library and Museum in Michigan. At the Reagan Library Smith held three jobs simultaneously: director of the library, executive director of the foundation, and head of the Center for Public Affairs. This triple job arrangement in one person works if that person has an integrated vision for the three organizational players in the system. He stayed there 2.5 years, got all the institutions under one roof, and most important, raised the visitor numbers at the museum, which was very important to the Board and Mrs. Reagan. Smith further stated his opinion that the Center for Public Affairs really only made sense when the library was going to be at Stanford University. Unfortunately, now it's an orphan!

The effect of the library's "remote" location is significant. Even staff members comment that it is hard to get to. The library's major goal now is to get the message out that the library is more than a monument to one man. There has been no real outreach to schools, although they have had teachers here several times a year and they produce curriculum guides and other educational materials.

***Internal Economy*** (Routine)

*Internal Economy: Administration (Decision-making, Staffing, Budgeting, Revenue Generation, Reports Filed with NARA, Information Systems and Technologies, and Service Policies)*

DECISION-MAKING

I use "decision-making" to mean policy-setting, as distinct from policy implementation, which happens during day-to-day problem-solving. Being a "new" library and the first to come under the provisions of the Presidential Records Act, the Reagan is the scene of many decisions that have to be made daily. The need to find more effective ways to process archival collections quickly is

pressing because of public demand and the inherent slowness of compliance with Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), requests which drives the processing on a piecemeal basis, rather than allowing the  processing of individual collections in toto and in some priority order. The need to develop effective community outreach programs is a significant challenge because of the library's remote location. The constant need to foster cooperation with the foundation is a further challenge.

Since mid-1997 and the departure of the supervisory archivist, all nine remaining archivists have had training in team management, and they make their own decisions now (i.e., responding to most FOIA requests, AV and photo orders, etc.), with Dennis Daellenbach serving as "coach." There is some individual specialization, but decisions are being made by the team. Team management is working well, and they have already eliminated or reduced the backlog of responses to requests for documents from researchers. Previously, there were long-term requests, in some cases dating back as far as three years. Archival issues and problems are now handled by Dennis and the team. Both Hunt and outside observers view the archivists as well-trained professionals who perform effectively (Morris, 1998).


STAFFING

In November 1995 current Reagan Library Director Mark Hunt interviewed with Archivist of the United States John Carlin and others in Washington, DC to succeed Richard Norton Smith, who moved to the Ford Library in Michigan. Hunt also interviewed with Mrs. Reagan and others active in the Ronald Reagan Presidential Foundation. He came to Simi Valley early in 1996. Hunt was accustomed  to a value-bound tradition similar to that of President Reagan from his work as director of the Boy Scouts of America museum in Kentucky. Hunt had always admired Reagan and was pleased to come to work for him. Hunt believes his selection for the position was based on his professional qualifications, but he also believes it helps if you share the values of the President.

The Reagan Library has 25 full-time staff and approximately 12 intermittent, part-time staff. On the archives side of the house, in addition to Assistant Director Daellenbach, there are nine professional archivists, three archival technicians, an archives specialist.  This relatively high number is due to the heavy archival processing load in new libraries. On the museum side there is the curator, the registrar, an exhibit specialist, and the public program specialist. Director Hunt devotes much of his energy to the museum area. The director's office has an administrative officer, a facility manager, a receptionist, and a secretary. Of the part-timers, five work in admissions, four work in the museum, one in the audiovisual section, and one in the administrative office. The assistant director's responsibilities include backing up the facilities manager, the administrative officer, and others. Daellenbach sees his role as "Mr. Inside," while Director Mark Hunt's role is "Mr. Outside." Having been here as assistant director since 1991, Daellenbach has helped initiate and support three directors.

Hunt recently requested and received three new archival technician positions from NARA, and he was planning to fill his museum curator vacancy and public program specialist positions within

the month after my visit. This will relieve him to get on with his "outside" responsibilities, which he has had to put aside while doing the museum work himself. These new positions and the ability to fill vacancies is part of the privilege accorded a new library.

The 1997 move to a team management approach in the archival operations is proceeding well and the director and assistant director are very pleased with the results, especially the reduction of the backlog and waiting time for FOIA requests. All team members participated in a three-day training seminar titled "Introduction to Teaming," and Daellenbach attended a one-day seminar on "How to Lead a Team." The team has set specific processing and internal work goals and established a monthly check of its progress. Since NARA has no rules for team performance appraisals, and since there is no supervisory archivist, all of the appraisals for 13 people now fall to the assistant director. The team includes the following levels of staff:  one GS12, seven GS11s, and two GS9s.

Requests for new positions must go through the office of David Peterson, Director of the Office of Presidential Libraries at NARA. NARA's Leadership Council, under Archivist of the U.S. John Carlin, parcels out the money and the positions. Daellenbach reported that working with the human resources department at NARA can be difficult. With a vacancy, presidential libraries have to interview the top three candidates from a list of applicants from outside NARA, and for the applicants from inside-NARA, either all or none must be interviewed. This process can be time-consuming and frustrating. Nevertheless, the Reagan Library's recent good fortune in getting positions approved has to do with its need to process materials and get them open to the public in a more timely manner.

Under Smith's directorship the foundation partially or fully funded some exhibits and program positions. This arrangement was discontinued when the incumbents left their positions. Now the positions are all federally funded.

The library's April-June, 1997 quarterly report highlights its "faithful volunteers" as unpaid staff, who contributed 6,363 hours as docents, museum tour guides, and special events assistants, plus an additional 1,214 working in archives, gift storage, and the gift shop. As with the other presidential libraries, the necessity of a successful volunteer program is obvious.

BUDGETING

NARA funding for the Reagan Library has been erratic over the past five years due to start-up activities inherent in establishing the library. In 1992 the library's total cost to the federal government was just over $900,000. That figure jumped to $2.8 million in FY1993. It fell by $200,000 in FY 1994 and another $200,000 in FY 1995. By 1996 and 1997 the figure had stabilized at approximately $2.5 million.

Like its sister presidential libraries, the Reagan Library's funding has permanent authorization and goes through Congress via the annual appropriations bill for independent agencies, of which NARA is one. I compare below this new library's funding to that of older libraries in FY 1997 to examine the fairly frequent complaint from NARA staff that new libraries "rob" funding and

staffing from older ones. I note that the Ford Library and Museum (two sites) cost slightly less than the Reagan Library's one site, and the Kennedy and Johnson libraries both cost taxpayers more than the Reagan library.

The Reagan Library spends almost all of its funds on salaries, operations and maintenance of facilities, and fixed costs. Only about $64,000 is "discretionary," and even those funds are largely uncontrollable, paying for such things as office supplies. In FY 1997 program costs were $1,092,000 and building operations were $1,425,000 - very similar to those of the Ford and Eisenhower libraries; more than those of the Hoover, Roosevelt, Truman, and Carter libraries. Costs at the Kennedy and Johnson libraries were more than those at the Reagan Library. Program costs at the Bush Library were very similar to the Reagan Library, but since the Bush facility was not dedicated until November 1997, its operating costs were $1 million less than at Reagan.

This comparison reveals that while there may be some negative impact on other libraries when a new one opens, the impact across the board is not major, as all of the libraries tend to maintain base federal funding year after year. In addition, the Office of Presidential Libraries, working with OMB and Congress, has launched a new initiative starting with the Clinton presidency to get NARA staffing for a new presidential library while the incumbent is still in office.

As with other members of the Presidential Library System, the support of the Ronald Reagan Presidential Foundation is important to the Reagan Library's overall budget, and it is critical to the success of the library's exhibit, educational, and outreach programs. The foundation provides about $375,000 per year in support of such programs. Nevertheless, the only evidence I saw of the foundation during my 1997 visit was a small recruiting brochure titled "Friends of the Reagan Library & Museum." Membership levels are listed as Friend at $35 annually for an individual and $50 annually for a family, Diplomat at $100 annually, Cabinet at $250 annually, and Board of Governors at $1,000 annually. Checks are to be made to the Ronald Reagan Presidential Foundation, and members of the foundation's board of trustees are listed on the back. The foundation is not listed on the Reagan Library web site. Chaired by Lodwrick M. Cook, the board of trustees includes such prominent names as Walter Annenberg, Malcolm Forbes, Jr., Merv Griffin, Rupert Murdoch, and George P. Schultz. Clearly, this board is populated by very wealthy businessmen and friends of the Reagans. The foundation does not prepare an annual report. (The foundation will be discussed in detail in this chapter under "external polity." )


REVENUE GENERATION

In FY 1997, the Reagan Library generated $194,588 in admissions income. Admissions are a direct gain for the library, rather than a reimbursable activity. Reproduction services generated $47,436, which is a reimbursable activity and basically cost recovery, wherein expenses for providing the service are subtracted from the revenue amount. Miscellaneous sales amounted to $8,607. The total of $250,631, after expenses were subtracted for staffing the admissions desk, etc., amounted to $67,544 net income. Income from investments equaled $36,007, minus $266 in prior year expense. Therefore, the total net adjusted income was $103,285. All income generated

by admissions, reproduction services, miscellaneous sales, and investments is deposited into NARA's Trust Fund and designated for support of the Reagan Library.

As with the LBJ Library, at the Reagan Library gift shop revenues and expenses are attributed entirely to the Ronald Reagan Presidential Foundation, as are the expenses of providing inventory and operating the shop. After the depreciation and overhead costs paid to the Reagan Library were subtracted, the shop actually showed a deficit for FY97.

The Reagan Library's assets in the NARA Trust Fund are almost $700,000, the sixth largest of the ten libraries.

REPORTS FILED WITH NARA

As of spring 1998, the Office of Presidential Libraries at NARA did not have copies of either one-year or five-year plans on file for the Reagan Library. Once again, this illustrates NARA's and the libraries' emphasis on such planning tools. Fortunately, the April-June 1997 Reagan Library quarterly report filed with NARA is available and it details a variety of activities in all areas of presidential library practice. The marked influence of the Presidential Records Act and the Freedom of Information Act on archival operations here make it obvious how compliance with these relatively new federal laws distinguishes this library from its predecessors. The other striking fact gleaned from this report is the continuing presence and influence of President and Mrs. Reagan in the library's operations. Details from this quarterly report are included in appropriate subheadings of this chapter.

INFORMATION SYSTEMS AND TECHNOLOGIES

Archivist Sherrie Fletcher inherited the Reagan Library computer functions by default. Although she says it is not her area of expertise (or perhaps even her interest), there is no one else to do it. This is another instance where NARA's refusal to approve computer skills positions in the field offices creates less than optimum support for vital operations.

In a February 1990 paper for NARA titled "The Impact of the Computer on the Ronald Reagan Presidential Materials Staff," Fletcher provided the following details, supplemented by information she gave me during my visit. The Reagan White House was the first to use a computer to provide physical control of presidential materials and documents via location registers. An IBM database management system called STAIRS (Storage and Information Retrieval System) was used in the Reagan White House and then by his Presidential Materials staff during the transition period from Washington to California in 1988.

During the transition, Reagan Library staff built upon the practices used for the Ford and Carter library materials, including pallet inventories, box lists, and folder title lists for initial control of the presidential materials. This step is critical during transitions, allowing the presidential materials staff to provide reference service for both the former President and his

successor. The difference with the Reagan materials from the previous two presidents was the use of the computer.

Automation of  White House records management functions was designed to track the huge amount of correspondence and other documents flowing in and out of the President's staff offices. The STAIRS system for the Reagan White House has full-text retrieval capabilities and includes four files: the Correspondence Tracking System (CTRACK) with 568,541 entries; the Staff Secretary's Log (SECLOG) with 44,125 entries; the Presidential Diary (DIARY) with 61,066 entries; the White House Photographic Office file (PHOTO) with 14,901 entries; and the White House Gift Unit file (GIFT) with 73,732 entries. The system is mounted at the Reagan Library on an IBM 9370 midsize computer with 8 megabytes of memory and 2 gigabytes of storage capacity. There are 6 direct access storage devices, a tape drive, laser printer, and stand-alone PCs throughout the library attached to the system.

To my amazement this huge and very outdated computer, along with its printer, consumes about one quarter of  a good-sized basement room, where all printing from the system must be done. Sherrie Fletcher works with the local IBM maintenance staff, who try to keep it running. When this old mainframe finally dies, which it undoubtedly will some day, no one knows exactly what will happen. Neither the software nor hardware are made any more, nor does IBM support it. NARA estimates it would cost about $100,000-$125,000 to transfer the STAIRS system to a more modern one. That project never rises high enough on the priority list to be funded. In addition, the system's search engine is cranky and cumbersome.

Because the STAIRS database cannot be updated (as it constitutes a federal record in and of itself),  nor is there money available to copy the database for migration to a new computer system, when an archivist organizes a collection for the first time and enters its finding number locator into today's desktop-based finding aid system, researchers then have to look in two places to find the item or folder. It is both amusing and frightening that White House records from 1980-1987 are under such convoluted and technologically fragile control.

To illustrate the STAIRS system's early utility in answering reference questions, between January and September 1989 the Reagan Library staff fulfilled a total of 553 requests for information, including 260 requests from former President Reagan's office and 98 from President Bush's White House offices.

The Reagan materials staff evaluated the STAIRS system based on their first year of experience using it. They examined the system's precision (how well it retrieves ONLY relevant documents) and its recall (how well it retrieves ALL relevant documents). Its precision averaged 79%, but its recall averaged only 20%. This sorry recall performance may be attributed to the full-text retrieval system's faulty assumption that users can foresee the exact words and phrases used in the documents they are seeking. Furthermore, it is not possible to correct any of the misspellings or typographical errors found in the system. In fact, as noted above, changes cannot be made in the original system anyway, because the original system as it was transferred to the library is considered a record in itself. For legal and records management reasons, the original record should not be changed.  Therefore, dual systems must be maintained.

Fletcher's evaluation of STAIRS concluded: "Even if privacy and security were not issues, and researchers could use the computer, the complexity of some searches may still require archivists to perform searches for researchers" (Fletcher, 1990, p. 26). The system makes it easy to retrieve specific documents or folders, but it does not facilitate research on the records of organizational units or broader topics such as tax reform under Reagan. In other words, it will not replace traditional finding aids.

Another technology problem is the existence of old 20" computer floppy disks in various file folders from White House offices. There is only one ancient computer with two external drives (one for the program and one for the document itself) and no hard drive to read the documents. This computer too appears to be in its final gasp of operation. There is no systematic way of identifying which of the traditional paper files in the collection include these floppy disks, they just surface as the archivists are processing the folders. One would like to assume that paper copies were made of all the documents on the floppy disks, but there is no assurance of that.

Despite the problems with the Reagan library's computer tracking system, according to Hunt, fortunately, most of the Reagan office files were originally and remain on paper. The Reagan White House had neither electronic mail, nor very many different computer files to handle. Nevertheless, given a very media-oriented president, the library does have to deal with many different audio-visual formats. The problem here is finding and being able to purchase the equipment necessary to handle outdated storage media.

SERVICE POLICIES

As I found at the four presidential libraries I visited, the archivists at the Reagan Library have a very professional and even-handed approach to providing access to the materials in their care. The Reagan work is in some ways more complicated than at other presidential libraries because of the Presidential Records Act requirements, which first went into effect with Ronald Reagan's presidency. Five years after the president left office on January 20, 1989, requests for access to archival collections could be generated by FOIA requests, many of which have been received at the Reagan Library. Once material has been opened for one researcher, it is then available to all subsequent users.

Under provisions of the PRA, information under six stipulated categories can be restricted for up to 12 years after a president leaves office. That period will end January 20, 2001 for Reagan administration materials. The three most frequently invoked of these restricted categories are 1) advice given in confidence to the president by his advisors or among those advisors, 2) clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy, 3) national security information. As of January 21, 2001 all Reagan materials will be subject to the full provisions of the FOIA.

During the first six years of processing at the Reagan Library, less than 10 percent of the requested materials fell under restrictions. Nevertheless, mostly because of the confidential advice category of materials, the 10 percent figure is roughly twice the proportion restricted at earlier presidential libraries where materials were deposited under a deed of gift.

As stated before, processing records piecemeal in response to FOIA requests is more time consuming than systematic processing of collections in a "logical" or provenance order. There is more paperwork and administrative overhead involved in FOIA access. Initial experience with PRA implementation at the Reagan Library suggests that the law is more restrictive of access to information in the short term, especially the first twelve years after a president leaves office, but that may provide more access in the long term since all records are subject to the FOIA (Daellenbach, 1994, November).

Edmund Morris observed in The New Yorker that

Although the legislators who drew up the Presidential Records Act of 1978 appear to have been spiritually descended from that old bat who guarded the papers of Charles Foster Kane [a reference to the movie *Citizen Kane*], archivists here are eager to make available what they can. Anybody with a serious interest can sign up to use the collection, and the open materials are not unrewarding. Everything processed in response to recent Freedom of Information Act requests is by definition in the public domain" (Morris, 1998, p. 55-56). Morris also praised the audiovisual collection, calling it "the richest deposit of historical material in the Reagan Library. (Morris, 1998, p. 56).

Among the open papers so far are those on the Falklands War, Granada, Guatemala, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, and the Vietnam War Memorial. Of the 600 staff collections from the eight-year Reagan administration, the papers of Elizabeth Dole and Margaret Heckler are open, with others opening regularly.

*Internal Economy: Archives Functions*

Library Director Hunt leaves the archives operations largely to Assistant Director Dennis Daellenbach, an experienced archivist who previously worked five years at the Eisenhower Library and 14 years at the Ford Library in Ann Arbor. As noted earlier under "Decision-making," the most significant feature of the Reagan archival operations during my visit was the recent decision not to replace their GS-13 supervisory archivist, who resigned in mid-1997 to take a position in Washington, DC Instead, the Reagan Library director and the archivists decided to move to a team approach for management and decision-making.

The Reagan Library has 50 million pages of documents and 1.6 million photos. So far the archives receives fewer than 1,000 researchers per year. The library does have to handle numerous requests for documents and information coming from Washington, DC. The major difference between the Reagan Library and the earlier presidential libraries is the effect of the 1978 Presidential Records Act on the library's archival operations. This law, as we have seen, allows the President to restrict these federally owned materials for up to 12 years after he leaves office. Releasing these documents involves first notifying the office of Ronald Reagan. On the manuscript front, FOIA requests involve notifying the former and sitting presidents. This is a convoluted way to do things, and it requires archivists to be reactive and open snippets of collections rather than whole units. That is, archivists here cannot process and open the archival

materials in any organized or "rational" manner according to the office of origin or the importance of the subject matter to most requesters. Instead the archivists respond to FOIA requests, and open the materials in the order each request is fulfilled. The Reagan Library has not been able to process collections and get them open to the public as quickly as earlier libraries could. About eight million of the 50 million pages have been released. They are processed in segments of 5,000 pages at a time, with a backlog of 10-11 months. If the documents are classified, the wait is one year for the material to be processed and then submitted for declassification by the originating agency. All of these requests and notifications must go through NARA headquarters. The administrative overhead is tremendous, as the notifications first go to NARA, then to the Office of President Reagan, then back to the library. The pressure of responding to these FOIA requests has delayed the development of the class of tools called "finding aids." Archivist Sherrie Fletcher noted that "Never more will presidential library archivists be able to organize and release their manuscript collections on a 'rational' schedule. They now spend all their time responding the FOIA requests and opening collections on a piecemeal basis as the files are requested." In 2001, the 12-year limit on President Reagan's authority to restrict access to documents ends, and all materials become subject to FOIA.

During the April-June quarter of 1997, in response to 32 new FOIA requests and 3 FOIA appeals, the archives staff processed and reviewed for access under PRA and FOIA approximately 40,000 pages of presidential records. The library also processed approximately 5,600 pages of presidential records from a select group of Head of State records, especially the correspondence file. Included is correspondence to and from President Reagan and General Secretaries Brezhnev, Andropov, and Gorbachev. At the end of the quarter, 18 FOIA cases had been closed and 117 cases were awaiting processing in a queue. The backlog of declassification referrals to originating agencies by the end of the quarter was 40 which had not been returned. Nevertheless, the archives staff were able to apply White House guidelines to declassify 634 pages during regular processing activities.

Seventy-nine researchers made 191 visits to the research room during the quarter, and the staff answered 993 requests for information from the library's holdings. Reproduction of 9,991 pages was provided, along with 341 still photographs, 63 videotapes, and 26 audiotapes. The 10th anniversary of President Reagan's Berlin Wall speech generated a great deal of interest and requests for audiovisual materials.

*Internal Economy: Exhibits/Museum Functions*

Because of his museum background and orientation, Hunt places more emphasis on the museum and public programs than on the archival operations. Also, Hunt is able to rely on Daellenbach to be responsible for the archival functions. Hunt is eager to enhance the public programs and to appeal to more of a young family audience. Many current visitors are older, retired people who have the time to come here. The library needs more diversified program and exhibit options to draw a bigger audience, especially given the culturally diverse nature of southern California. The library needs to reach beyond the usual audience for a presidential library. One initiative in this direction is the new winter program on sharing different cultures'

holiday traditions. Hunt also wants the main gallery to become more interactive in order to appeal to kids and broaden its appeal. Another reason Hunt has spent most of his time on the museum functions is the fact of several vacant staff positions.

The museum received 137,656 museum visitors in FY 1997. This figure has been declining over the past few years, as is typical of most presidential libraries after the initial hoopla of their dedications subsides. In its first year (1992), the library attracted 280,219 visitors, but only approximately half that the two following years. Visitorship went back up to 186,114 in 1995, then down to 155,649 in 1996. Last year showed the lowest number ever. This is a cause of great concern to Hunt and the staff, as well as to the Reagan family and the foundation. All agree that the museum's distance from the nearest major population center in Los Angeles (40 miles), the lack of public transportation to the library, and the lack of a university affiliation contribute to the problem.

The three presidential libraries that attracted fewer visitors in 1997 were the Hoover (in West Branch, Iowa) at 75,146; the Carter (in Atlanta) with 75,371; and the Ford Museum (in Grand Rapids), which came in at 118,013 despite being closed for renovations for the first 3.5 months of the year. The most puzzling among these is the Carter Library, located in the major urban center of the southeastern United States.

During the April-June quarter of 1997, Reagan Library museum staff spent significant time processing objects (560) for acquisition and loan purposes. The popular exhibit, *Back to the 60s*, closed April 6, 1997, and the *Tokens and Treasures: Gifts to Twelve Presidents* traveling exhibit from NARA in Washington opened May 3.

A big splash was made when the museum's millionth visitor arrived June 10, 1997. A Florida couple won numerous prizes for achieving this distinction, including t-shirts, lifetime museum membership, an autographed copy of Nancy Reagan's autobiography, a box of jelly beans, a behind-the-scenes tour of the museum, two tickets to the musical *Ragtime*, dinner at Harry's Bar and Grill, two nights in the Presidential Suite of the Century Plaza Hotel in Los Angeles, a limousine for the weekend, lunch at Chasen's Restaurant, a sightseeing trip to Santa Barbara, and dinner at Boccacio's Ristorante.

*Internal Economy: Education/Outreach*

Educational and outreach efforts at the Reagan Library have had a difficult time since before the library was completed. When the Reagan Library was originally envisioned for the Stanford University campus, it included a public affairs/research/conference center to be run by the Hoover Institution, a semiautonomous conservative think tank with ties to Reagan administration officials. In fact, this was one of the factors which drew the ire of some Stanford faculty, who opposed the university's acceptance of the Reagan Library. When the library site was moved to Ventura County north of Los Angeles and there was no direct connection with a university or think tank, that left the Reagan Center with a much more difficult task in inventing itself. In February 1993, when the Ronald Reagan Foundation paid off the $2 million balance it owed on the original $57 million mortgage, the library's and foundation's focus turned to launching the Reagan Center,

with newspaper speculation that it was trying to emulate the Jimmy Carter Center of Emory University in Atlanta. The Carter Center has often been credited with resurrecting President Carter's image since Reagan defeated him in 1980. At that time in early 1993 the Reagan public affairs center had about $1.5 million in hand, plus pledges totaling another $8 million. The Center was housed at the library, where it paid no rent, but did cover its own utilities.

Nevertheless, within eight months the <u>Los Angeles Times</u> Ventura County section (October 3, 1993) headlined "Reagan Library Discards Think-Tank Plan" and reported that the Ronald Reagan Presidential Foundation had decided to move to "event-oriented programs with popular appeal." It was not coincidental that the same article announced that "renowned historian and biographer" Richard Norton Smith would arrive on November 8, after several years at the Hoover and Eisenhower libraries, to be executive director of the Reagan foundation. The goal clearly was to hire a "rain-maker" for the foundation and re-focus the think-tank idea in order to boost library attendance through effective programming.

Accordingly, in January 1994, the foundation announced it would raise $20 million to expand the museum exhibits and support major public conferences on domestic and international issues. Columnist George Will was scheduled for February 28 to address "What Happened in the 1980s," former Secretary of State George Shultz was scheduled to address "The Perils of Democracy" April 18, and there was to be an August conference focusing on the California defense industry and how it was coping with the end of the Cold War. A similar announcement in the summer of 1994 reviewed the revised and refined goals for the outreach fund-raising initiative, now known as the "Legacy Campaign," and referred to Richard Norton Smith as Director of the Reagan Library, while he simultaneously held the post of executive director of the foundation. The shift in the foundation's focus was toward a series of one-time events with popular appeal, as opposed to scholarly functions over an extended period of time.

It is not clear whether these initiatives were overwhelmingly successful in addressing their intended purpose, for by late 1995 Smith had departed to lead the Ford Library in Michigan. Mark Hunt came to the Reagan Library as director in 1996. When I visited in the summer of 1997, there was no full-time education/public program staff member on the personnel list, although Hunt did say he was hiring a public program specialist the next month.

The April-June 1997 quarterly report did list a healthy array of upcoming events, with special activities listed every week. Included were a book signing by Nancy Reagan, an art workshop for children, a traditional Fourth of July family celebration with the Marine Corp Band from Camp Pendleton, a one-man portrayal of frontiersman and Congressman Davy Crockett, holiday seasonal exhibits and events, and the opening of a *Grandma Moses* exhibition. A "Battle of the Bands," featuring eleven local bands in the library courtyard, was held April 6, 1997 to serve as a send-off for the *Back to the 60s* exhibit. All ages and many musical styles were represented, from country to jazz to rock-and-roll.

During the spring quarter 1997, library director Hunt spoke to local groups such as the Abraham Lincoln Elementary School and the Pro-Search Job Fair. He gave interviews to local and national media, including the <u>Los Angeles Daily News</u>, MSNBC, the <u>Simi Valley Star</u>, and

PBS affiliate KCET. He also attended a meeting of the foundation's board of trustees in Las Vegas and the Ventura County Museum Directors in Santa Paula.

Local groups that held meetings at the library during spring 1997 included the Special Children's League, Kiwanis Governors, Leadership Simi Valley, Amgen (to present their Amgen Teacher Excellence Awards of $10,000 each to five area teachers), Boy Scouts of America, California Lutheran University, and Moorpark College.


*Summary of the Reagan Library's Internal Economy*

The internal economy of the Reagan Library may be described as stable and rather quiet under Hunt's leadership. Funding from the federal government and income from the Ronald Reagan Presidential Foundation is stable, adequate, and predictable. The former President until quite recently, and Mrs. Reagan, to a greater extent, are still a visible force in the foundation and the library itself. Their ability to attract audiences for events and fund-raising benefit the library.

The Library's primary focus here is on compliance with the Presidential Records Act in opening the archival collections as soon as possible. Staffing is relatively high because Presidential Records Act requirements mandate that opening the Reagan collections to researchers be a priority among overall positions for the agency. The 1997 shift to team management for archival operations is progressing well and has been a morale booster for staff. The need to increase a declining visitorship is a constant concern for the director and the museum staff. A fairly high level of satisfaction is evident among the staff, who seem to appreciate their beautiful surroundings and pleasant working conditions. Several staff have had experience at other presidential libraries or at NARA in Washington, DC, so they bring a somewhat broader perspective to operations than might otherwise be possible.

Dealing with outmoded information and media technologies presents a serious challenge for the staff here, and it affects the short and long-term availability of materials to researchers. As in the other presidential libraries, there are no staff here with formal professional skills in computer technologies, so an archivist must provide the support for staff and the public. The computer situation at the Reagan Library, which could go from okay to horrible overnight and would require for restitution expenditures no one has budgeted for, is a major internal economy accident waiting to happen.

Barring that eventuality, the internal economy of the library functions well, and interested groups are able to achieve their shared desire to affect public policy in support of the library. The Ronald Reagan Presidential Foundation is well funded, and it devotes adequate and appropriate resources to the library. Like the Gerald R. Ford Foundation, the Reagan foundation appears to devote itself to supporting the library and is not very involved in other projects, especially since abandonment of the concept of a center for public affairs here.

***Internal Polity (Non-Routine)***

*Internal Polity: Normative Structure (Incentive Structures, Dominant Coalition, Socialization, and Interest Articulation and Aggregation)*

INCENTIVE STRUCTURES

The Reagan Library is new enough that the emphasis here is still very much on processing archival collections and getting them open to the public. Major incentives are associated with increasing productivity in the archives. The efforts to generate visitorship and outreach are concentrated at the director's level, and are at least partially in response to pressure from Mrs. Reagan to get the numbers up to the level of the most popular libraries (i.e. the JFK and LBJ libraries). Concurrence with Reagan's philosophy is important for staff here, from the director on down. In earlier years, when that concurrence was not always present, problems arose. Staff I talked with all admire Reagan as a man and as a president. Somehow that seemed more important here than at the other libraries I visited.

The support provided the library by the Ronald Reagan Presidential Foundation is significant, and absolutely critical to the survival of the museum and educational programs. Reagan's foundation is financially healthy and provides stable and relatively generous annual support for the library. The continuing interest of Mrs. Reagan and her numerous wealthy friends benefits the library enormously, despite the occasional negative news stories about her possible interference in the operations of the library and/or the foundation. Maintaining good relations with the foundation is an essential feature of the incentive structure, and Hunt and his staff are doing that.

DOMINANT COALITION

Clearly, the dominant coalition at the Reagan Library today revolves around the staff and the Reagan family, who still wield great influence. Among the library staff, the archival staff is prominent because of the emphasis on processing and opening collections in a more timely manner. Also important here is having an entire staff who are comfortable with President and Mrs. Reagan and their philosophy. Mrs. Reagan is a clear and regular presence, her hand visible in many activities.

The emphasis within the library appears to be on professionalism and a fairly traditional and bureaucratic approach to the library's functions, again fostering the dominance of the archivists. Relations between the library and the foundation today appear cordial, but rather formal, definitely more so than under the previous directorship of Richard Norton Smith, when he was simultaneously library director and executive director of the foundation.

SOCIALIZATION

The library is making an effort to build staff confidence and morale through activities such as an outdoor barbecue held recently for NARA and foundation staff, contract employees, and

volunteers. Described by Hunt as "very successful," the event gave everyone an opportunity to "meet and greet and talk with other people from the Library beyond the sometimes fleeting official contacts" (Quarterly Report, April-June 1997).  Similarly, on May 1, 1997 when Supervisory Archivist Rod Soubers was departing for his new NARA position on the White House National Security Council (NSC) staff, the library hosted a farewell party with presents, food, and other "good stuff." The quarterly report noted that "Rod was one of the four people who came west with the Reagan presidential records in January 1989," and it went on to detail his accomplishments at the Reagan Library.  His new position working with declassification issues for the NSC in Washington is seen as a very positive career move for Soubers, and obviously provides an example for other young archivists who sometimes have few career mobility options.

Two promotions for archivists were noted during the quarter, along with the birth of a baby to one of the archivists. A cleverly worded paragraph ("April 19 was a dark and stormy night.") commended three library staff for helping their NARA colleagues at the Federal Records Center in Laguna Niguel, California, throughout the night when that center was hit with a flood.

The team management project among the archivists is also a morale booster. During my visit, as a reward for meeting their work goals this quarter, the team treated itself to lunch off-site and seeing the movie "Air Force One," which features the actual plane used during Reagan's presidency. That afternoon they were all in high spirits and obviously thriving under the new team arrangement. My chats with Sherrie Fletcher and the other archivists were very positive in tone; they seem to enjoy their work and the pleasant surroundings.

The turmoil from having had three directors during the library's first six years seems to have settled down. Hunt and his staff appear comfortable with their work and with the Reagans' worldview, which is important according to former director Richard Norton Smith. Likewise, staff seem to be secure in the knowledge that their work is important. They are not overwhelmed with huge groups of either researchers or museum visitors, and their location is beautiful and peaceful.


INTEREST ARTICULATION AND AGGREGATION

The Reagan Library feels like an outpost of the federal government high on a hill in southern California, rather than a dynamic local institution. Despite the library's interest in increasing visitorship and its work with the foundation to support educational and outreach activities, it does not exhibit the same kind of local visiblity, integration with its community, and sense of independent mission that I observed at the Kennedy Library,  the Roosevelt Library, and the Ford Museum. The Reagans, especially Mrs. Reagan since her husband's illness, are still very much involved with the Reagan Library, effectively articulating their particular interests. She is visible in many of the library's activities and is consulted about  exhibits, conferences, speakers, etc. before final decisions are made. It will be interesting to see how the library evolves after the Reagans are no longer around. Again, the location of the library may be even more of a handicap when it loses the "draw" of the former president and first lady. Than again, as the city of Los Angeles continues

to expand into southern Ventura County, bringing more population and development, the potential for visitorship and community support should increase.

*Internal Polity: Leadership Attributes of the Director*

Like most presidential library directors, Hunt clearly supports the decentralized system we currently have in place for handling presidential archives and museum operations. He believes this system gives citizens a sense of the presidents as hailing from a wide spectrum of places and contexts. The libraries illustrate the character of their respective areas, as well as the man himself and the local community's influence on him. Hunt believes the setting tells one something about the man and his area of political activities. In Reagan's case, although he grew up and went to college in the midwest, he has spent his adult life in southern California. Hunt also believes accessibility is an important issue for citizens of the region who would never be able to go to Washington, DC Hunt describes the presidential libraries as "branch offices for presidential history." They promote knowledge of the presidency as an institution. He clearly relishes his leadership role of a presidential library, albeit with a quiet, somewhat reserved, demeanor.

He would like to see more collaborative projects among all ten libraries, such as jointly prepared and funded traveling exhibits that rotated from site to site. An example of collaboration is  NARA's declassification scanning project, which has been going on at the older libraries (Eisenhower through Ford). Scanning is not happening here at the moment, because of the pressing need to respond to FOIA requests and provide initial processing of materials. As the deadline for declassification of Reagan Library documents under E.O. 12958 approaches, scanning or other technologies for speedy processing will undoubtedly be undertaken.

Hunt's biggest headache is how to make more people aware that the library exists. Visitorship should be higher, given the size of the metropolitan area. The Reagan Library needs to show people how easy it is to get here. The second headache is simply the time needed to process materials and eliminate the backlog of requests. The wait is too long, partly because of declassification activities.

When Richard Norton Smith was here, he simultaneously served as Director of the Library and Executive Director of the Foundation. Hunt does not duplicate that model. Hunt noted that today, the only presidential library director who still holds both jobs is Harry Middleton at the LBJ Library. Nevertheless, former director Daley at the JFK Library retired from federal service to become head of their foundation.  In the opinion of  Lou Anne Missildine, long-time Reagan Library Secretary, one person simultaneously holding both directorships works great. There is no conflict, as there sometimes is when there are two directors who disagree. Nevertheless, sources at NARA confirmed that the same person holding both jobs simultaneously probably will not be repeated in the future. Although NARA does not report any major problems with the joint directorships, the potential for an appearance of impropriety inherent in that model is sufficient reason to discontinue the practice after Middleton retires.

Hunt is a rather low-key museum professional. He is clearly working hard to build strong relationships within the organization and a positive identification with the library. His personality

and style are very different from his predecessor Smith's high energy, entrepreneurial manner. Hunt said he speaks with Smith fairly often, and he seems well-connected within the presidential library directors group. His demeanor seems somehow better suited to the Reagan Library than Smith's would have been. This library is a quiet place in a quiet setting, and the priority right now has to be on the archival side of the house. Therefore, Hunt, complemented by Daellenbach as assistant director, is a good leader for this library at this time.

*Internal Polity: Rule-making, application, and adjudication mechanisms*

Because of the Presidential Records Act (PRA), federal government rules and regulations have had a greater impact at the Reagan Library than at any previous presidential library. In addition to the usual federal procurement and personnel rules, the PRA governs every aspect of the release of presidential materials. As described in detail earlier under 'Internal Economy: Archives Functions,' the Reagan Library is heavily involved with processing and opening collections under the provisions of the PRA, and since January, 1994 (five years after Reagan's presidency ended), via FOIA requests. As the first president whose papers were declared government property by the 1978 act, Reagan did not donate his collections under deed-of-gift. Of the almost 50 million pages in the manuscript collection, approximately 8 million pages have been made available to the public. Scholars complain about the slowness of the release of documents, but an unanticipated consequence of the PRA has been even slower processing than in earlier presidential libraries.

The rules governing mandatory review for declassification constitute another area with significant impact on the Reagan Library. Under Executive Order 12958, researchers may request that agencies of the federal government declassify documents that are closed for national security reasons. Researchers are alerted to the existence of classified documents in collections when a withdrawal sheet is placed at the front of a folder where the classified document resides. The process for getting such documents declassified is detailed, and it can take months. In some cases NARA archivists have been trained and given the authority to declassify documents under strict guidelines from the originating agencies. This speeds up the process considerably. Also, under this E.O., all classified documents in the Reagan collection must be declassified by 2014, 25 years after Reagan left office.

Information technology is another area where the impact of federal rules and regulations are evident. As Archivist Sherrie Fletcher pointed out, because the outmoded STAIRS retrieval system for Reagan's files is in itself a "record," the integrity of its arrangement and content must be preserved, even if an updated computer system becomes available. Archivists throughout NARA have been struggling for some years now with how to preserve computer-generated government records and make them available to the public. The need to constantly update the hardware and software for accessing these documents in digital formats is problematic, and the debate continues.

*Summary of the Reagan Library's Internal Polity*

The Reagan Library today exhibits stability and functionality are fostered by congruence between the internal polity and the external economy and polity, as we shall see in the next two sections. Staff size is healthy by NARA standards, and their roles are well-defined. Professionalism is obvious, and, with a relatively young staff, the energy level appears high. Allegiance to the Reagans and their world-view is understood and accepted, despite the inevitable anxieties produced by high turnover in the director's position during the library's first six years.

Staff understand and appreciate the library's mission and their own individual roles in fulfilling it. The disappearance of the Center for Public Affairs removed a large uncertainty and distraction for library staff, and that seems to have helped focus everyone's attention on the library's core missions of 1) archival preservation and availability to researchers and 2) museum/outreach/educational programming. As the ninth library to join the Presidential Library System, the Reagan Library's questions of survival, institutional goals, and legitimacy of function were largely settled before it opened. At this time there are few struggles within the internal polity.

**External Economy (Routine)**

*External Economy: Local Economy including the Labor Pool and Employment Rate*

Simi Valley, California, is in the rapidly growing southern part of Ventura County. Prosperous and full of new housing developments and upscale shopping malls, the area houses not only the staff for the library, but perhaps even more important, the 200+ volunteers (many retirees) who key to the Reagan Library's provision of services and programs. Filling vacant positions in consultation with NARA is a headache for Hunt and Daellenbach, who must interview the top three candidates from a list sent by NARA Human Resources in DC. Daellenbach described these lists as "catch-as-catch can."

This process for announcing and filling vacancies from 3,000 miles away is cumbersome.

When I asked Sherrie Flecther, who accompanied President Reagan's papers when they were shipped to a Los Angeles warehouse in January, 1989, how she felt about moving out to the far suburbs when the library opened in 1991, she replied that she and most of the archivists like it fine. Housing costs less here than in L.A., and the atmosphere is peaceful. Since there is very little in the way of a career path for the archivists if they stay here, one wonders whether there will be more cases like that of Rod Soubers, who moved to DC to work for NARA.

Simi Valley is primarily residential and it is not a major tourist area. These factors contribute to the Reagan Library's relatively low visitorship. As noted earlier, the location is perceived as remote by Angelenos, and few attractions persuade tourists to drive out to the mountaintop off the I-5 highway. Hunt plans to enhance the library's interactions with the Los Angeles Unified

School District to bring in more teachers and school groups, at least in part to try to entice the children to come back with their relatives.

*External Economy: Stability and Vitality of the General Economy*

The current strong national economy is probably best reflected at the Reagan Library through the financial reports of the Ronald Reagan Presidential Foundation, which provides generous support to the library. Investment returns for the foundation between January 1 and September 30, 1996 amounted to more than $225,000. Those returns alone could account for two-thirds of the support provided to the library in an average year. Similarly, the foundation's gift shop operations generated over $600,000 during the same period, and reflected the highest *per visitor* spending of any presidential library gift shop. It is safe to assume that both the investments and the gift shop operations would be adversely affected if the national economy takes a down turn.

California's recovery from the deep recession that hit in the early 1990s is also evidenced by the growth in the communities near the Reagan Library. The area's building boom in housing and shopping centers is a reflection of a strong economy.

*External Economy: Overall Perception of "What We Can Afford" As A Country*

Like all presidential libraries, the Reagan Library holds a secure spot in the federal budget, and its status as one of the newest libraries has helped secure extra staffing. Congress decided long ago that the Presidential Library System was here to stay. In the case of President Reagan, the country also decided through its representatives in Congress to name the second largest building in the country, newly opened in downtown Washington, DC, the Ronald Reagan Federal Building. In another recent decision (1998), over the objections of the Virginia constituents who reside near the airport, Congress renamed the Washington National Airport the Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport. This decision was taken despite projected costs of more than $1 million to produce new signage, stationery, etc.  Such decisions reflect an expansive mood and economy, at least where Congress is concerned.

Even though the Reagan Library cannot realistically expect significant increases in its federal funding as it ages, the financial health of the foundation means that the library will probably be able to undertake new exhibits and programming indefinitely.

*External Economy: Government Funding for the Library/PLS*

Federal government costs for support of the Reagan Library in FY 1997 were $2,517,200, including personnel, building operations, and maintenance. Like all presidential libraries, the Reagan Library's budget has permanent authorization and goes through Congress via the annual appropriations bill for independent agencies, of which NARA is one. This amount is second only to the Johnson Library, and just ahead of the Ford Library/Museum. This amount is enough to keep the library operating, and relatively well, considering the newness of the physical complex

and the relatively high level of staffing allowed the library so it can speed up the processing of the collections. Nevertheless, the almost 15% in additional funding provided by the foundation is the key to the library's public face via programming and museum exhibits.


*Summary of the Reagan Library's External Economy*

The Reagan Library's external economy is healthy and stable. NARA funding for the library is relatively generous (third after the more heavily used Kennedy and Johnson Libraries), and financial and in-kind support from the Ronald Reagan Presidential Foundation is substantial. The Reagan foundation is financially sound and very effective at fund-raising. It also appears to be well managed. The continuing interest of Mrs. Reagan and the prominent friends of the former president assures some visibility and the ability to generate income.

Nevertheless, the library's remote location may create some hardships when the Reagans and their immediate circle of friends are no longer around to provide a "draw." I believe, however, that with today's healthy financial grounding and sound investments, the Ronald Reagan Presidential Foundation will largely offset these difficulties and inevitable losses.


**External Polity (Non-routine)**


*External Polity: Relations with the former President and/or his family*

Mrs. Reagan is actively involved in the Foundation and in fund-raising, as was President Reagan until recently. Nancy Reagan visits the library often, and Hunt talks with her on the phone even more frequently. Other Reagan family members are not involved in the library's activities. On April 25, 1997, despite his Alzheimer's disease, President and Mrs. Reagan paid a surprise visit to the library, during which he delighted the tourists and library volunteers by having his photo taken with them and sitting on the set of his childhood home in Illinois.

Prominently featured in the April-June 1997 quarterly report was a project undertaken by Reagan Library staff and Mrs. Reagan, along with her decorator, to "freshen up" the private presidential quarters at the library. A case of medals given to President Reagan, along with swords, paintings and other art work were added to the decor.

Despite the apparently cordial relations between the Reagans and the library director, President Reagan's office is no longer housed at the library, having moved to an office building in downtown Los Angeles. Given the provision of ample space for his office in the library, it does seem to emphasize once again the remoteness of the library. When even President Reagan, his family, and staff prefer downtown L.A. to the beautiful Simi Valley site, one can see why visitors might think twice about trekking out to Ventura County.

*External Polity: Relations with Congress*

The Reagan Library's relations with Congress appear much more remote than those of the Roosevelt and Ford libraries, both of which have directors with political experience before they became involved with presidential libraries. Mark Hunt is a museum professional who, although obviously comfortable with the Reagans and their political milieu, does not appear to be particularly well-connected politically in Congress or the administration. This may not be a particular handicap, given that presidential library directors do not lobby on behalf of their institutions anyway.

In another, perhaps more significant divergence from the Roosevelt and Ford libraries and their foundations, the Ronald Reagan Presidential Foundation does not have members of Congress on its board. Yet despite this lack of direct Congressional visibility for the Reagan Library and foundation, the current popularity of Ronald Reagan with the Republican Congress is obvious given the recent buildings named or renamed in his honor.

*Prominent Friends*

THE RONALD REAGAN PRESIDENTIAL FOUNDATION

From its creation on February 27, 1985, until today the Ronald Reagan Presidential Foundation has been successful in fund-raising. The involvement of a popular former movie star/President made it possible to attract high-profile support. For example on February 7, 1991 The New York Times (p. B26) reported that Ronald Reagan's star-studded 80th birthday celebration in Beverly Hills attracted more than 900 people at $2,500 each. Among prominent attendees were Elizabeth Taylor, James Stewart, Merv Griffin, former British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, California Governor Pete Wilson, and Vice President Dan Quayle. The event raised more than $2 million for support of the Reagan Library.

Nevertheless, even before the Reagan Library was dedicated on November 4, 1991, the Ronald Reagan Presidential Foundation was the focus of controversy over the membership of its board of trustees. Long time Reagan faithfuls Edwin Meese III, Martin Anderson, and William P. Clark were pushed off the board just before the grand opening, despite their firsthand knowledge of Reagan's politics and policies going back to his years as governor of California. Sources quoted in the Los Angeles Times (November 3, 1991) insisted that Nancy Reagan was responsible for the move toward her preference for personal friends and wealthy businessmen.

In February 1992, the foundation announced the appointment of former Secretary of State George Shultz to its board, while newspapers once again noted the controversy swirling around the recent removal of Martin Anderson, William P. Clark, and Edwin Meese III in a supposed purge orchestrated by Nancy Reagan, and the subsequent resignation in protest of board member former Energy Secretary John S. Herrington. Former President Reagan denied that his wife had anything to do with the removals.

Today the Ronald Reagan Presidential Foundation makes its headquarters at the Reagan Library and employs about 12 people. When Richard Norton Smith served as head of both the library and the foundation, foundation support for the library was handled rather informally. Now that the two entities are more separate, the library submits detailed annual budget requests to the foundation. Of the foundation's approximately $2 million annual budget, about $375,000 per year comes to the library for support of advertising, promotion, special events, and exhibits.

When I called to request information about the Ronald Reagan Presidential Foundation, I found the staff much more cooperative than most other presidential library foundations in sharing financial data; but other kinds of publications, such as newsletters and brochures, were oddly lacking. Fortunately, the foundation promptly provided financial statements for the year ended December 31, 1995 and for the nine months ended September 30, 1996 (which reflected the organization's change in fiscal year). The foundation counts the Simi Valley land, building, and equipment value of approximately $64 million as part of its assets, which total almost $80 million. On March 18, 1991 the foundation granted NARA the "exclusive right to use and operate the Library for so long as the Library is operated as a presidential archive" (The Ronald Reagan Presidential Foundation: Financial Statements for the Nine Months Ended September 30, 1996, p. 7).

In a departure from most earlier libraries (the LBJ Library being the exception), the Reagan Library's gift shop operations are run by the foundation, and its costs and earnings are reflected in the foundation's financial statements, including indirect costs such as utilities and general foundation overhead. For the nine months ending September 30, 1996 the gift shop generated $612,919 in revenue on merchandise and personnel costs of $453,535. When depreciation, amortization, and allocated overhead costs are added, the shop lost $7,043 during the period. A 1998 NARA study of presidential library sales stores revealed that the Reagan Library's sales per visitor ($5.25) were by far the highest of any of the shops at other presidential libraries. The next highest amount per visitor of $3.31 was generated at the Eisenhower Library.

For the Reagan Foundation, the end of the 1996 nine-month period saw almost $300,000 provided by operating activities, plus cash and cash equivalents of approximately $1.7 million. On September 30, 1996 the Legacy Campaign designed for fund-raising to support the library's outreach and educational efforts noted above had a balance of almost $9 million.

*Prominent Enemies*

The Ronald Reagan Library has been subject to the usual criticisms common to all of the presidential libraries. For example, in his August 1, 1991 Washington Post column, Jack Anderson first criticized the appointment of former Reagan White House aide Michael K. Deaver to supervise the upcoming grand opening of the new Reagan Library, with his salary of $15,000/month coming from gas and oil giant ARCO. Anderson's criticism stemmed at least in part from Deaver's conviction and $10,000 fine for illegal lobbying activities after he left the White House. Anderson then went on to state:

"As with the other presidential libraries, the really interesting stuff will be off limits. For example, foreign affairs and national security documents may be kept under wraps well into the next century thanks to an executive order Reagan signed while in office. Much of the compelling reading material on the Iran-Contra scandal will be stacked high in a basement vault." (Anderson, p. D12)

I found no evidence to support Anderson's claim. The Reagan Library is complying with applicable federal legislation and policies. Nevertheless, it is true that classified documents may remain unavailable to researchers for years and it is up to the originating agency to release them earlier. If we assume that most Iran-Contra documents are classified, they may remain unavailable until after 2000.

Prominent historian Dr. Joan Hoff of Ohio University's Contemporary History Institute, in a December 4, 1997 telephone interview with me, claimed the Reagan Library is using a loophole in the law to refuse access to the position papers the president's aides sent him. In Hoff's view these are especially important documents for the Reagan administration, "because everyone knows he [Reagan] had no thoughts of his own." This assertion may be proved correct or incorrect when these documents become available to the public on January 21, 2001, when Reagan's option of restricting access to some documents under the PRA expires.

*Summary of the Reagan Library's External Polity*

The Reagan Library's success in its relationship with the external political environment is directly related to its ability to sustain positive dealings with Mrs. Reagan and with the Reagan foundation. The foundation's board is comprised largely of wealthy businessmen, rather than political operatives or members of Congress. The Reagan Library is geographically isolated and is not as integral a part of its community as the Roosevelt and Ford libraries are. Without a direct university affiliation to foster scholarships, conferences, and symposia (as the Carter, Kennedy, LBJ, Ford, and Bush libraries have), the Reagan Library has to exert more effort to maintain visibility in both the scholarly community, and the museum world. Also, the director is less politically well-connected, and therefore less visible, than some of his counterparts.

The library has been successful in lobbying NARA for more staff, primarily to help address the backlog of researcher requests for documents under FOIA. Given the stability of federal funding for the library and the sound financial health of the foundation, the Ronald Reagan has perhaps less need to cultivate stronger ties with its external political structures and processes than older members of the system. Whether that situation can be sustained after the Reagans are gone remains to be seen. The fact that the foundation counts the library land, building, and improvements among its assets may provide more security than at some libraries, where the property title was transferred to the federal government.

***Reagan Library Political Economy Quadrants Summary Chart***

| ***Internal Economy*** | ***External Economy*** |
|---|---|
| • The Library is only seven years old and in very good physical condition<br>• Processing and opening collections is the top priority for the library<br>• Staffing is relatively generous<br>• Decision-making is informal, decentralized<br>• Interactions with other federal agencies are decentralized<br>• The federal budget sustains more than metabolism<br>• New initiatives are funded by the foundation<br>• Archives functions are a driving force because of the PRA and FOIA compliance<br>• Museum and education functions present promotional challenges due to the site | • The Ronald Reagan Presidential Foundation is wealthy and provides key private funding under the surviving President and especially the First Lady<br>• Government funding is relatively generous<br>• The Reagan Library is isolated and somewhat invisible in Simi Valley<br>• The local labor market provides applicants, but NARA hiring is cumbersome<br>• Visitorship has been declining for several years<br>• The Reagan Library's place in American culture is secure, but its ability to thrive depends heavily on private support<br>• The Reagans' deaths will present challenges |
| ***Internal Polity*** | ***External Polity*** |
| • Staffing grew in 1997 and with moderate turnover<br>• Teaming efforts have been successful<br>• Staff roles are well-defined and comfortable<br>• The Presidential Records Act is a major constraint on archival operations, but E.O. 12958 does not yet have a significant impact on archival activities/priorities<br>• The interest and support of the Reagans is a positive common denominator for the staff<br>• Director Hunt is a thorough professional, calm and deliberate<br>• Struggles within the internal polity are minimal at present | • President and Mrs. Reagan are active in supporting the Reagan Library<br>• The Ronald Reagan Presidential Foundation is financially sound and supportive of the library<br>• Director Hunt is less well connected politically than some of his counterparts, but he works effectively with the foundation for support in the external polity<br>• Direct Congressional relations are managed by NARA and are cordial, though distant<br>• Relations with historians and other constituents appear relatively calm at present, with little scholarly activity at the library so far |

### *Characteristics of the Reagan Library as a Policy Subsystem*

The following description of the Reagan Library was derived from applying the variable characteristics of a policy subsystem from Wamsley and Milward and Wamsley, numbers 4-11 from the list of characteristics in Chapter II. Note that numbers 1-3 (recall pp. 36-37) in the list are statements of fact, not variables, and they will be dealt with only in the conclusions section, Chapter VII. Each variable addressed below is either a dichotomy (for example, the Reagan Library *is* or *is not* a system) or a continuum (for example, the Reagan Library staff may be described along a continuum from collegial to adversarial).

Characteristic 4.

"Policy subsystems are systems in the sense that the variables that comprise them are interrelated so that a change in one variable results in a change in others. Members of policy subsystems are thus **functionally interdependent** or interrelated; in some, members have close symbiotic relationships, in others members have worked out guarded truces, while in still others members are engaged in open competition or aggressive interaction." Their general effects "generally do **not** represent conscious, planned centrally coordinated, **macro-rationality**." "The behavior of individuals within a policy subsystem exhibits **micro-rationality**; i.e., these individuals reflect functional activity of the subsystem and their roles; these roles provide determinate goals, rationales, and calculable strategies that are rational for the individual actors within the context of the subsystem." *(M&W #3, #12, #11)*

The first sentence is an hypothesis, and it represents a dichotomous *variable* (i.e., the Presidential Library System is or is not a system). I judge the Presidential Library System to be a system. The relationships are *variable* and they offer the opportunity to devise a Likert scale along the continuum from collegial relationships to adversarial. I must describe individuals' behavior and their relationships.

Yes, the Reagan Library fits the definition of a system. The addition of three new positions to the staff last year because NARA judged the processing of archival collections a priority is an example of how the library operates in a larger world. That larger world is in turn affected by what happens in Washington and how the work of other presidential libraries is perceived in comparison to the Reagan Library's priorities. The sharing of traveling exhibits, such as the "Tokens and Treasures: Gifts to Twelve Presidents," provides a recent example of system-wide cooperation which benefited the Reagan Library.

Staff here are relatively young and they exhibit a high level of collegiality, especially given the recent move to a team management approach in the archives operations. Given that archival

activities are predominant at the Reagan Library and that the majority of the staff work in this area, the high level of collegiality here tends to affect the entire organization. The arrival of museum professional Hunt as director has given a boost to that operation as well, freeing Assistant Director Daellenbach to concentrate on archival operations. The pleasant and generously sized physical plant, as well as the beautiful scenery, seem to have a positive effect on those who work here.

Characteristic 5.

"Policy subsystems in the American system cut across the conventional divisions of power (legislative, executive, and judicial) and levels of government with **varied internal distributions of power**." "The configuration of power within policy subsystems varies widely from one to another. Some are dominated by one or a few very powerful actors, but in others power may be relatively diffuse." *(M&W #5 and #6)*

*Variable*: The "internal distribution of power" can range from a narrowly dispersed distribution of internal power (very few powerful leaders) to widely dispersed powerful leaders.

The Reagan Library exhibits very few powerful leaders, and the internal ones are low key. Mrs. Reagan is recognized as a dominant force at the library, both internally and externally. Former President Reagan, who suffers from Alzheimer's disease, makes occasional visits, but he is now a figurehead, rather than a active participant. At the time of my visit in August, 1997 the Ronald Reagan Presidential Foundation included a number of prominent, wealthy businessmen on its board, but these individuals were not powerful leaders interacting within the policy subsystem directly. In 1998 a new director was hired for the foundation, Mark Bearson, and he is dynamic and forceful, rather dramatically altering the situation when I was there. The library director and staff are competent, professional, and low-key, but the emphasis at this library today is definitely on processing collections in compliance with the PRA and FOIA, while trying to enhance visitorship through programming and exhibits. Relationships with the local and state governments are also low-key at the moment and are managed at the director and assistant director level. For example, because the Reagans will be buried on the library grounds, Director Hunt recently passed the California examinations required for certification in cemetery management. Relationships with NARA are largely handled in a decentralized manner by the individuals directly involved in the question at hand.

Characteristic 6.

"The structure of **functional differentiation**, or, in some cases, task interdependency, also varies; in some it is consciously structured and interrelated in complex ways, others will have much less interdependence or it will exist on an unconscious level." *(M&W #6)*

*Variable*: From consciously structured to unconsciously structured.

The Reagan Library, like its sister institutions, operates in a consciously structured manner, although it is beginning to try new management arrangements such as the archival team created in 1997. This library appears more self-contained and isolated than some of the other libraries. While it is interrelated with its internal and external partners, such as NARA and the foundation, in a somewhat complex web of associations, this is not as obvious here as elsewhere. The library's clear and conscious focus on its archival operations and the relatively generous support available from both the federal treasury and the foundation allow it to function rather independently and quietly.

Characteristic 7.

"Policy subsystems manifest a **normative order**. Some are replete with symbols, myths, rituals, and sometimes a special language which reflects the intersubjective reality of the members or their consensus as to what is important, desirable, and right. Referred to by some as a 'constitution,' it has the effect of legitimating and delegitimating behaviors, reaffirming intersubjective reality, and of enhancing exclusivity and autonomy." *(M&W #7)*

*Variable:* Each policy subsystem exhibits a visible normative order to a greater or lesser extent.

The normative order at the Reagan Library is visibly centered around archival professionalism, along with acceptance, and usually affection, for the Reagans and their view of the world. There is a quiet camaraderie under Hunt's directorship, which must be something of a relief after the turnover of directors in the library's earliest years. The geographic isolation of the staff from their NARA counterparts and from the nearest metropolitan area probably promotes some sense that they must form their own professional community. Everyone is proud of their new, well-equipped facility, but the state of their information technology creates a source of frustration. The underdeveloped state of the library's web site is probably more indicative of its internal focus than of NARA's slowness in promoting web development. The concept of decentralized presidential libraries is firmly accepted here as not only "the way we do it in America," but also the way it should be done.

Characteristic 8.

Policy subsystems are "comprised of actors seeking to influence the authoritative **allocation of values**, be it rewards (dollars, services, status, benign neglect) or deprivation (regulations, taxation, conscription, punishment, status denigration)" (W. p. 77-78). policy subsystems "have embedded in them an opportunity or incentive structure. Functional interaction holds forth the prospect of affecting public policy either in formulation or implementation, i.e., interaction has payoffs that, while by no means certain, nonetheless seem plausible to members." *(M&W #10)*

*Variable:* Each of the policy subsystems described in the dissertation, and the overall policy subsystem of the Presidential Library System, is more or less successful in influencing the "allocation of values" (i.e., does a better or worse job of taking advantage of its available resources in all sectors of government and the private sector to promote its health and viability, i.e. funding, clear mission, passionate supporters, etc.).

By "allocation of values" I mean basically what Congress approves for the budgets and authorizing legislation for the presidential libraries. These are the public funds which require for passage at least some agreement among various powerful actors. In turn, the work of the presidential library foundations is influenced by what happens with the public funding. It is a complex interweaving of what each sees as its particular responsibilities and what each is willing to pay for.

The Reagan Library so far has been able to count on two things to insure its rather generous and stable funding. First, the Reagan and Bush presidential libraries are the two newest ones, each with an enormous backlog of archival material to process, and they must comply with the detailed Congressional mandates of the PRA and FOIA. These two libraries, along with NARA's new facility in College Park, Maryland, are the agency's trophy sites, and they are adequately staffed and maintained. Second, the Reagan foundation is financially healthy, and it is generous in a routine and predictable manner. The library so far has not had to cultivate and sustain the kind of networks and powerful allies necessary to support the older libraries. Undoubtedly, those tasks will become necessary as the institution ages and newer libraries open.

Presently, players in this policy subsystem have been largely limited to the bureaucrats within the system, Mrs. Reagan, library volunteers, a few members of the foundation board, a few scholars who have used the collections, and museum visitors. I expect the need for a broader base of support will materialize in the library's second decade.

Characteristic 9.

Policy subsystems are "heterogeneous, have variable **cohesion** and they exhibit internal **complexity**." (W., p. 78) "policy subsystems are comprised of multifarious actors: institutions, organizations, groups, and individuals linked on the basis of shared and salient interests in a particular policy. In the American polity these might include bureaucratic agencies from all levels of government, interest groups, legislative committees and subcommittees, powerful individuals, or relevant others." *(M&W #8)*

Variable: Each library and the Presidential Library System have 1) more or less cohesion and 2) more or less internal complexity. It is possible for a library to have any level of combination of these two variables.

Given its focus on archival operations and the push to get rid of the FOIA backlog, the Reagan Library exhibits a high degree of cohesion among the staff. Although exhibits and educational programming are receiving attention from the director, and they are obviously important, the needs of the archives are really driving operations here. Everyone seems to understand that and support it. The movement to team management is seen as a positive development.

Internal complexity is low, because the library operates with a clear mission and a high degree of autonomy to carry it out. Roles and responsibilities for the staff are largely unambiguous. Interactions with local universities, the community, and other agencies are discretionary, rather than being a mandated or integral part of this library's operations.

Characteristic 10.

Policy subsystems have "an unremitting drive for **functional autonomy** on the part of those interests which are dominant in a subsystem at any given point in time." (W. p. 78) "policy subsystems are subsystems of the larger political system; related to it but in varying degrees of intensity and richness. All have established some degree of autonomy from the larger system." *(M&W #4)* "Self perpetuation of the policy subsystem is the most consistently shared goal of participants. If authority and funding of its correlated programs or its functional autonomy are threatened, this will tend to enhance consensus." *(M&W #13)*

*Variable*: Each policy subsystem described is more or less autonomous at this

moment in terms of its balance of powers and functional activities in relation to its "larger political system"-NARA, and in terms of its feelings of security about its perpetuation.

The Reagan Library currently has a high degree of autonomy in its relations with NARA and support from its parent agency to carry out the mandates of the PRA. As the first library covered by that law, it seen as the prototype for how the policies and procedures will be carried out in future presidential libraries. Therefore, it is in NARA's interest to help it succeed in this arena. NARA's support, along with the stable support of a wealthy foundation, allows the Reagan Library policy subsystem to feel secure about its perpetuation. The absence of perceived threats allows the library to concentrate on its core mission, which at this time is primarily archival, rather than educational.

Characteristic 11.

Policy subsystems have "an identifiable core of **horizontal integration**. Unfortunately, most of the research tended to see this horizontal integration as confined to the agency or agencies with statutory responsibility, interest groups and relevant legislative committees or subcommittees. Thus they gave impetus to the oversimplistic metaphor of the 'iron triangle'." (W., p. 78)  AND "**vertical integration** is a part of policy subsystems. Interest groups, program managers and program professionals can be found systematically linked through all layers of the federal government into what the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations called 'vertical functional autocracies'." (W., p. 78) "The linkages between units of a policy subsystem are vertical as well as horizontal so that a policy subsystem may consist of horizontal cluster at different levels which are liked to one another vertically to form the overall system. For example there can be linkages among health agencies in a city as well as each agency being linked to separate state and federal agencies." (M&W #9)

*Variable*: Each policy subsystem described has more or less horizontal

and vertical integration.

The current focus on archival operations promotes vertical integration between NARA and Simi Valley. Although the library engages in some outreach and programming activities, the emphasis here is on compliance with Congressionally mandated archival procedures. The Reagan Library's operations and interactions with those outside its bureaucracy  illustrates that at this point it can depend largely on NARA and the foundation to maintain its equilibrium. The library's quarterly report cited above reveals a fairly typical "iron triangle" model.

The earlier controversies surrounding the Reagan foundation board and the status of the Center for Public Affairs may have fostered a tendency for the library to become more internally focused than other libraries. On this characteristic, the Reagan Library behaves less like a policy subsystem and more like an iron triangle than most of its sister libraries.

### *Answers to Stein & Bickers' Three Key Questions*

The three questions around which Stein and Bickers focused their discussions of policy subsystems were: 1) to whom is the policy subsystem accountable? 2) whose interests does it serve? and 3) how is the connection between the public and its elected representatives distorted by the policy subsystem? Answers to these questions for the Reagan Library follow. Part of the purpose of addressing these questions is to see whether, indeed, this policy subsystem "exists within the context of democratic institutions and practices in America" (Stein & Bickers, 1995, p. 151), as the authors believe most such subsystems do.

1)  *To whom is the Reagan Library policy subsystem accountable?*

The Reagan Library policy subsystem is primarily accountable to two key authorities, NARA and Mrs. Reagan. NARA is not only the library's parent agency; but it also provides the professional "home" for staff allegiance and many of its norms. Nevertheless, most everyone acknowledges that Mrs. Reagan is still regularly involved in decisions about exhibits, outreach activities, ideas for increasing visitorship and fund-raising. Although the library depends on the foundation for substantial financial support each year, the relationship between the two entities currently seems to be rather formal, and the support is standardized and predictable.

2)  *Whose interests does the Reagan Library serve?*

Like all presidential libraries, the Reagan Library serves various constituencies. In fiscal year 1997, the library serviced 614 researcher visits and hosted 137,656 museum visitors, exceeding the year's attendance at the Hoover, Eisenhower, Carter, and Ford libraries. Overall, during the library's first four years it served more than 675,000 visitors to the museum and its conferences, programs, and events. Researchers who have filed FOIA requests for documents are a small, but important, constituency here, and meeting their needs more promptly has become a top priority in recent years. Failure to do so could lead to a serious backlash and diminution of NARA and Congressional support for the library.

This library seems less integrated into its local community than many others, partly because of the growing and transient nature of southern Ventura County. Therefore, the local community is less of a constituency here than elsewhere. Likewise, the library's relationship with its foundation presently appears less intense than at some other presidential libraries. Nevertheless, the members of the Ronald Reagan Presidential Foundation, especially its board of trustees, constitute a very important constituency for the library.

3) *How is the connection between the public and its elected representatives distorted by the policy subsystem?* The Reagan Library policy subsystem does not distort the relationship between the public and its elected representatives in any way I can discern. More than most, the Reagan Library functions as a Southern California outpost of the federal government, which carries out its mandates quietly, professionally, and in a rather routine manner. The library is occupied with fulfilling its charge to preserve and make available the Reagan administration's official documents according to the guidelines laid down in the PRA. The system and its operations did not originate

here, nor is it seriously questioned. Rather, the library is only one of the most recent incarnations of a system whose mission and mechanisms were settled years before this library opened.

# Chapter 6 Office of Presidential Libraries and the Presidential Library System Policy Subsystem

Chapter VI examines the Office of Presidential Libraries (referred to within NARA and in the libraries as 'NL') and the overall Presidential Library System policy subsystem. The chapter will illustrate that the overall policy subsystem is operative in a much more complex environment than the environments found in the individual libraries. If I describe each individual presidential library as a policy subsystem in miniature, or "lite," I mean they are policy subsystems, but ones which operate in a fairly limited sphere of operations and influence. On the other hand, I can describe the overall Presidential Library System policy subsystem as full-blown policy subsystem, or a "regular" policy subsystem.

In my descriptions of the overall policy subsystem using Wamsley's four political economy quadrants, the subheadings will vary somewhat from those used to describe the individual libraries, because the mission and responsibilities of the central office are different from those of the libraries. Likewise, the descriptions vary in length depending on the circumstances affecting this "central office" aspect of the system's operations.

## *Office of Presidential Libraries at NARA*

NARA's Office of Presidential Libraries (NL) provides oversight for the ten presidential libraries and for the Nixon Presidential Project based at NARA's Archives II headquarters in College Park, MD. The office is also engaged in planning activities, direction of federal policy in the libraries, and White House liaison activities (to provide preparation for the transition of archival materials between administrations and to facilitate swift White House access to documents housed in any of the presidential libraries). NL employs approximately 54 staff in the Washington, DC, area (about half of those are the Nixon Presidential Project staff) and commands an annual budget of just over $3 million. David Peterson, Director of the Office of Presidential Libraries, is assisted on a policy level by Sharon Fawcett, Deputy Assistant Archivist for Presidential Libraries. I conducted interviews with the following staff at the Archives II in College Park: Michelle Cobb--Management and Program Analyst (the most extensive interviews and continuing consultation), John Constance--NARA Congressional Liaison, David Peterson--Director of the Office of Presidential Libraries, and Alan Lowe--Management and Program Analyst. I also conducted extensive interviews with John Fawcett, retired Director of the Office of Presidential Libraries.

As we turn to a discussion of the internal economy, the internal polity, the external economy, and the external polity of the Office of Presidential Libraries, we find the topic particularly complex because the quadrant model may be applied in three distinct ways. First, NL has a direct effect on the individual presidential libraries. Second, NL is affected by what happens in the libraries. Finally, NL has its own policy subsystem characteristics within NARA. For the purposes of this study, I concentrate on the first two - NL's relationships with the libraries and their

operations. The topic of NL's functioning within NARA may provide ample fodder for a follow-up study.

Of the four political economy quadrants discussed in this paper, NL is most intimately involved with the internal economy of presidential libraries. Daily interactions take place between NL staff and the libraries regarding decision-making, staffing, budgeting, planning and reporting activities, information systems and interfaces, and service policies. Large and small decisions must take into account both federal government policies and procedures and those of the private-sector support organizations. Exemplifying the internal economy focus is the August 5, 1998 "Policy on funding programs and staff in Presidential Libraries," NARA 98-205, published under Archivist Carlin's signature. Although it has a one-year expiration date and is marked "Interim Guidance," it is safe to assume something very similar will be retained beyond the year. The document provides for the first time in the history of the Presidential Library System a policy paper defining the appropriate funding source (NARA, the NARA Trust Fund, or foundations) for activities such as solicitation of donations of historical materials, programs for the documentary publication of records, recruitment and training of volunteers, and operating museum shops. It also specifies that all new staff positions in presidential libraries must be funded by NARA or through trust fund revenues, and that existing positions funded via other means (usually foundation supported) must be reassigned over time to one of these two approved sources. This document is significant because it codifies in writing some relationships that have been left unspoken for many years. Some within NARA believe there has been a reluctance to document ongoing foundation support for presidential libraries for fear that Congress would react by cutting federal funding accordingly. This fear could also help to explain why NARA has never sought regular documentation from the presidential library foundations about their annual support for the libraries. Perhaps implementation of the Presidential Libraries Act of 1986 and the advent of fairly stable and predictable Congressional relations in recent years has prompted NL to take whatever risk is involved in formalizing these relationships. My observation is that the system is becoming somewhat less politicized than it was early in this decade.

The Office of Presidential Libraries is somewhat less involved in the internal polity of individual presidential libraries than it is with their internal economies. Nevertheless, compliance with federal policies and procedures in such areas as personnel, budgeting, contracts, procurement, document access and security, and declassification activities has a decided effect on the libraries. Normative structures, including incentives, dominant coalitions, socialization, and interest articulation within the libraries are predominantly influenced by who was hired when and under what budget line, length of tenure among the staff, lack of career ladders in the field locations, and the career path of the library's director.

NL has little effect on the external economic factors of the individual libraries such as their local economies, labor pools, and employment rates. NL does, however, have an important role to play in insuring the continuing stream of federal dollars coming into the libraries to fund all of the basic operations such as salaries, maintenance, and office equipment. NL bundles all of the libraries' annual budget requests into NARA's budget request and sends it forward to OMB and Congress.

Except with a sitting president or with a very new library, NL's role in the external polity of individual libraries is also limited. Relations with the former president and his family and with prominent friends or enemies of the library are largely handled on the local level. NL's advice may be sought, but the responsibilities in this arena are largely local-- with one exception: relations between presidential libraries and Congress. These relations are an important area of the external polity in which NL's role is prominent because of its determination to keep all of the libraries and their foundations working together to support NARA's priorities, rather than having individual libraries or foundations make an "end-run" around NL to get funding for a local project.

*Internal Economy* (Routine)

*Internal Economy: Administration (Decision-making, Staffing, Budgeting, Revenue Generation, Reports Filed with NARA, Information Systems and Technologies, and Service Policies)*

DECISION-MAKING

Decision-making in the Presidential Library System policy subsystem is characterized by decentralization with only broad guidelines and advice provided by NL. The extent of local autonomy varies somewhat from library to library, based primarily on the views and style of individual library directors and the extent of foundation support each has available to provide support for local endeavors. The following discussion of the guidelines NL provides the libraries illustrates the extent of local versus centralized decision-making in the system.

The current Presidential Libraries Manual (Libraries 1401, April 15, 1985) is undergoing a complete revision. The revised version is due in late 1998. This document, which provides the basic policy guidance for presidential libraries, has been supplemented and revised piecemeal over the past 14 years via memoranda and change orders. Revision of the manual has been delayed while the long-anticipated Architectural and Design Standards for Presidential Libraries: NARA Internal Review Draft (dated December 19, 1997) was being prepared. The purpose of the manual is described as follows:

> This handbook sets forth guidelines for the operation of Presidential libraries and Presidential materials projects and provides general guidance on administrative, professional, and technical matters. It is in accord with the provisions of law (44 U.S.C. 2101-2207 and 2301-2308 and Pub. L. 98-497) and the regulations for the public use of records (41 CFR 105-61). At the same time, it recognizes that in some of their activities the libraries must be guided by local circumstances. (p. 1-1)

After defining its purpose, the manual describes the following: acquisition and processing of historical materials, reference service, published materials in the collections, oral history, preservation and security, public relations, and planning and reporting. Model deeds of gift for

donation of historical materials and oral history interviews and a sample deposit agreement are provided, along with an appendix with architectural and design standards for presidential libraries. The fact that the manual has not been fully updated in 15 years, during which time the applicable laws and public policy have changed dramatically, is probably indicative of the administrative and leadership difficulties experienced by NARA and the Office of Presidential Libraries during the first half of the 1990s.

The manual calls for each library to provide a five-year program plan, annual work plans, quarterly narrative and statistical reports, monthly statistical reports, and other occasional special reports as requested by NL. As noted previously, these reports have not always been submitted nor officially acknowledged by NL, particularly when NARA and NL were without permanent directors.

To familiarize myself with NL's reporting style and to provide the flavor of its routine activities, for comparison purposes with the period during which I did my field research, I consulted the Third Quarterly Report of FY 1997 for the Office of Presidential Libraries. The report revealed planning activities for the Clinton library, a management program review of the Truman Library by three staff from headquarters, and events at various libraries. Highlighted was the NARA's Remote Archives Capture (RAC) Project for scanning documents and creating a database with regard to E.O. 12958 (declassification of archival documents in a more timely manner). Declassification activities were conducted in cooperation with the State Department, the U.S. Information Agency, and the Federal Emergency Management Agency during the quarter.

In addition to the manual, NL also follows NARA's agency manual called ADMIN 201. This document covers standard federal rules and regulations such as cash handling, personnel directives, and budget requirements. NARA also has TRUST FUND 300, a manual specifically designed to address the procurement and other administrative functions associated with this private money, as distinct from the money appropriated by Congress.

Presidential library policies and procedures are also emphasized at the annual presidential library directors' conferences. The most recent conference was held in November 1997 in College Station, Texas, in conjunction with the Bush Library dedication. Held over two days, the conference provided an opportunity for NL staff and all the directors to meet and discuss changes in procedures and policy, as well as any issues of concern. My request for permission to attend the non-confidential portions of this meeting was rejected by NL on grounds that allowing any outsider to attend the meeting would make it a public meeting. NARA did not want to set such a precedent because it fears that discussions of personnel matters and proposals in progress may be published to the detriment of the agency. I question this decision, since all the individuals involved are public employees, and I am a professional colleague who happens to be conducting research on the libraries. Nevertheless, I did not have either the time or the resources to challenge the decision. Fortunately, the NL Program Analyst who took minutes at the meeting was allowed to summarize them for me orally within several months of the event.

The topics addressed at the conference made up an ambitious two-day agenda: cooperative funding for traveling exhibits, training and travel funds, advertising restrictions in federal agencies, appropriate and inappropriate use of library facilities by outside groups, compliance with the

Americans with Disabilities Act, approvals required for staff memberships on local community boards, the logo policy for library exhibits and facilities, museum shops and sale of reproduction items versus authentic artifacts, a Presidential Records Act update, position classifications for archivists in the libraries and at NARA, a redesign of the CIDS training program for archivists, automation in the libraries, facilities standards, contracting for services, upgrading the process for the required five-year program reviews of each library by NL, an update on NARA's compliance with the GPRA, NARA's Strategic Plan and the libraries' place in it, an update on the Clinton Library, and the renovation projects at the FDR and Truman libraries.

STAFFING

Staff at NL are career bureaucrats with deep ties to NARA. Most have advanced degrees in history and/or public administration. They appear to be hard-working and diligent, as well as dedicated to the mission of the presidential library system and its approach to preserving and managing presidential archives. For many middle-level positions, the GS 12 and 13 grade levels strike me as low, given the amount of responsibility the positions carry.

The number of staff at NL was relatively small and stable until about 1989, when John Fawcett arrived as Director and Pat Borders as part of the management team. At that time the size of the staff increased. By 1995, due to retirements from NL and a major reorganization and downsizing throughout NARA, the composition of NL staff changed, although the size of the overall staff remained about the same. A shift occurred away from support and clerical positions and towards more mid-level, professional positions. The office became more focused on centralized planning, automation of work processes, and the development of system-wide standards. Of the 27 staff at NL today, seven work in planning and direction functions, while 10 work on the presidential materials staff interacting with the current administration and performing miscellaneous archival and artifact collections management tasks from their "downtown" office.

To illustrate the various roles and responsibilities for staff in NL, I provide the following descriptions for two key staff members in the office and their interactions with the field offices.

*Management and Program Analyst for Facilities (Alan Lowe)*

Having joined NARA in 1989 with his new masters degree in history and having served with the Reagan project in Los Angeles before the new library opened, today Alan Lowe is based in College Park at Archives II and is most involved with presidential library facilities. He engages in facility maintenance planning, operations and maintenance contracts, and planning for new presidential libraries. Lowe oversees the move of historical materials to new and existing libraries. In addition, he serves as NL's management control liaison, which includes site inspections and audits of library operations, in-depth research and analysis of internal administrative systems, and oversight of administrative legal matters referred to the Office of Presidential Libraries. The job requires top secret clearance. Yet with all these responsibilities, the position is only a GS 12. (A proposal of reclassification to the GS 13 level was made for FY 1999 and approved effective in March, 1998.)

Lowe described two of his recent projects. The first, installing a new fire protection system at the LBJ Library, was originally estimated to cost just over $1 million. NARA secured from Congress a special appropriation to cover this cost, given that NL's total annual facilities budget at that time for all of the presidential libraries was about $750,000. Simultaneously, NARA created a new line item in the Congressional budget for maintenance and renovation projects through a no-year fund. Unfortunately, not only did the GSA estimates for the LBJ fire protection project turn out to be too low, but in addition, asbestos was found in the building. The project ended up costing approximately $1.6 million. NARA had to go back to Congress for supplemental funding before the project could proceed. The second project we discussed in detail is the addition/renovation project at the FDR Library and the difficulties involved in coordinating such a project with the National Park Service, the New York State Historic Preservation Office, and the Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt Institute. The usual budget now allocated by Congress for repair and renovation projects in all of the presidential libraries combined is approximately $1.1 million.

In a February 26, 1998 Library Expansion Analysis document, Alan provides useful information on the funding, reasons for expansions, and criteria for funding such projects. Reasons for expansions include the age of the facilities and renovations required for the libraries to fulfill their mission, i.e., access and safety concerns for visitors and staff and/or inadequate space for public educational programs and temporary exhibits. Solely government funded expansion projects at the libraries took place in 1968 (Truman), 1969 (Hoover), 1971 (Eisenhower), 1974 (Hoover), 1975 (Eisenhower), and 1979 (Truman). There have been no projects solely funded by the federal government since the Carter administration. Since then, joint funding of projects has included the 1972 expansion at the FDR Library, the 1991 expansion at the JFK Library, and the 1992 expansion/renovation at the Hoover Library. Alan's analysis notes that Senator Hatfield (R-OR) was instrumental in getting Congressional approval for the massive Hoover renovation completed in 1992, that Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan (D-NY) obtained a FY 1994 appropriation of $500,000 for design of the FDR addition, and that Senator Edward M. Kennedy (D-MA) and Representative Silvio Conte (R-MA) secured Congressional funding for the Kennedy expansion in the total amount of $17.3 million in no-year funds dedicated solely to the JFK Library. (No-year funds are rare in the federal budget). Meanwhile, the Kennedy Foundation also donated $2 million for museum exhibit design and production of a film for use in the new museum.

Criteria for funding such projects now include two elements, each dependent on a number of factors difficult to forecast. The first criterion is the availability of private funds, and the second is the availability of federal funds. Private funding depends on an active library foundation and an active library director who works well with the foundation. Federal funding is dependent first on having a member of Congress willing to take up the cause, followed by the general budget climate, and the support of the active foundation willing to approach Congress about the expansion needs. The availability of private funding is the key ingredient in making the appropriation of federal dollars palatable to Congress.

Lowe and other NL staff have been heavily involved in developing the Architectural and Design Standards for Presidential Libraries: NARA Internal Review Draft dated December 19,

1997, which had not achieved final approval as of 9-1-98. These standards are required by the Presidential Libraries Act of 1986 (Pub. L. 99-323). After general information and program requirements, they provide specific standards for the major elements of internal economy: siting requirements, general building criteria, structural systems, heating/ventilation/air conditioning, fire and life safety, security, floor loads, finishes, lighting, glazing, electrical systems, program equipment, and required documentation. The information in the new architectural and design standards document was previously available only as a rather brief appendix in the <u>Presidential Libraries Manual</u> dated April 15, 1985 and reprinted in 1992.

*Program Analyst for Planning and Policy Management (Michelle Cobb)*

Michelle Cobb joined NARA in 1990 as Congressional Liaison. In 1991 she became a program assistant in the Office of Presidential Libraries. She has served for the past five years as Management and Program Analyst for planning and policy management. The position requires that she analyze, review, and make recommendations to NL and to NARA management regarding the agency's policies, programs, and procedures that have agency-wide or government-wide professional impacts. She evaluates and administers directives, forms, correspondence, and reports; conducts policy and program analysis and planning; and develops proposals for policy guidance. She develops management control plans for the presidential library system, having performed in-depth research and analysis of internal administrative systems. One of her major areas of responsibility is office automation systems for the libraries, the role of NL software systems in relation to NARA-wide databases, and computer planning and support for NL. She helps plan new presidential libraries, creates submittals to Congress for acceptance of new libraries, and assists in the move of materials from Washington to new and existing libraries. In short, her job is to think and write about planning and policy for the presidential library system.

Examples of Cobb's work include museum visitor and researcher survey projects at the Kennedy, Hoover, and Truman Libraries as part of GPRA compliance. The goal is to evaluate visitors' satisfaction levels, determine whether their needs/requests are being met, and learn what the unmet needs are. Outside contractors were employed to help conduct the surveys in the libraries (using a model derived from a visitor survey conducted at NARA's DC area facilities). One of the stumbling blocks with using surveys is compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act and the concomitant requirement to get approval from the Office of Management and Budget, which can take six months. Eventually, all the libraries will need to conduct surveys, focus groups, and similar projects to measure their outcomes under the customer plan, rather than use the old output measures of previous years (largely statistics, head counts, document counts, etc.). Another recent significant project for Cobb was the evaluation and recommendation of a computer software system for tracking museum objects.

Cobb emphasized that, while planning and reporting activities between the libraries and NL were neglected during a period of upheaval in the early 1990s when there was no appointed Archivist of the U.S. and no permanent director of NL, those days are over. Now, as a result of former Governor Carlin's efforts as Archivist and new requirements under GPRA, such plans and reports will become more important than ever. NARA and presidential libraries are being held

accountable to Congress for every resource, and the agency must show how the resources are directly tied to the strategic plan. The constant question is, does this activity relate to the core mission of the agency; and if not, why are federal funds being used to support it? The trend will be toward ever more private funding to support exhibits and programs. For the first time, in 1997 NARA hired a foundation development officer. Cobb's involvement in this issue includes working with individual libraries to review whether a given expenditure is appropriate within the federal budget, or whether it must be funded with private support. While archival processing of documents in clearly a federal responsibility, it is not so clear where the development and provision of Internet access to documents and finding aids comes in.


*The Hiring and Role of Presidential Library Directors*

In discussing the hiring and role of presidential library directors, David Peterson explained that under current legislation they are appointed by the Archivist of the United States after consultation with the former president. Once a former president and other close family members have died, the Archivist considers these appointments in a more autonomous manner, but there would always be close consultation with the foundation supporting the library. Presidential library directors can be either "Schedule C" (non-career, political) appointees, or they can be career civil servants appointed under the General Schedule (GS) process used for most federal jobs. Presently, four of the ten directors are Schedule C appointees. The directors have a basic reporting responsibility to the Director of the Office of Presidential Libraries, to the Archivist of the U.S., and to NARA. Yet, if they are to fulfill their missions effectively, their positions also require that they work successfully with their private sector foundations. Peterson noted that this requirement to cultivate private sector support is not the "normal" way of doing things for NARA employees or those of any other federal agency. It requires effective recognition and manipulation of the external economy and polity, as well as the internal economy and polity. Other than the four Schedule C directors, the Presidential Library System is staffed by approximately 350 career government employees.


BUDGETING

Budgeting for federal funding of NL and the presidential libraries is handled by NARA's budget office, with input from NL. As illustrated in my interview with NARA Congressional Liaison John Constance, NL and all of NARA are aware of the importance of maintaining good relations with Congress, especially in the budget process. These days presidential library budgets are fairly non-controversial in Congress, and the process is routine. Central office functions are described in the budget process as planning and direction, White House liaison, and support for Presidential Materials Projects (the periods of operations before new libraries are built and operational).

In FY1999, the cost of staffing and maintaining the Office of Presidential Libraries was $3,226,000, or somewhat over 13% of the overall federal spending on the Presidential Library System. This figure does not include the office's proportional share of the allocated administrative

costs of NARA, but it does include $757,000 in rent paid to the General Services Administration for space in the Archives II facility in College Park, Maryland. Program costs, largely salaries and other personnel expenditures, for the central office function have fluctuated dramatically over the years. Whereas federal funding for costs in the individual presidential libraries have shown steady annual increases, NL funding for its program costs have been much more erratic and subject to the various "budget reform" measures undertaken by Congress and the trend toward a preference for supporting "field office" operations. For example, NL program costs in FY1984 were $100,000 more than they are today, and they were almost double in FY1992 ($3.5 million) what they were five years later in FY1997 ($1.67 million).

REVENUE GENERATION

Revenue generation for presidential libraries is a "field office" endeavor, with the major areas of revenue generation being museum store sales and admissions, plus some income from reproduction services. The net operating income of presidential libraries overall for FY1995 (the latest year for which complete figures are available) was $139,000. This total represented an increase of approximately 30% over the previous year's net revenue. Staff attribute this increase to special events and exhibits related to the 50th anniversary of the end of World War II. After accounting for expenses and other income, such as interest on investments, presidential libraries showed a total net income of $405,000 on total revenues of $4.6 million.

Presidential libraries also represent the major area of activity in the National Archives Gift Fund. This fund handles gifts or bequests of money, securities, or other personal property which benefit NARA's activities. For FY1995, presidential libraries received in the aggregate $381,205 in grants and donations, plus $91,258 in interest on securities. When added to the balance already in the fund, the total was $2,018,163 out of $2.5 million for all of NARA. Separate accounts for each presidential library are maintained within the fund. Gifts received by presidential libraries in FY1995 came largely from the libraries' individual foundations and totaled $41,631 to the Carter Library; $2,265 to the Eisenhower Library; $13,564 to the Ford Library; $30,848 to the Hoover Library, $60,301 to the Johnson Library, $17,550 to the Kennedy Library; $180,458 to the Reagan Library; $24,155 to the Roosevelt Library; and $10,433 to the Truman Library. As noted earlier, NARA hired a development officer in 1997 with the expectation that outside funding for the non-presidential library portion of this fund will increase.

REPORTS FILED WITH NARA

*Presidential Libraries in NARA's Strategic Plan*

NARA's strategic plan for 1997-2007 is titled "Ready Access to Essential Evidence." It may be found on the World Wide Web at http://www.nara.gov/nara/vision/naraplan.html. This plan provides an overview of the agency's situation now; statements of strategic directions, mission, vision, and goals; and assessment mechanisms. Appendices provide a chronology of NARA's streamlining, its Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) activities, and the evaluations

and reports used to draft the strategic plan. NARA states its mission as follows: "NARA ensures for the citizen and the public servant, for the President and the Congress and the Courts, ready access to essential evidence." This mission derives from federal legislation and is codified under Title 44 of the United States Code. The agency's four goals are:

- One: Essential evidence will be created, identified, appropriately scheduled, and managed for as long as needed.

- Two: Essential evidence will be easy to access regardless of where it is or where users are for as long as needed.

- Three: All records will be preserved in appropriate space for use as long as needed.

- Four: NARA's capabilities for making the changes necessary to realize our vision will continuously expand.

Essential evidence is generated by all three branches of government. It can be in a variety of formats, and it includes "material generated by or received by the federal government, that documents the rights of citizens, the actions of federal officials, and the national experience."

Areas of the plan related to presidential records and libraries stress an active role. NARA promises to "advocate executive-level attention to records management" and to "aggressively approach new presidential administrations at the beginning rather than at the end of their terms, with advice on how to avoid later difficulties by practicing good recordkeeping from the start." It plans to "expand current efforts to build a nationwide, integrated online information-delivery system…[and] make available digital copies of high-interest documents." NARA "will represent within the government the public interest in seeing that material is not classified or otherwise closed unnecessarily or longer than necessary."

Under Goal Three, the strategy of consolidating holdings and staff into larger facilities with better environmental controls appears to be contrary to that of the presidential library system, in which archival collections are dispersed throughout the country. The strategy statements for Goal Three acknowledge this contradiction by promising to work with future presidents on options for housing presidential materials. As part of the strategy to seek new ways of meeting the mounting costs of facilities' maintenance, NARA pledges to "work with presidential library support organizations to increase private funding for major renovations and additions to presidential libraries." Renovation and records preservation projects for presidential libraries are also addressed under Goal Three.

Declassification activities under E.O. 12958 are addressed at length, including the Remote Access Scanning project NARA has undertaken for the classified holdings of presidential libraries. Scanned documents will enable federal agencies to perform the necessary classification reviews at their headquarters, rather than having to send staff to the libraries around the country. Performance measures and targets are provided for each of the strategies.

*Presidential Libraries in NARA's Annual Performance Plan*

NARA's "Fiscal Year 1999 Annual Performance Plan" provides four strategic goals and three to eight targets under each of them. It may be found at http://www.nara.gov/vision/f99pplan.html. Budget resources are provided, listed by budget authority. Each strategic goal is operationalized by long range performance targets, FY99 resources required to meet this goal, FY99 objectives (including their "significance, means and strategies"), key accomplishments needed in FY98 that enable achievement of FY99 goal, and measurement categories and values (FY99 workload, output, productivity, and outcome). Of particular interest here are the sections of the plan directly related to presidential libraries.

*STRATEGIC GOAL 2*

NARA's Strategic Goal 2 affirms that "Essential evidence will be easy to access regardless of where it is or where users are…." Target dates for all of NARA, including presidential libraries, are 2004 for declassification of the records more than 25 years old for which NARA has been given declassification authority, and 2007 for 100% of NARA records holdings to be described in an online catalog to at least the series or collection level. For presidential libraries specifically:

> By 2007, 100 percent of Presidential records transferred to NARA are inventoried and processed so that they are readily identifiable for requests under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) at the end of the five-year post-presidential period specified in the Presidential Records Act. At the same time, 10 percent of records of a two-term President or 15 percent of records of a one-term President are open and available for research.

Development of the online Archival Research Catalog (ARC) and the description of 10% of NARA holdings in the pilot catalog (NARA Archival Information Locator-NAIL) are objectives that also have an effect on the presidential libraries. The NAIL data are to be migrated to ARC by the end of FY99, with ARC implemented in all NARA facilities. The goal is a searchable catalog of "selected NARA holdings nationwide, and access to 140,000 high-interest documents linked to their descriptions."

Declassification activities will be fostered by the implementation of a scanning process whereby classified records in presidential libraries will be scanned at the rate of 2,500 pages per day and sent to the relevant agencies for declassification review. Private contractors will be engaged to carry out this activity. Scanning will save time and money by reducing the need for on-site reviews by personnel of the agencies that classified the documents when they were created.

Another significant FY99 objective is the hiring and training of more NARA staff to start or to increase the pace of processing the Reagan, Bush, and Clinton presidential records in an effort to improve compliance with provisions of the Presidential Records Act. Fulfillment of this objective should allow for a significant reduction in the processing backlogs which are developing at the Reagan and Bush sites now, and will inevitably arise at the Clinton Library as well.

*STRATEGIC GOAL 3*

NARA's Strategic Goal 3 is that "all records will be preserved in appropriate space for use as long as needed." The older presidential libraries are obvious beneficiaries of this goal, in particular the FDR and Truman libraries, both of which have renovation projects under way. The reasons given for renovations are to make the facilities safer and more accessible for staff, researchers, and museum visitors and to bring them into compliance with contemporary standards for security, fire protection, climate control, and access by those with disabilities. (A key *external* economy quadrant factor noted under this goal is the need to raise enough private dollars in FY98 to funded the library renovation projects. The plan does not specify a dollar amount for the private funding.)

Another aspect of Goal 3 is preservation, and in some cases restoration, of documents in NARA's various facilities. The plan calls for developing a systematic preservation program for the Office of Presidential Libraries and NARA's other sites. Again, it is clear that simply housing documents in adequate facilities is not adequate if the documents themselves (all formats are included here) are fragile and subject to destruction through neglect.

Focus on these goals and objectives illuminates once again how the presidential library system policy subsystem operates in its internal economy and polity, which are NARA-specific; as well as in its external economy and polity, which are related to its dependence on the private economy, private contractors, and others external to the agency or even to government.

*Government Performance and Results Act of 1993*

Slightly more than two months after President Clinton signed Public Law 103-62, the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) of 1993, the Acting Archivist of the U.S. appointed three task forces to begin responding to the relevant memoranda and executive orders. NARA's GPRA efforts are imbedded in its ongoing strategic planning process and its annual performance plans. Performance measures and targets are included for each strategy in the plans. Many of the performance targets designed for NARA as a whole, such as responding to 80% of written requests within 10 working days, have long been exceeded in presidential libraries, where the collections are smaller and staff are more intimately familiar with those collections. At Archives II in College Park and at the military personnel records facility in St. Louis, however, the size of the collections and the volume of requests make this target an ambitious one.

NARA's "Customer Service Plan" addresses the agency as a whole and will be a key element in GPRA assessment efforts. New demands on presidential libraries as a result of the "Customer Service Plan" are minimal. GPRA compliance for the presidential libraries under this plan will require more specific documentation than in the past, but the plan should not require major changes in the nature of the services provided. For example, the libraries have been communicating with customers electronically for several years, but now they have a specific goal and timeline to perform *all* researcher contacts online. Those communications will have to be carefully tracked and a more concerted effort made to put the research aids and document order forms online.  Presidential libraries will revise their workload measurement reporting system, i.e., how staff time and production is counted. NL has been issuing special reports on this topic, and

NARA has hired an outside contractor to help identify and implement the new measurement system.


INFORMATION SYSTEMS AND TECHNOLOGIES

In one of its earliest information technology initiatives, NARA and NL hired American Management System (AMS) in 1985 to survey the Roosevelt, Ford and Carter Libraries to determine the automation needs of the presidential libraries. These libraries were chosen because they were at different stages of their development in terms of organizing and using their archival materials. By April 1986 an automated information storage and retrieval system called PRESNET was installed in the Gerald Ford Library. The database is still in use in several libraries. It employs a thesaurus for subject descriptors (controlled vocabulary) based on the MARC-AMC format, which is the world-wide cataloging standard for bibliographic and archival materials. The Ford Library experience showed that processing time increased up to 20% due to the use of standards, more information to fulfill all the data elements, and retrospective processing of older collections. The very positive benefit of this effort, however, has been much faster and more accurate retrieval. Nevertheless, PRESNET has now been superseded in the more recent libraries by newer technologies.

Through its Electronic Access Project NARA is developing a new nationwide online information system, called the Archival Research Catalog (ARC), to include holdings data and some digital copies of complete documents. According to NARA's strategic plan, the development of the ARC is scheduled to be completed in FY 1999. By FY 2002 85% of holdings are to be online, and by FY 2007 100% of record holdings are to be described at least to the series or collection level.

Despite these early individual automation initiatives, NARA has sometimes been slow to grasp new technologies used in offices throughout the government. The struggle continues, as illustrated by recent court rulings that NARA must preserve archival materials in their original electronic form, rather than printing off copies of documents and filing them in traditional ways. Some of NARA's constituent groups (journalists, librarians, and historians) have long held that printing paper copies of electronic records and documents is not equivalent to preserving electronic formats which track where the documents were distributed, thus providing a "paper trail" of evidence.

Similarly, NARA's response to the arrival of the Internet's World Wide Web was laissez faire at best. When NARA's benign neglect failed to provide support for development of web sites in presidential libraries, local initiative quickly took over. Through partnerships with whatever local servers they could find (frequently colleges or universities) and under the guidance of interested, though often untrained, staff members, each library approached in its own idiosyncratic way the mounting of its information, finding aids, photographs, and other materials. Examples of this phenomenon appear throughout this paper. Interviews with NARA staff in headquarters and in the field revealed that NARA not only failed to support web development, it actually refused to authorize any staff positions with computer skills in individual program units such as presidential

libraries, contending that information technologies would be supported from the central office. One of the biggest complaints I heard in the libraries was that staff members with an interest, but little or no training in computer/information technologies, were thrust into development and management of automated access to information. Predictably, staff who took on the new responsibilities for information technologies received recognition neither in their job descriptions nor in their pay scales.

Despite these lapses and delays in website development at the presidential libraries, NARA finally seems to be plunging into the development of its own web presence. Readers are encouraged to visit http://www.nara.gov to view the developments of the central office's site. Links are provided to the presidential library sites from the NARA site.

SERVICE POLICIES

As illustrated in the earlier section on "Reports Filed with NARA," the agency's website includes its strategic plan, annual performance plans, customer service plan, and other documents, many of which contribute to Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) compliance. There is a GPRA link on NARA's web page. Presidential libraries play an important part in NARA's various plans, as they are one of the most visible NARA service providers. The Customer Service Plan defines who NARA's customers are, priority areas for improving services, customer service values and standards, and what to do if things go wrong. Several interviewees in presidential libraries admitted to me that some of NARA's performance standards for services such as response time to customer requests, which were established for other NARA units (i.e., NARAII in College Park and the regional records services facilities) are far more lenient than the libraries would find acceptable. Because the volume of questions is lower in the libraries, and staff knowledge of the collections is sometimes greater, their internal service standards are actually higher than those required by NARA.

According to Michelle Cobb, although most of NARA's goals are not new as they are directly related to its mission and functional areas, the most significant activity is the revision of the workload measurement reporting system. The old concept of outputs has been replaced with an emphasis on outcomes: for example, how many customers received the records they needed within the guaranteed timeframe and how many complaints were received during a reporting period. The relatively new emphasis on service policies and customer satisfaction under GPRA has induced NARA to hire an outside contractor to help identify and implement an appropriate measurement system.

*Internal Economy: Archives Functions*

Archival functions are what NARA as a whole and its presidential libraries do best. It is what the agency was founded to do. Most NARA staff have education and training in archival functions and subscribe to the professional values of the field. As illustrated in the previous chapters, when we examine NL's role and its interactions with the libraries, the emphasis is on the acquisition,

retention, processing, and servicing of archival collections in all formats. Federal law and policies regarding archives are relatively clear, and the agency has learned over the past 60+ years how to manage their role in implementing them.

One need only look at the NARA web site and at the manuals and policy memoranda coming out of NL to see that archives are their primary concern. NARA and NL are proud of their record in maintaining presidential library archival holdings in excess of 300 million papers, 5 million still photos, 14 million film images, 36,000 feet of video tape, and 42,000 hours of audio tape. If we recall that prior to President Franklin Roosevelt, many these materials were lost or destroyed, then the program has been a success in institutionalizing the retention and preservation of such collections. Over the past 20 years, the institution has adjusted to changes in federal law that mandated more complex and demanding policies and procedures for handling these collections, such as the Presidential Records Act and the Freedom of Information Act.

Despite the fact that less than 12,000 researchers visited presidential libraries in FY1997, in comparison to almost 13 million museum visitors, the federal government's emphasis in its funding and policies is on collections and researchers' access to them. This government sector emphasis on archives is appropriate, given NARA's dependence on private sector partnerships with the presidential library foundations to fund the exhibits, educational outreach programs, and other museum-related functions in the libraries. Also, as electronic access mechanisms become more prevalent and an international audience is able to access presidential library archival materials from remote locations, the federal emphasis on funding and overseeing standardized archival functions throughout the presidential library system will become even more relevant. NARA's 1999 Annual Performance Plan specifies a long-range performance target of 2007 for 50% of customer contacts for information and services NARA-wide to be made electronically. Reaching this target will require a much greater level of standardization and coordination among the presidential libraries regarding electronic access to their collections and services than ever before.

*Internal Economy: Exhibits/Museum Functions*

Exhibit and museum functions display much more variability across the presidential library system than do archival functions. Space limitations and foundation support in the older libraries sometimes restricts what those libraries are able to undertake in their museums. The background and preferences of each library's director and its former president, when he is still alive and involved with the library, also influence the nature and extent of museum operations. As noted above, NARA's primary function is archival, and museum operations are peripheral to its primary mission of providing "ready access to essential evidence." Museum functions are not addressed in NARA's strategic plan for 1997-2007.

Museum specialists are not among the staff of NL's central office, several of whom have, however, become knowledgeable about the basics of museum operations. For instance, NL Program Analyst Michelle Cobb has spent a significant part of her time in recent years identifying and investigating automated museum object tracking systems. Implementation of such a system

throughout the libraries will enhance their ability to manage and protect museum objects, and it will foster resource sharing via traveling exhibits and other system-wide museum projects.

*Internal Economy: Education/Outreach*

Education and outreach programs are another area in which NL does not play a very significant role in the policies and operations of presidential libraries. Again, the priorities set by that library's foundation and the proclivities of the individual library director have a much greater influence on the extent and focus of such programs than NL does. Total head counts of public program and outreach program participants hover around 200,000 and 30,000 respectively for the entire presidential library system. The levels vary widely, from over 50,000 participants per year at the JFK Library to fewer than 3,000 at the Carter Library. Few staff resources for educational functions are funded from the federal budget, so again, the federal government has largely left this aspect of presidential library operations to the private sector.

As with museum functions, NARA's strategic plan does not address educational and outreach functions, other than as they relate to providing public access to and servicing of collections. Nevertheless, the plan's emphasis on electronic preservation and access will inevitably lead to a recognition soon that what and how we mount electronic resources has an educational component that has so far been little acknowledged.

*Summary of the Presidential Library System Internal Economy*

The internal economy of the Presidential Library System and NL is stable. Both the system and the office have functioned effectively over the past several years, since the appointment of a permanent Archivist of the U.S. and a permanent director for the Office of Presidential Libraries. The upheavals and crises of the first half of the 1990s, characterized by Congressional inquiries and legal battles over such issues as the preservation of and access to archival materials have subsided. More routine matters such as the filing of reports by the libraries are being addressed in a timely manner. Long-term projects such as the publication of the "Architectural and Design Standards for Presidential Libraries," the updating of the 1985 "Presidential Libraries Manual," and official clarification of the role to be played by presidential library foundations are finally being accomplished. Personnel matters are being addressed, such as advancing some grade levels for professional and managerial positions and designating that all permanent positions in the libraries must be federally funded and those now funded by the foundations or other sources will be migrated to the federal payroll in a timely manner. Career federal bureaucrats with deep experience in NARA negotiate within the agency to assure system stability.

Local autonomy remains high among presidential libraries, but system-wide functions and policies are stable, with effective interactions with NL. Congressional support for presidential library functions is adequate and stable and the appropriation process is stabilized. Foundation support for the two most recent libraries is especially strong because of the 1986 revisions to the Presidential Libraries Actrequiring significant endowments for each new library.

## Internal Polity (Non-Routine)

*Internal Polity: Normative Structure (Incentive Structures, Dominant Coalition, Socialization, and Interest Articulation and Aggregation)*

INCENTIVE STRUCTURES

Incentive structures in the Presidential Library System revolve around the two-pronged base of support the system needs for survival. The system must maintain stability within NARA and the federal budget process, and it must constantly seek to enhance private-sector support for the myriad of functions not funded by the federal government. In the most successful libraries, i.e., those with high visibility and private-sector funding, the directors must be both effective federal bureaucrats and entrepreneurial operators. Archival staff in the system have a clear federal mission and at least baseline federal funding to carry out that mission. The incentive in the archival operations is to find ways to serve researchers and comply with NARA's planning targets, while drawing the least possible attention to themselves. The same is true of museum collections management and registrar activities. Exhibits, symposia, and education functions are less well-defined by NL and NARA. Therefore, staff in those areas have to develop a more creative and flexible approach to their tasks. Their incentive is to draw on outside resources to help them meet their objectives.

Presidential Library System staff frequently find themselves in isolated locations where they are among the few federal employees in the area and almost the only ones who routinely come in contact with the public. This places a responsibility on them to conduct themselves with obvious efficiency and effectiveness and to "show the flag" for their agency and all federal employees. Many of them expressed to me their acknowledgment of this responsibility and how it serves as a daily incentive in their performance.

DOMINANT COALITION

The dominant coalition in the Presidential Library System is comprised of the library directors and the private foundations attached to the libraries. The federal structures, staffing, and funding for the system are codified and stable at the moment, but the system's ability to meet its multiple missions depends on the effectiveness of the library directors in juggling their public and private roles and on the leadership and financial vitality of the foundations. NARA initiatives in the late 1980s included establishing the national level Advisory Committee on Presidential Libraries and enhancing the annual presidential library directors' conferences. These endeavors are evidence of the agency's recognition of the importance of this coalition. When it appears in late 1998, the clarification in writing for the first time of appropriate roles and activities for the foundations will

be another step in the process of fostering communication and cooperation among NL, the libraries, and the foundations.


SOCIALIZATION

In recent years, as the Presidential Library System has grown with the addition of new libraries, professional staff including library directors, archivists, and museum specialists have begun to transfer between libraries within the presidential library system, and between NARA headquarters and the field sites. The CIDS program brings archivists to DC for some or all of their post-masters archival training and it promotes socialization into NARA's policies, procedures, and institutional values. In addition to the professional socialization these individuals have absorbed through their education and professional associations, mobility within the system has promoted a greater sense of identification with NARA and with the Presidential Library System.

Identification with a single library has always existed among paraprofessionals and technicians in the libraries. At these lower staff levels salaries and job requirements do not promote recruitment from a national pool. Therefore, local recruitment of personnel for relatively coveted federal jobs results in a high degree of loyalty and identification with that particular library. Lower level staff are socialized by the local environment (often it is their home town), by that one library, and by the supervisors and directors they work with.

The inevitable central office vs. field office tensions are visible in the presidential library system, but they seem to be mitigated somewhat by the cushion of autonomy provided by the private support available to most of the libraries. All Presidential Library System staff I interviewed accepted the notion that the system's greatest strength lies in its diversity and a high degree of local autonomy and entrepreneurialism.


INTEREST ARTICULATION AND AGGREGATION

Interest articulation and aggregation at the level of NL and the Presidential Library System is a powerful activity, though less obvious than it is in some of the individual libraries. Much of the work is done in a quiet, behind-the-scenes manner. Congressional and White House relations are carefully nurtured by all NARA staff. NL Director David Peterson has adopted a facilitator role with the libraries and their foundations, rather than a directive role. Now that full implementation of the Presidential Libraries Act of 1986 is in place, with its strict size and endowment guidelines for new libraries, Congressional approval has been accomplished without hearings. Annual budget hearings have been uneventful the last few years, undoubtedly due in part to the fact that NARA's Congressional Liaison maintains effective communication and provides in advance adequate program justifications to Capitol Hill.

NARA's 1998 appointment of its first-ever development officer signals a new commitment to improved public relations and private-sector fund-raising agency wide. NARA and NL have

undertaken nascent efforts to foster cooperative endeavors among the presidential library foundations, such as joint funding for traveling exhibits.

Perusal of NARA's 10-year Strategic Plan and its Annual Performance Plans illustrates the agency's response to earlier criticisms of the agency and its attempt to improve its public image. The documents play to popular sentiments calling for quick access to "essential evidence" produced by the federal government, and performance targets are written in a style more common in private business than public agencies. Like all federal agencies, NARA must now articulate its interests, measure its performance, and justify its funding in overt and public ways unheard of even five years ago.

Throughout my interviews with NL and NARA headquarters staff I was impressed with their levels of expertise, their commitment to the system's mission, and their ability to articulate that mission and their individual roles in fulfilling it. This observation is remarkable given the downsizing of their ranks over the past decade (in proportion to the number of libraries and documents requiring attention) and their relatively low pay grade levels.

The following summary of my interview with retired director of NL, John Fawcett, will provide insights into how interest articulation works within the Presidential Library System. John Fawcett first joined the presidential library system in the 1960s as a young Iowan from a farming family who took a job as a laborer, then as a guard/custodian at the Hoover Library in West Branch. This experience influenced him to become an archivist via a two-year training program in Washington, DC. The program was interrupted by military service in 1967 and 1968, during which time he was assigned to the White House to help prepare the administration for the eventual transition of its archives to the library in Austin, TX. Fawcett went to the LBJ Library, where he worked his way up to Supervisory Archivist (GS 13). Since there was no career ladder for him in Texas, given very little  likelihood of a vacancy at the assistant director or director level, Fawcett took an upgrade to an administrative position in the Office of Presidential Libraries in DC. After a few years there, and again with no opportunity for upward mobility, Fawcett took a leave of absence from his federal position and accepted the executive directorship of the Herbert Hoover Presidential Library Association. After two years in that role, the director of the Hoover Library left and Fawcett held both positions simultaneously. Fawcett supported the appointment of Don Wilson as Archivist of the U.S., and when that was accomplished, Wilson asked Fawcett to come back to DC to become Director of the Office of Presidential Libraries. Once Fawcett found Richard Norton Smith and persuaded him to become director of the Hoover Library, Fawcett came to NARA.

Because of his varied experience in two presidential libraries, as well as leadership of presidential libraries at NL, Fawcett possesses unique and valuable insights into the presidential library system. Based on four telephone conversations and two lengthy personal interviews, I can summarize Fawcett's perspective in terms of three major points.

First, presidential libraries represent a compromise between the interests of donors (presidents, presidential families, cabinet members, and others closely associated with that president) and the interests of researchers (historians, journalists, biographers, even members of

Congress) who want immediate and complete access to everything surrounding a presidency. (It is what Fawcett might call a "policy subsystem" if he were a student of public administration.)

Confidentiality is a key ingredient in many of a president's relationships. If the president cannot assure some level of confidentiality to his advisors and confidants, they will not be willing to converse openly. Congress recognized this right in the initial hearings for establishment of the presidential library system in the 1950s, and reconfirmed it in the 1986 revisions of the Presidential Libraries Act. So the tug-of-war between donor interests and those of researchers is a perennial and sometimes intense one. Fawcett was adamant that no professional archivist would ever destroy materials or restrict them unnecessarily, but believes temporary restrictions are necessary to entice donors to save the materials in the first place and eventually donate them to the archives. Now that the Presidential Records Act declares many presidential materials public property, what Fawcett is primarily referring to here are the private, non-official, frequently pre-presidential and post-presidential materials (diaries, political party papers, personal correspondence) so illustrative of any historical period. He described the archivists' role as one of "honest brokership" among competing interests.

Second, presidential libraries provide a president and his retinue a direct incentive to keep their papers and donate them to the one institution devoted exclusively to the presidential administration they were a part of. These individuals would not necessarily wish to make such donations if the government provided only a central repository where the particular administration would not be highlighted. Also, presidential libraries are, or should be, designed to be the base of operations for a president and first lady after they leave the White House. Therefore, planning for the libraries must always keep this function as an important focus for the institution.

Third, presidential library foundations provide research grants to scholars, funding for new exhibits, educational programs, and outreach efforts in support of presidential archives that would simply not exist if all presidential libraries were consolidated into one huge facility or incorporated into the NARA headquarters. Although some presidential library critics contend that presidential materials would be made available to researchers more quickly in a centralized facility, that would depend on sufficient staffing provided through the often-parsimonious appropriations process.

In Fawcett's view, until Watergate there was a fairly high level of consensus among the public and within Congress in support of the presidential library system. Despite occasional complaints that certain libraries provided favored access to "court historians" (at the JFK in particular), archivists, historians and other researchers, and the Congressional oversight committees largely agreed that presidential libraries were a very good way to handle presidential archives (which at that time were still the private property of each president). After 1974, cooperation evaporated. Congress and many in the researcher community began to see the libraries as a political tool. Former presidents and Congress squared off over exactly who "owned" these archival collections, who should fund their support, and who should have access to them. New legislation in 1974 addressed the Richard Nixon presidential materials, which are still in litigation 25 years after he left office; then presidential records in general were addressed in 1978; then the presidential library system overall was addressed in 1986. It appears the system has been reformed, but it will

take a few more years to know for sure whether the controversies have been resolved permanently.

Fawcett himself became embroiled in NARA controversies during the early 1990s. Fawcett's colleague and supporter, Archivist of the U.S. Don Wilson, was in trouble over his role in the disposition of President George Bush's electronic records. Wilson was soon accused of having a conflict-of-interest when he accepted a position with the Bush Library Foundation. Meanwhile, the Archivist of the U.S. position became a more politicized appointment. For an extended period the position was filled by an Acting Archivist. Acting Archivist Trudy Peterson,  who had started out at the Hoover Library, did not support the presidential library concept. Powerful members of Congress, such as Senator Glenn of Ohio and Senator Chiles of Florida, remained hostile to presidential libraries and encouraged NARA's Inspector General (IG) to uncover "problems" within the agency, particularly presidential libraries. In particular, the IG and the Acting Archivist tried to examine the role of the presidential library foundations, which were seen as exercising a great deal of power with very little government control. In short, this policy subsystem was perceived, as might be expected, as a threat to the policy system it derived from.

The influence of the foundations was seen as limiting the accountability demands NARA could make on the libraries. There was an attempt to define the foundations similar to the way government contractors are defined, i.e., as "prohibited sources" for funding projects. This particular initiative failed, but several individuals became embroiled with NARA's IG, including the Ford Library director and Fawcett himself. Eventually, even though they were cleared of wrongdoing, Fawcett and others departed out of a sense of frustration and disappointment with the agency.

Today, says Fawcett, it all depends on one's mindset toward presidential libraries whether they are a benefit or a liability. If you view them as tremendous resources for their communities and funded in some way by those communities; and if materials are accessible to researchers, then the federal resources are a good investment. If, on the other hand, you view the presidential libraries as expensive perks for former presidents, with biased exhibits that hide crimes and misdemeanors and deliberately restrict access to sensitive archival resources, then they are not only a poor investment, but an absolute travesty. It appears for now that the argument has been settled in favor of the current system.

Fawcett expressed grave concern over NARA's relatively new mission statement, which invokes the phrase "essential evidence." Previously, NARA's mission was to be an impartial custodian and preserver of our country's historical documents. Providing immediate access to "essential evidence" is an entirely different mission, one which will be a huge disincentive for federal employees to save documents and other "evidence" of their work, not to mention donors who will be unlikely to hand over materials which can and will be used against them in short order. If we take the longer view of preserving materials for eventual historical analysis, the current emphasis raises serious doubts about whether there will be any real richness of materials for historians 100 years from now to study.

*Internal Polity: Leadership Attributes of the Director and the Archivist of the U.S.*

System maintenance requires sustained, effective leadership from NL and NARA, if presidential libraries as an entity are to thrive within the larger context of the federal bureaucracy. The 1995 appointment of former Kansas Governor John Carlin to be Archivist of the U.S. was controversial because he was considered long on political and managerial skills, but short on the archival professional qualifications his predecessors had. His nomination was opposed by 16 professional archival, historical, and library association. Several Senators, especially Glenn (D-Ohio) and Levin (D-MI), questioned Carlin's potential ability to be independent of President Clinton. Nevertheless, Carlin was appointed with little delay. He has been effective in bringing a level of stability to the agency and to the Office of Presidential Libraries that was sorely lacking in the early 1990s, when the agency was lead by professionals. NARA's web page illustrates the strides the agency is making and the ambitious goals it has outlined in its strategic plan.

Although the current Director of the Office of Presidential Libraries appears to be a rather low-key career bureaucrat, David Peterson exhibits a quiet confidence about how the Presidential Library System can and should interact with the current administration, with Congress, with private foundations, with local governments, and all of the other groups involved in the policy subsystem.

The effective planning efforts now going on for the Clinton Library provide a good illustration of the leadership attributes of David Peterson. Clinton Library planning is going smoothly, with good working relationships established inside the White House, with the leadership of the foundation, and with the major fund raisers. For the first time, NL has asked Congress to appropriate funds directly to NARA for hiring the curator who will work with the White House starting in 1998 and stay with the collection when it is moved to Little Rock. Over the next three years NARA will hire other staff who will reside permanently in Little Rock. These steps should provide for a smoother transition when President Clinton leaves the White House, and it should also enhance speedy compliance with the Presidential Records Act. In the past, existing presidential libraries and NARA headquarters have suffered when a new library came on line, because there was no new staff to support the new facility. Staff had to be reassigned from other posts to fill positions at the new library. This time NARA hopes to achieve an appropriation to fund up front the 20-25 staff who will be needed to open the Clinton Library. This entire initiative may be characterized as an internal economy need being identified by the policy subsystem's leadership and satisfied by its external polity.

In response to my question about whether space limitations of 70,000 square feet imposed in the 1986 Presidential Libraries Act will pose a problem for the Clinton Library, Peterson responded yes, unless the Clinton fund-raisers are able to provide the "super penalty" endowment provided for in the legislation to support the space above that limit. At the new Bush Library, the 69,000 square feet of useable space is barely adequate for a one-term president; fortunately the availability of adjacent buildings supported by Texas A&M University relieves the pressure. But the Clinton Library will have to house the archives and artifacts of a two-term president, presenting an enormous challenge for the architects. Another key element in the Clinton Library's success will be the level of affiliation it ultimately has with the University of Arkansas. Peterson

asserted that "a modern presidential library pretty much has to be connected to a major university for all sorts of practical as well as many other reasons." The significance of university affiliation for a presidential library will be addressed again in Chapter VII's conclusions.

*Internal Polity: Rule-making, application, and adjudication mechanisms*

NL is responsible for assuring the appropriate promulgation of rules governing presidential library policies and operations and overseeing their application. Library directors are held accountable for compliance with these rules and regulations, and they are supposed to submit quarterly and annual reports to keep NL informed about their activities. On-site audits of the libraries are performed on a regular basis by NL staff.

Agency-wide, NARA's Strategic Plan highlights the effect of federal rule-making, application, and adjudication mechanisms. The plan refers to the accelerated release of Kennedy assassination documents, Nixon administration tapes, and classified records as worthy goals recently mandated by Congress without adequate funding for staff to carry out the mandates. The plan goes on to note federal budget reductions for the agency despite the exponential growth of records and the expansion of electronic formats.

Nevertheless, the foregoing description of the official rule-making and adjudication process in the Presidential Library System fails to illustrate the informal application of federal policies and procedures in the field locations. Although there are standard and widely accepted ways of implementing federal archival policies and procedures, in the museum and educational aspects of their operations, variety is the hallmark of how the individual libraries approach federal guidelines and policies.

*Summary of the Presidential Library System's Internal Polity*

The Presidential Library System's internal polity today exhibits a higher level of stability and functionality than at any time in the past 25 years. Although staffing levels and overall federal funding for presidential libraries are merely adequate, new approaches to outside funding are a positive development, one which provides hope for brighter prospects a few years from now. The level of inter-library cooperation is on the rise. Leadership of NARA and NL is more stable and politically well-connected than at any time in the 1990s. Threats from the external economy and polity are acknowledged, understood, and under control for the present.

NL and field staff exhibit a high degree of professionalism, and they can articulate the libraries' mission and their own roles in fulfilling that mission. There appear to be few significant struggles within the internal polity at the moment, as questions of survival, institutional goals, and legitimacy of function have largely been addressed.

**External Economy (Routine)**

*External Economy: Local Economy including the Labor Pool and Employment Rate*

The labor market in the Washington, DC, metropolitan area currently exhibits very low unemployment. Nevertheless, cutbacks in federal government employment continue to have an impact on some fields, especially defense-related ones. Within NL, the workforce has been remarkably stable, with modest turnover levels. For individuals with undergraduate or masters degrees in history, NARA is considered a good career option, so applicants are readily available when openings occur. Presidential libraries are generally viewed as rather glamorous, so recruitment does not present a serious problem for that office.

When NARA was constructing its new facility in College Park, MD, the original plan was to have NL remain at NARA's downtown location, but that was changed mid-stream, and the office was moved to the new suburban "campus." This relocation created rather serious commuting problems for some of the staff, but there were no resignations because of it.

*External Economy: Stability and Vitality of the General Economy*

As stated in earlier chapters, the general economy's boom cycle of recent years and the federal budget surplus experienced this past year for the first time in a generation can only help agencies such as NARA, whose mission is clear and the need for its services growing. All three branches of the federal government are obligated to retain and turn over to NARA on a set disposition schedule designated archival collections. The system is designed to provide all citizens with a record of "essential evidence" about their government and its actions. The system also provides a certain level of "job security" for NARA, because what all federal entities do best is generate documents. Today, in addition to traditional paper and print-based collections, NARA is obliged to retain electronic versions of records generated in that format. Obviously, NL and the presidential libraries are included in this scenario.

Even during the years of budget reductions and downsizing throughout the federal government, impacts on existing NL staffing levels were not substantial. What downsizing meant was few new positions available to support new presidential libraries as they came into the system. Older libraries were sometimes "robbed" of their staff in order to support the newest library. The theory was that the older libraries should have completed the processing of their archival collections and could absorb the loss of positions more easily.

Today, NARA goes to Congress while the administration is still in office to secure positions to work in the White House and prepare for the transition much earlier in the process than was previously the case. Basically, over the past decade the Presidential Library System has become institutionalized in such a way that it is usually funded without much controversy and changes in the general economy do not appear to have much influence on the system.

*External Economy: Overall Perception of "What We Can Afford" As A Country*

The Presidential Library System today is obviously one of the things our country has decided it can afford. Despite lingering complaints from some journalists and scholars who resent the geographic dispersion of the collections and the local autonomy of the libraries, the museums are popular among ordinary citizens, and localities are pleased to have these federal institutions in their communities to draw tourists and to educate school groups. Universities have made commitments to house and foster the scholarly endeavors that take place in the libraries. Nine of the fifty states have presidential libraries within their borders. At least 18 Senators and 10 members of the House of Representatives now have a vested interest in maintaining and enhancing the libraries. When President Clinton's library is built in Arkansas, the numbers noted will increase again.

Private funding supports each of the libraries to some extent, and the most recent ones have significant endowments to provide private funding in perpetuity to supplement the federal appropriations. All future libraries must have such endowments in place before the federal government will accept title to the properties.

In short, both the public and private sectors in the U.S. economy have decided that presidential libraries are worthy of funding, i.e., we can afford them.

*External Economy: Government Funding for the Presidential Library System*

Federal government costs for support of the Presidential Library System now approach $30 million per year, including personnel, building operations, and maintenance. Funding has permanent authorization and goes through Congress via the annual appropriations bill for independent agencies. The cost seems relatively modest to me, given the system's support of 10 libraries in the field, plus the central office and Nixon materials project in the DC area. In the overall scheme of federal, or even NARA's costs (the agency receives over $200 million per year), presidential libraries do not represent a large investment.

All of the libraries contribute to the NARA Trust Fund their earnings from museum admissions and reproduction services (making copies of documents, photos, film images, etc. for users). Most of the libraries' museum stores are part of NARA operations, but the Johnson, Reagan, and Bush stores are operated by their foundations. Some showed a net operating profit in FY 1997 (FDR, Carter, Ford, Truman, and Reagan) and others showed a loss. The individual libraries can draw on the funds available in their account to help defray local expenses.

In addition, all of the libraries, with the possible exception of the Carter Library, receive at least some funding from their foundations. In some cases (the JFK and Johnson libraries in particular), presidential libraries cover substantial portions of their total annual costs through these private, non-profit entities. NARA's 1995 Annual Report lists $381,205 in gifts to presidential libraries. This figure for gifts does not include various types of "in-kind" contributions made to the libraries. Throughout this research project I observed that the libraries could survive

on the baseline federal funding they receive, but anything other than maintenance of the status quo has to come from the private sector.


*Summary of the Presidential Library System's External Economy*

The external economy of the Presidential Library System is stable and system maintenance is in no jeopardy at present. Federal funding for the system is now appropriated in a routine manner, and it is adequate to maintain basic, primarily archival functions. Private-sector support for the system varies from library-to-library, but all of them now have some support. The newer libraries (Reagan and Bush) are in especially good financial shape, with substantial endowments in hand.

David Peterson, Director of NL, described the objective of the presidential libraries as a simple one: "to be the chief and hopefully pretty much the sole repository of all the records and many of the objects relating to any given president of the United States." The libraries are partnership operations, and the best libraries are the ones that have a bullish and robust private sector aspect. The libraries with difficulties are those with small endowments and little or no foundation support. For example, Peterson cited the responsibility of each foundation to fund replacement of the core exhibits at the libraries every 15 years or so, at a current cost of $3-5 million per library.


**External Polity (Non-routine)**


*External Polity: Relations with the current and former Presidents and/or the first families*


NL is responsible for managing relationships between the Presidential Library System and the current president. First, NL responds to information requests from the White House as an intermediary with individual libraries. A typical example occurs when the current administration engages in activities for which precedents were set by earlier presidents (say Middle East peace talks held in the U.S.), the White House seeks information from the appropriate presidential library about how the matter was handled in the past.

Second, NL and NARA have begun to work with each White House early in the President's term to facilitate the process of launching the presidential library planning process and organizing administration records and files in preparation for the transition when the next president takes office. For example, David Alsobrook, current Director of the George Bush Library, worked with the Bush White House during the administration in preparation for the transition of the records and other presidential materials to library status.  As noted above, NL Director David Peterson is proud of having secured Congressional funding for NARA positions to be assigned to work directly with the Clinton White House. The current NL staff members who work with the White House, in addition to advising administration operatives about advance preparation of its archival materials, are working with Skip Rutherford, president of the Clinton Presidential Foundation, to

plan the Clinton Library in Little Rock, Arkansas. Although presidential libraries are usually rather low- profile institutions, they do crop up regularly in the media even before they exist. For example, in its October 15, 1998 "Late Bulletins" <u>Library Journal</u> reported that both professional historians and Skip Rutherford agree that the Clinton Library will be the repository of Independent Counsel Ken Starr's investigations into presidential wrongdoing by Clinton. ("Historians agree…, 1998, p. 11). For more information on the Clinton Library, see Appendix A.

 A noted earlier, presidential libraries continue to be popular with presidents and their families. Once the precedent for them was established by Franklin Roosevelt, no president has opted to decline a presidential library in favor of depositing his papers into the general collections at NARA (which would be the only other option, now that the collections are public property). The libraries provide an incentive for presidents, their families and friends, those who served in the administration, and other prominent figures associated with the president to save their papers and artifacts because they can be assured of a permanent repository for these materials. Likewise, the fact that private money from sources favorable to the president builds and endows the library means he and his family will have some influence over how the museum and public programming aspects of the library will be presented. This is the bargain the American people struck with the private sector when presidential libraries were institutionalized in the manner of a public/private partnership.


*External Polity: Relations with Congress*

When I asked David Peterson whether Congress and the Executive Branch share his conception of the mission of presidential libraries, Peterson said yes. Over the past several years, he is not aware of any major Congressional criticism of the libraries. For example, the Bush Library funding package, he said, sailed through Congress without hearings or criticism. Peterson's view is borne out by studying the House Appropriations  Subcommittee on the Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government budget hearings for FY 1998 and FY 1999, where questioning of  John Carlin, Archivist of the U.S., was brief and cordial. In the 1998 budget hearings, presidential libraries were mentioned only twice, once in reference to the new Bush Library funding and once regarding renovation plans for the Roosevelt and Truman Libraries. In each case the questions and responses were cursory and simply verified that the projected costs were "in line" with costs at other libraries (<u>Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Appropriations for Fiscal Year 1998</u> and <u>Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Appropriations for Fiscal Year 1999</u>).

Peterson concluded this segment of our conversation by cautioning that NL must not become smug about these good relationships. They need to be cultivated at all times. My interview with Congressional Liaison John Constance explained how NARA attempts to maintain these relationships.

NARA's Congressional Liaison Officer, John Constance, summarized his job into three key functions: constituent services for members of Congress, actual Congressional liaison/ communication activities designed to showcase and explain NARA and its operations to members

of Congress, and legislative identification and tracking (especially anything having to do with Title 44). He represents all of NARA, not just the presidential libraries. The Congressional budget cycle has a heavy influence on Constance's work. Every spring in March or April the Archivist of the U.S., as head of NARA, will be called to Capitol Hill to testify before the first budget hearing of the House Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on the Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government. After the House hearings, NARA staff will typically meet with senior staff on the Senate side. Sometimes hearings may be held in the Senate, although that has not happened in the past few years. Constance is involved in drafting testimony for the Archivist. He also makes courtesy calls on all members of the Appropriations Committee before the hearing to stress what NARA's interests are in that year's budget. After the spring hearings, Constance tracks the legislation and prepares for the "passback" of budget numbers in the late fall or early winter. When I interviewed Constance on November 12, 1997, he was waiting for the passback on the President's FY 1999 budget request.

NARA's multiple constituencies--including genealogists, scholarly researchers, veterans, and most of all the three branches of the federal government--provide a strong base of support for Constance's work with Congress. The presidential libraries play a large and visible role in NARA's public outreach and interface with citizens throughout the country. Constance's discussions with Congresspersons and their staffs often touch on the libraries, especially regarding appropriations. Recent renovation projects at the FDR and Truman Libraries required detailed explanations and justifications with members of the Appropriations Committee in advance. The libraries in general represent an aging inventory of buildings around the country, and the necessity of garnering trust and support with Congress for maintenance and renovations is critical, especially since such projects are not generally viewed as exciting or "splashy."

The public-private partnership aspect of presidential libraries will obviously continue to be important for the ongoing vitality of the libraries, according to Constance, but he has had to spend quite a bit of time on Capitol Hill explaining the appropriate vs. inappropriate functions of the presidential library endowments. There remains some confusion on the Hill about how much of the endowments are supposed to be devoted to supporting the actual operations of the libraries. The intent of the endowments is to serve as a support or supplement, not to cover the ongoing daily operations of the libraries. Constance confirmed that Congress does not request annual reports from the presidential library foundations; they simply require that when a new library comes on line, an endowment be placed in the NARA Trust Fund for support of that library. This procedure started with the opening of the Bush Library in 1997.

To the question whether the individual presidential library foundation board members tend to go to Congress themselves for support of their favorite projects, Constance said it has not been much of a problem in recent years. He doesn't object when influential presidential library supporters work on behalf of their libraries, as long as it is not at cross purposes with NARA's priorities. The foundations have been very responsible in this regard, especially since NARA has done an adequate job of having a dialogue with the presidential libraries, setting the agency's priorities, and articulating them fully within and without NARA.

*Prominent Friends*

The Presidential Libraries Advisory Committee was started by Archivist of the U.S. Don Wilson at the suggestion of former President Gerald Ford. Ford felt that the Archivist of the U.S. could use a bi-partisan "clout" committee with an interest in presidential libraries. The idea was to have this group look at broader issues than individual libraries are likely to do. Cross-fertilization of good ideas among the libraries was a primary goal. The meetings are open to the public and are announced in advance in the Federal Register. Given the short duration of these Advisory Committee meetings, the ready availability of their minutes, and my inability to attend any other substantive meetings during the Bush Library festivities, I made the decision not to go to Texas at this time.

The committee met on November 5, 1997 in conjunction with the Bush Library dedication festivities. The roster of attendees illustrates that it is indeed a clout committee, with names such as David Eisenhower, Ambassador William Vanden Heuval, Stewart Etherington, and Skip Rutherford. Archivist of the U.S. John Carlin provided an overview of recent agency activities and answered questions about the current Congress's view of presidential libraries. Carlin noted that some historic misunderstandings remain about the concept of presidential libraries as "monuments" to individual presidents and about the differences between access to materials held under deeds of gift versus those held under the Presidential Records Act. Nevertheless, support for presidential libraries in general is adequate, and support for specific projects at specific libraries is usually forthcoming. Carlin did describe the situation which arose when NARA was working with Congress to get funding for the FDR Library addition and, simultaneously, supporters of the Truman foundation were going to Congress for renovation money for their library. Fortunately, the potential conflict was recognized in time, and NARA was able to negotiate with Congress to get additional funds for both the Truman and the Roosevelt projects. This example was used to emphasize the importance of the libraries and their foundations working together to avoid undercutting each other with Congress.

Clinton Library initiatives were also addressed. NARA is working on developing a better relationship with OMB in general to support a new pattern, where new libraries get staff and funding for the activities necessary long before the new library is built. NARA included Clinton Library positions in its FY1999 budget request.

The draft memo on foundation/library relations was circulated and discussed. This document was released in August, 1998, as the Interim Guidance document NARA 98-205, "Policy on funding programs and staff in Presidential libraries." Related to this discussion was a question from Ambassador Vanden Heuvel regarding responsibility for the libraries' web pages. NARA official Sharon Fawcett noted that all of the libraries now have websites, some through NARA and some through university host sites. This is an area where the libraries were working on their own well ahead of NARA. NARA has now hired a Webmaster to bring commonality to the various sites, as Archivist Carlin wants a common message for all of NARA. Marty Allen of the Ford Library foundation requested a report at the next meeting on what all of the libraries are doing in the technology arena. The question of transferring library functions to the foundations

was treated at some length. If a library wishes to transfer functions to its foundation, the transfers must be in the public interest, they must further the interests of the library, proceeds derived must be deposited into the NARA Trust Fund, and if it is a substantive change, it must be reported to Congress. The judgment of what constitutes a "substantive" change rests with NARA.

The status of the Nixon Library was discussed, although the settlement agreement with the Nixon estate over his papers could not be discussed as it was still in litigation. Carlin articulated NARA's position that it is concerned with access, history, and the records themselves. He expressed hope that an agreement will be reached so the private Nixon Library in California will become part of the presidential library system during his tenure as Archivist.

NARA's new Development Officer addressed fund-raising by NARA and by the individual library foundations. The discussion touched on "naming" opportunities in the libraries and the current NARA prohibition on permanent logos being posted in the libraries. The prohibition was implemented to prevent over-commercialization and loss of control over library space. Also, NARA had had an unfortunate experience when tobacco conglomerate Phillip Morris underwrote a project under the agency's purview and major public criticism erupted.

The appropriateness of certain public relations activities was discussed during the clarification of the government's policy that advertising can be for informational purposes only, not for aggrandizement of an individual or "puffery." Even when foundation or Trust Fund money is used, the library's advertising must meet this standard.

When I interviewed recently retired member of the advisory committee George Elsey, who worked in both the Roosevelt and Truman White Houses, he observed that he was not sure the committee actually accomplished much other than serving as a sounding board for the Archivist of the U.S. One of his principal memories is the Archivist emphasizing that the foundations would need to take on more and more of the burden for funding the long-term health of the libraries. The federal funds to maintain the libraries and the museums was shrinking and the foundations would have to pick up the slack.

PRESIDENTIAL LIBRARY FOUNDATIONS

As illustrated throughout this paper, each presidential library's attendant foundation provides the key to whether that library thrives or languishes. The foundation must adapt and grow long after the president and his immediate family are dead, if the library is to prosper in its roles beyond merely archival preservation and access to a few researchers each year. In the early years of the Presidential Library System, the foundations set up to build the libraries sometimes withered away after the initial construction was completed. Today, all of the libraries have revived their foundation partners, and the library directors realize that their work with the foundation is a key element in their potential success.

When I asked David Peterson why some of the presidential library foundations are less than forthcoming about how much financial support they provide their libraries, Peterson said he assumes they fear media attention, which has sometimes been very negative, plus the fact that

probably less than half of these foundations have any paid staff who can compile such a report. These foundations function largely with volunteers, who may not have the time or expertise to produce full or effective financial reports. In addition, some of the foundations have other priorities besides the presidential library. The Roosevelt Institute's charitable and scholarly activities in the Netherlands come to mind.

Today, NARA and NL realize the importance of promoting and working effectively with the individual foundations, as well as NARA's new development officer. Nevertheless, each foundation has autonomy to set its own priorities and local decision-making rules. Recent documentation from NL defining the roles of foundations versus NARA's role is a step toward more standard interfaces between the public and private sectors across the Presidential Library System.

*Prominent Enemies*

"Enemies" of presidential libraries consistently include a few members of Congress, who believe the cost of maintaining the system is too high, and historians and journalists who believe the individuals libraries are too slow to process and open collections for public scrutiny or provide preferential access to partisan favorites. Criticisms seem to rise and fall in a cyclical pattern, depending on "whose ox is being gored" at the moment. Today controversies are few, and, except for the ongoing battle regarding disposition of Richard Nixon's archival collections, they tend to be low-key. Again, the handling of the Nixon papers could easily provide enough material for several dissertations, but I am not addressing it here.

In response to criticisms of the Presidential Library System, David Peterson said he believes that the previous systemic problems within the Presidential Library System were largely resolved by the1986 Presidential Libraries Act. There are fewer prominent enemies of the system than in the past. Without that 1986 legislation, Peterson's nightmare would have been that fifty years from now there would be 25 libraries in the system, most without a surviving president or immediate family members, with small or non-existent endowments, and with moribund foundations. From his point of view, the legitimate criticisms were addressed via the 1986 law's endowment requirement for all new libraries, the size restriction (to prevent any more "Taj Mahals"), and the architectural design standards requiring high quality interior features to help insure economical long-term maintenance. Peterson summarized, "I think we have dealt with this [presidential libraries] as an entity and in a responsible manner, and I think that's why at least for the moment there are not the vocal critics in the House and the Senate." Further, he expects more political support for the system given Archivist of the U.S. John Carlin's recent work in cultivating members of the Advisory Committee on Presidential Libraries and members of the various presidential library foundations. The goal is to rally these influential people around the larger cause of presidential libraries in general, rather than identification with a single specific library.

According to Peterson, John Fawcett, and other interviewees, the ever-present criticisms from journalists and scholars who want collections open immediately will linger on, despite the

potential for such an approach to endanger privacy and archival preservation efforts. Nevertheless, the major controversies surrounding the libraries have been resolved for the moment.


*Summary of the Presidential Library System's External Polity*

At the present time, the Presidential Library System's external polity is sufficiently supportive of the system and its mission to provide stability. The American public, to the extent it is aware of presidential libraries at all, appears to have accepted the concept of presidential libraries as an appropriate method for handling the disposition of each administration's documentation.

Clearly, members of Congress are not currently receiving much negative feedback on the libraries, because the approval for new libraries and the annual funding for the system as a whole have progressed through the budget process without controversy. When a new library is dedicated, these celebrations of American history have evolved into lead stories on the evening news. The historians and journalists selected to provide commentary on such occasions tend to be those who support the libraries, rather than those who find fault with them. Essays, editorials, and news stories negative toward presidential libraries these days tend to deal with political issues such as the restaurant tax proposed in Little Rock to help pay for the new Clinton Library, rather than dealing with the fundamental nature of the library system.

### Presidential Library System Political Economy Quadrants Summary Chart

| *Internal Economy* | *External Economy* |
|---|---|
| • The system is stable and institutionalized<br>• Staffing is adequate, if not generous<br>• Decision-making is decentralized, but becoming more standardized with GPRA<br>• Interactions with other federal agencies are decentralized<br>• The federal budget sustains slightly more than metabolism<br>• Processing and opening archival collections remains the top system-wide priority<br>• Archives functions have become even more of a driving force because of the PRA and FOIA compliance<br>• Relationships between NARA and the various library foundations are being clarified | • Government funding is stable and adequate to maintain equilibrium<br>• The system is fully institutionalized in the national economy (i.e., its future is not in serious question)<br>• The general economy is relatively vital and stable at the moment<br>• Adequate and appropriate labor is available to support operations<br>• Private funding is being enhanced via NARA's development office and the individual presidential library foundations<br>• New libraries must have on opening day endowments in place to support future operations |
| *Internal Polity* | *External Polity* |
| • Top management at NARA and NL are in place and provide stability<br>• Team management efforts have begun with some success<br>• Staff roles are well-defined and predictable<br>• System-wide cooperative projects and staff mobility are increasing cohesion<br>• The interest and support of Congress and the White House are currently positive<br>• Strategic planning efforts will begin to promote system-wide improvements as they expand beyond its archives-only focus<br>• Struggles within the internal polity are minimal at present | • Presidential libraries receive enthusiastic support from sitting and former presidents<br>• Presidential library foundations are becoming increasingly financially sound and supportive of the libraries, especially the newer ones<br>• NARA is well connected politically under John Carlin as Archivist of the U.S.<br>• NL is directed by a career bureaucrat who negotiates the external environment well<br>• Direct Congressional relations are managed by NARA and are cordial<br>• Relations with historians and other constituents appear relatively calm at present |

### *Characteristics of the Presidential Library System as a Policy Subsystem*

As in Chapter III, IV, and V the following description of the Presidential Library System applies the variable characteristics of a policy subsystem from Wamsley and Milward and Wamsley, numbers 4-11 from the list of characteristics in Chapter II.

Characteristic 4.

"Policy subsystems are systems in the sense that the variables that comprise them are interrelated so that a change in one variable results in a change in others. Members of policy subsystems are thus **functionally interdependent** or interrelated; in some, members have close symbiotic relationships, in others members have worked out guarded truces, while in still others members are engaged in open competition or aggressive interaction." Their general effects "generally do **not** represent conscious, planned centrally coordinated, **macro-rationality**." "The behavior of individuals within a policy subsystem exhibits **micro-rationality**; i.e., these individuals reflect functional activity of the subsystem and their roles; these roles provide determinate goals, rationales, and calculable strategies that are rational for the individual actors within the context of the subsystem." *(M&W #3, #12, #11)*

The first sentence is an hypothesis, and it represents a dichotomous *variable* (i.e., the Presidential Library System is or is not a system). I judge the Presidential Library System to be a system, although it is quiescent, rather than active, at present. The system is relatively inconspicuous on a national scale. The relationships are *variable* and they offer the opportunity to devise a Likert scale along the continuum from collegial relationships to adversarial. I must describe individuals' behavior and their relationships.

Yes, the Presidential Library System fits the definition of a system, in that all of the libraries are dependent on NARA for their baseline funding and their interface with the federal government. All of the libraries must perform their archival operations in standardized ways and compliance is monitored. All staff vacancies must go through NARA's centralized approval process before they can be filled. It is not unusual for one library to lose positions, if agency-wide priorities favor filling vacancies at another library, especially newer ones where a great deal of archival processing remains to be done.

Nevertheless, in their museum and educational/outreach programs, presidential libraries in most ways cannot be described as a system. Although a few system-wide museum exhibit initiatives are under way, for the most part each library has a great deal of autonomy with regard to its exhibits and programming. This autonomy is inevitable because the funding for these operations comes primarily from the libraries' foundations.

Presidential library directors throughout this policy subsystem reveal regular interactions with NL, as well as some information-sharing and cooperation among the library directors themselves. I did not detect a highly competitive or aggressive atmosphere among the directors. Lower level staff in the libraries have less interaction with their counterparts in other libraries, but NL is beginning to sponsor national meetings for museum curators and archivists in an effort to promote more information exchange and mutual support. Overall, even at the directors' level, most presidential library employees exhibit identification and concentration within their own libraries, rather than system-wide.

Characteristic 5.

"Policy subsystems in the American system cut across the conventional divisions of power (legislative, executive, and judicial) and levels of government with **varied internal distributions of power**." "The configuration of power within policy subsystems varies widely from one to another. Some are dominated by one or a few very powerful actors, but in others power may be relatively diffuse." *(M&W #5 and #6)*

*Variable*: The "internal distribution of power" can range from a narrowly dispersed distribution of internal power (very few powerful leaders) to widely dispersed powerful leaders.

The Presidential Library System exhibits dispersed leadership cutting across the public and private sectors. In the federal government sector, the current leadership at NARA and NL are important elements in how the system functions. For example, when NARA and NL were without appointed directors in the mid 1990s, the system suffered. Likewise, Congressional interest and leadership play an important role in how the Presidential Library System fares in its annual budget appropriations and in the approval process for new libraries. In the 1980s, when Senators Chiles and Glenn were ascendant in Congress, relations between the libraries and Congress were contentious. Today, few Congressional leaders show a particular interest in the libraries and relations are relatively quiet. Relations between the Presidential Library System and the White House and with other executive agencies are become stable, routinized, and cooperative over the past decade. Relations with the judicial branch are more remote, occurring primarily when rulings regarding the access to collections or declassification issues are handed down in response to legal actions brought by citizen groups.

Presidential library foundations represent the major point of contact between the Presidential Library System and the private sector. The foundations show variable levels of leadership and prominence locally and nationally, but a perusal of the list of the combined board memberships of all the foundations reveals strong ties between the board members and the political, corporate, and charitable worlds nationally (and even internationally in some cases).

Characteristic 6.

"The structure of **functional differentiation**, or, in some cases, task interdependency, also varies; in some it is consciously structured and interrelated in complex ways, others will have much less interdependence or it will exist on an unconscious level." *(M&W #6)*

*Variable*: From consciously structured to unconsciously structured.

The Presidential Library System operates in a consciously structured manner specified by federal legislation. Nevertheless, there is a low level of interdependence among the libraries. As emphasized throughout this paper, the individual libraries operate quite autonomously, particularly in regard to their museum and programming activities. Some staff in the libraries, even at fairly senior levels in the organization, seem only dimly aware of how their sister libraries operate and what they have to offer.

The libraries' archival functions and how they operate are dictated by federal policies and procedures. Archival operations are monitored rather closely by NL, but even here the libraries operate independently of each other for the most part. Earlier libraries have different challenges than newer ones, because their collections are fully processed for the most part and were all deposited through deed-of-gift. Newer libraries must meet different demands dictated by the Presidential Records Act and the Presidential Libraries Act of 1986.

Despite some similarities across the system, each library's interactions with its foundation are unique. Likewise, interactions with and support from local communities are as varied as the locales the libraries are sited in, from Hyde Park, New York to Simi Valley, California to College Station, Texas.

Characteristic 7.

"Policy subsystems manifest a **normative order**. Some are replete with symbols, myths, rituals, and sometimes a special language which reflects the intersubjective reality of the members or their consensus as to what is important, desirable, and right. Referred to by some as a 'constitution,' it has the effect of legitimating and delegitimating behaviors, reaffirming intersubjective reality, and of enhancing exclusivity and autonomy." *(M&W #7)*

*Variable:* Each policy subsystem exhibits a visible normative order to a greater

or lesser extent.

The normative order of the Presidential Library System is clearly visible with regard to its archival mission and functions, less so with regard to its museum and programming functions. This archival focus reflects the history of the system, i.e., its original purpose. The archival normative order in the Presidential Library System may also reflect the fact that the archival profession is well established, with its own norms and values across organizations and a well-established tradition throughout NARA and all of the libraries. NARA's CIDS training program for archivists, which many presidential library staff have completed, also builds normative congruence throughout the system.

The museum curators and educational specialists in the libraries come from more varied backgrounds, and there are fewer similarities and commonly held norms among these groups. Staff members in presidential libraries, especially at the professional level, tend to stay with the system throughout their careers, and they absorb and pass on the system's traditions and norms to new staff. As the overall system matures, the number of staff transferring from one library to another and back and forth to NARA increases as well, enhancing the system-wide normative order.

Characteristic 8.

Policy subsystems are "comprised of actors seeking to influence the authoritative **allocation of values**, be it rewards (dollars, services, status, benign neglect) or deprivation (regulations, taxation, conscription, punishment, status denigration)" (W. p. 77-78). policy subsystems "have embedded in them an opportunity or incentive structure. Functional interaction holds forth the prospect of affecting public policy either in formulation or implementation, i.e., interaction has payoffs that, while by no means certain, nonetheless seem plausible to members." *(M&W #10)*

*Variable:* Each of the policy subsystems described in the dissertation, and the overall policy subsystem of the Presidential Library System, is more or less successful in influencing the "allocation of values" (i.e., does a better or worse job of taking advantage of its available resources in all sectors of government and the private sector to promote its health and viability, i.e. funding, clear mission, passionate supporters, etc.).

The Presidential Library System has over the past 60 years succeeded in becoming institutionalized as one small part of our national infrastructure, codified and assured of at least baseline funding from Congress for the foreseeable future. The overall system, despite rocky periods characterized by Congressional investigations and media exposés, has survived and thrived in recent years. Its place in the federal government is secure. Individual libraries have been able to favorably influence their federal allocations from time to time (for example, the special "no-year" appropriations for the Kennedy Library and the renovation project at the Truman

Library). NARA/NL, however, take a dim view of such "end runs" by individual libraries, which may disrupt system-wide priorities.

Individual libraries are most readily able to influence their own "allocation of values" through interactions with their private-sector foundations and in some cases local and state governments. Foundation funding is what makes it possible for libraries to be vibrant and visible, with active outreach programs, appealing and informative web pages, and up-to-date exhibits. Here again, changes wrought under the Presidential Libraries Act of 1986 ensure that new libraries (beginning with the Bush Library) will have healthy endowments in place from the day they open to support all of these "extra" activities not funded by federal appropriations.

It will be most beneficial to the earlier libraries if they can develop similar endowments over the next few decades, because the struggle for individual, corporate, and foundation funding will become more of a challenge as the libraries age and the former presidents and their families are no longer around to help raise private funds.

Characteristic 9.

Policy subsystems are "heterogeneous, have variable **cohesion** and they exhibit internal **complexity**." (W., p. 78) "policy subsystems are comprised of multifarious actors: institutions, organizations, groups, and individuals linked on the basis of shared and salient interests in a particular policy. In the American polity these might include bureaucratic agencies from all levels of government, interest groups, legislative committees and subcommittees, powerful individuals, or relevant others." *(M&W #8)*

Variable: Each library and the Presidential Library System have 1) more or less cohesion and 2) more or less internal complexity. It is possible for a library to have any level of combination of these two variables.

The Presidential Library System is a supremely heterogeneous organization, as highlighted by the diversity of forms, funding, and operations found within it. Individual presidential libraries are quite autonomous and distinguished by their variety. Although they all engage in archival, museum, and outreach activities, the emphasis is different in each library.

Other than an overall commitment to the mission of presidential libraries in general, cohesion is not evident across the system. Given the different emphases found in the libraries, staff in any given one reflect the focus of that institution, its director, its locale, the interests and financial strength of its foundation's, and its stage of development.

Although internal complexity varies from library to library, with some showing less complexity than others, the overall system reflects a high degree of complexity. As described in this paper, the variety of local, state, and federal institutions and individuals involved in the overall system is extensive. From state and university bureaucracies in Texas to state funding in Iowa to

the FDR Library foundation's activities in the Netherlands, the system's tentacles run deep across the country and occasionally internationally.

Characteristic 10.

Policy subsystems have "an unremitting drive for **functional autonomy** on the part of those interests which are dominant in a subsystem at any given point in time." (W. p. 78) "policy subsystems are subsystems of the larger political system; related to it but in varying degrees of intensity and richness. All have established some degree of autonomy from the larger system." *(M&W #4)* "Self perpetuation of the policy subsystem is the most consistently shared goal of participants. If authority and funding of its correlated programs or its functional autonomy are threatened, this will tend to enhance consensus." *(M&W #13)*

*Variable*: Each policy subsystem described is more or less autonomous at this

moment in terms of its balance of powers and functional activities in relation to its "larger political system"-NARA, and in terms of its feelings of security about its perpetuation.

The Presidential Library System holds a high-profile position within NARA, and it has a relatively high degree of autonomy within the agency. As emphasized throughout this chapter, the system has achieved in the past five years or so a stability and level of support which, along with its support from the private sector, provides a sense of security about its future. Mandates arising from the Presidential Libraries Act of 1986 provide newer libraries with more consistent guidance from NARA than in the past, as well as the assurance of ongoing private funding. At present there are few perceived threats to the system, which is finally allowing NL to begin focusing on producing or updating documentation for areas which need to be standardized throughout the libraries and supporting library operations in the field as necessary.

Characteristic 11.

Policy subsystems have "an identifiable core of **horizontal integration**. Unfortunately, most of the research tended to see this horizontal integration as confined to the agency or agencies with statutory responsibility, interest groups and relevant legislative committees or subcommittees. Thus they gave impetus to the oversimplistic metaphor of the 'iron triangle'." (W., p. 78) AND "**vertical integration** is a part of policy subsystems. Interest groups, program managers and program professionals can be found systematically linked through all layers of the federal government into what the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations called 'vertical functional autocracies'." (W., p. 78) "The linkages between units of a policy subsystem are vertical as well as

horizontal so that a policy subsystem may consist of horizontal cluster at different levels which are liked to one another vertically to form the overall system. For example there can be linkages among health agencies in a city as well as each agency being linked to separate state and federal agencies." (M&W #9)

*Variable*: Each policy subsystem described has more or less horizontal

and vertical integration.

For the Presidential Library System as a whole, relatively high levels of horizontal and vertical integration are observable. All of the libraries are closely tied to NARA and the federal government in a vertical fashion, and all of them must be horizontally linked to their local institutions and their private foundations if they are to fulfill their dual archival and museum functions.

I prefer to use the metaphor of a spiral, rather like a tornado image, instead of straight line to describe how the system actually operates in its environment. Horizontal and vertical lines do not effectively illustrate the complexity and intricacies present in the Presidential Library System, especially if the straight lines are organized as an equilateral triangle implying equal relationships between government agencies, Congress, and interest groups.

### Answers to Stein and Bickers' Three Key Questions

Stein and Bickers focused their discussions of policy subsystems around three questions: 1) to whom is the policy subsystem accountable? 2) whose interests does it serve? and 3) how is the connection between the public and its elected representatives distorted by the policy subsystem? Below are the answers to these questions for the Presidential Library System. My purpose here is to see whether, indeed, the overall policy subsystem "exists within the context of democratic institutions and practices in America" (Stein & Bickers, 1995, p. 151).

1) *To whom is the Reagan Library policy subsystem accountable?*

The Presidential Library System policy subsystem is accountable to all three branches of the federal government to varying degrees. First, the library system is accountable to its parent executive branch agency, NARA. The libraries are a key component of NARA's day-to-day operations, it planning efforts, and its visibility with the public. NARA's Office of Presidential Libraries is responsible for insuring compliance with all laws, rules, and regulations applicable to the libraries. To a greater or lesser extent depending on the age of the library, all of the libraries must maintain effective relations with the White House, and all libraries must be accountable to it. Presidential libraries are accountable to Congress, which authorizes each library initially and funds its basic operations in perpetuity. Accountability to the judicial branch is less obvious and examples less frequent than interactions with the executive and legislative branches. Nevertheless,

court rulings regarding access to archival collections, declassification of materials, appropriate use of federal facilities, etc. require library compliance and accountability.

The libraries individually, and in some cases collectively, are accountable to the private sector foundations that provide support for almost all of their activities beyond basic archival ones. Private groups do not fund activities or projects without some expectation of accountability. Although the amount of private support varies rather dramatically from library to library, all of them are subject to some level of outside support and influence in carefully specified areas of their operations.

In recent years, especially since passage of the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (GPRA), presidential libraries are focusing on accountability to their diverse "customer" base and compliance with government-wide performance standards.

2) *Whose interests does the Presidential Library system serve?*

The Presidential Library System serves a variety of national, and sometimes international, constituencies. Individual libraries first must serve the interests of the president the library honors and his family as long as they survive and choose to involve themselves in library matters. Second, the libraries serve the obvious user groups--researchers, museum visitors, and participants in educational programs.

The overall system is responsible for serving the federal government's interest in preserving White House archives and making them available to the public. In a rather unusual twist in its approach to fulfilling this archival preservation interest, the federal government depends on private sector funding to build and endow the facilities to house these archival collections. Therefore, the library system must serve the ongoing interests of the private supporters of the presidents and their libraries. The Presidential Library System serves the interests of the localities and institutions (particularly universities) the libraries are part of.

*3) How is the connection between the public and its elected representatives distorted by the policy subsystem?*

The Presidential Library System does not distort the connection between the public and its elected representatives. Despite the perennial criticisms directed at the Presidential Library System by a group of vocal scholars and journalists who resent not having all presidential materials open for scrutiny in a central location immediately after the president leaves office, I have not found that the system engages in regular or significant distortions of the democratic process nor undue restrictions on access to information.

For the most part, presidential libraries carry out their archival and educational missions in a routine, quiet and professional manner. They serve a variety of constituencies within and without the government in an acceptable manner. If we recall that FDR established the system to insure the preservation and accessibility of materials that had been routinely lost to posterity before his time, and that changes in the ground rules over the past 60 years have succeeded in keeping that original mission in mind, I believe that, given the alternatives, this is a policy subsystem that functions overall in the best interests of our nation.

# Chapter 7 Conclusions

Chapter 7 addresses five topics: the conclusions I have reached about the Presidential Library System policy subsystem, answers to the original research questions, the future of the Presidential Library System, the utility of the policy subsystem model for this study, and implications for future research.

## *Conclusions*

### *The Presidential Library System fits the definition of a policy subsystem.*

Nevertheless, it is a quiescent policy subsystem at present - that is, it is in a relatively quiet or restful state. At some periods in its history, the Presidential Library System policy subsystem has been turbulent and "noisy," particularly between 1974 and 1986. Those were the years from Richard Nixon's resignation (with his archival materials being immediately impounded) and passage of the revised Presidential Libraries Act (PL99-323, 44 USC 2112), designed to accommodate Congress's serious criticisms about excessive costs and the increasing grandeur of each new library. Since 1986, the system has been carefully defined in law and its existence assured for the foreseeable future. This hard-won stability assumes no major change in the way presidential administrations operate, and continued Congressional support for the 60-year tradition of presidential libraries now entrenched in 12 communities throughout the nation.

### *The Presidential Library System is a quintessentially American way of handling presidential archives.*

The system is based on shared responsibility and shared governance woven through federal, state, and local governments and the private sector. The libraries are set up as federally supported public institutions that cannot succeed without continual and significant private funding. The archival functions of the libraries are supported by the federal budget and operated according to federal policies and procedures. Many of the museum and educational functions are supported with private money, and are therefore subject to the influences that accompany such funding. The percentage of projects supported by private sources varies from library to library, from little or none at the Carter Library to the more typical figure of 20-30% with private funding. Library directors must meet all the obligations of other federal "field office" directors, while simultaneously spending a significant percentage of their time working with private foundation supporters just to secure the minimal funding necessary to fulfill their mission. Researchers (the "elite" minority) complain that the libraries are geographically dispersed and that archival

materials are inaccessible to scholars, while museum visitors and the general public (the majority, comprising "average" citizens) appreciate having the libraries in their own states or regions and enjoy visiting them as tourist destinations.

The federal government is content to have the private sector fund the construction and endowment of the facilities in return for the private interest groups having a measure of influence over what takes place there. Until late 1998, NARA, the federal agency responsible for presidential libraries, was content to allow vagueness to rule regarding the complex relationship between the federal and private sectors in presidential libraries. There was no written documentation to define these relationships. Only now is NARA beginning to distinguish in its policy statements the exact areas of federal responsibility from those of the private foundations.

*The two most important factors influencing a library's vibrancy and effectiveness are a) the personal characteristics and professional skills of the library director, both as a bureaucrat and as an entrepreneur; and b) the financial health of the foundation charged with supporting the library, and its level of commitment to the library.*

Throughout my visits to libraries and to NARA headquarters, from extensive telephone interviews with directors, and from the quarterly reports the libraries file with NARA, I detected a clear relationship between the director's personality and his background (I use the masculine pronoun, for today they are all men) and the vitality of the library's current activities. It also became evident that directors who work to support, promote, and cooperate with an active and financially healthy library foundation can be much more successful than if they do not. It is a complex dance in which the director juggles his federal bureaucrat role and his role as entrepreneurial fund-raiser. A director who fits the stereotype of a "stack rat" archivist/line federal bureaucrat probably cannot be successful as director of a presidential library. Likewise, to succeed beyond maintaining an archival status quo, a presidential library must have a foundation that is visible, active, and assured of a steady influx of private money.

To ground my conclusions in public administration theory, I offer the following. The views expressed here support the "refounding" movement in public administration enunciated in two volumes (1990 and 1996) written and/or edited by Wamsley, Wolf, and others. The "refounding of public administration" perspective emphasizes a focus on the individual, on the public interest, and on the important symbolism needed to sustain our system of government.

The "old" traditional rationalistic/instrumentalist view of public administration championed by the 3-Es types, who are interested only in economy, efficiency, and effectiveness, is described by Wamsley as follows:

> The 3-Es are measures of the efficacy of means given agreed-upon or specified ends, but they do not provide a satisfactory measure of the *appropriateness* of either the means or the ends. Such a measure of appropriateness is important for all government but essential for a democratic constitutional republic. Without it such a government has no *raison **d'être***. (Wamsley, 1996, p. 356)

Questions of responsiveness, representativeness, and responsibility are harder to answer. These "three Rs" represent considerations of "serving our fellow citizens, upholding constitutional values, and the creation of relationships that evoke human and democratic development" (Wamsley, 1996, p. 355). I conclude that, overall, presidential libraries are remarkably successful in fulfilling both the 3-Es and the 3-Rs. To illustrate my point, I have shown in this research that each library plays a visible role in its local community; it exhibits responsiveness to its federal, local, and private sector constituencies; and it displays a commitment to preserving the artifacts and memory of the president it memorializes and the Presidency as an institution.

Any system that can staff and maintain for less than 30 million federal dollars a year ten archival/museum facilities located from Boston to Atlanta and from West Branch, Iowa, to Simi Valley, California, with 350 government employees, is obviously operating with a fairly high level of economy and efficiency. System effectiveness, as measured by user surveys and management reports, also appears to be more than adequate. The disadvantage of researchers having to travel to the various sites is at least partially offset by the loyalty (and the funding, including the research grants) of the foundations and by the detailed knowledge of the staff in each individual library. Given the inevitable tension between the researcher community's desire to have the archival collections centralized at NARA headquarters in the Washington, DC, area and the museum visitors' desire for educational resources in geographically accessible locations, I conclude that the current system, despite its faults and failings, is probably more responsive and representative than a centralized system could be. Nevertheless, since we have not tried employing a centralized system for handling today's extensive presidential archival collections, it is impossible to say conclusively one way or the other.

Despite the objections of presidential library critics (usually researchers or members of Congress), I tend to agree with Richard Norton Smith, well-known popular historian, current director of the Gerald Ford Library and Museum, and former director of the Hoover, Eisenhower, and Reagan Libraries:

> In their range and variety, presidential libraries reflect the genius for governing that marks the American people at their best. They trace the lives and legacies of an Iowa-born mining engineer whose humanitarian instincts rescued millions from starvation and a plain-spoken haberdasher from Missouri, who reminded us anew of the uncommon abilities that reside within so-called common men and women. They introduce us to a Congressman from Grand Rapids, a Georgia peanut farmer, and a former movie star turned governor who, each in his own way, helped restore the public trust while reaching out to achieve a more peaceful world. (Smith, Richard Norton, 1989, p. 115-116)

Similarly, Bob Moos, in a 1990 Dallas Morning News editorial noted his conversion from skeptic, who thought presidential libraries were "no more than 20th-century equivalents of pyramids built by modern-day pharaohs so their accomplishments could live on in splendor," to a supporter of

presidential libraries as educational centers which can be part of the answer "to the abysmal lack of knowledge about our heritage" so evident among our citizens (Wilson, 1991, p. 774).

## Answers to Research Questions

### What the Libraries Share

All presidential libraries have the following characteristics in common: a relationship with NARA, standard archival policies and procedures, a small piece of the federal funding pie, the need for private funding if they are to be successful in their non-archival functions, and a commitment to serving their disparate clienteles effectively. The libraries are outposts of the federal government in their localities, yet they are inherently local institutions that depend on the community's acceptance and support to achieve success.

A widely shared belief among presidential libraries staff throughout the system is in the concept of a presidential library life cycle. The concept, which has become conventional wisdom, holds that each presidential library experiences a life cycle that falls into three phases. Phase one is characterized by creation of a permanent setting, museum development, and heavy archival processing. Museum visits are usually quite high during phase one, which lasts about 10 years. Phase two, which lasts about 15 years, is characterized by professional and research use with continuing archival processing, scholarly conferences, and educational programs. Museum visitation stabilizes. Phase three is described as the "mature" library, characterized by nostalgia, when major archival collections have been processed, research activity stabilizes, and outreach activities must be intensified to reach non-academic and non-traditional audiences (Wilson, 1991 p. 774-775).

This concept has been internalized by presidential library staffs throughout the system. In every library I visited, at least one person mentioned the "life cycle" and told me which of the three phases currently describes his or her library. The interviewees appeared to find this description of the system comforting, and few had carried the analogy to its logical conclusion-- that life cycles include death. Rather, they all seemed to assume that the libraries will just continue in the "mature" mode in perpetuity. I encountered only one individual who implied that if the federal government does not do a better job of living up to its commitment to provide core support for the libraries, the properties might revert to the private foundations that built them, and the libraries as we know them could disappear. The buzzword "reinvention" has occurred to some staff at presidential libraries, who expressed the opinion that their institutions were involved in the concept long before Vice President Albert Gore popularized it (Daellenbach interview, Reagan Library). Nevertheless, I do not believe these staff members foresee reinvention of their institutions to include a radical change in how they do things (internal economy/internal polity).

Because the life cycle concept is reminiscent of biology where birth, growth, and death are constants, I find the analogy inapplicable to presidential libraries, which have no notion of death. Rather, presidential libraries individually and as a group are in a constant state of evolution, re-

evaluation, and change. Perhaps "constant evolution" would be a better model for allowing staff to make sense of their world.

*What is Unique About Each*

The unique features of each presidential library were highlighted in the descriptions of the case study libraries and in the brief descriptions in Appendix A. To recap, each library is unique most significantly in its subject president, his policies, his politics, his personal characteristics, and his family; each library has a unique locale, which reflects some aspect of the president's life; each library benefits from and suffers from the "accidents of history" surrounding its birth; each library reflects the characteristics of its foundation; and each library reflects the influence of its leadership, i.e., previous and present directors, the presence and proclivities of its subject president and his family, who heads its foundation, and that person's relationship with the library director.

*The Extent To Which the Presidential Library System Is a Policy Subsystem*

The Presidential Library System collectively, as well as each library individually, fits the definition of a policy subsystem. In its briefest definition (Stein & Bickers, 1995, n.p.), a policy subsystem is "links among members of Congress, interest groups, program beneficiaries, and federal and subnational government agencies that blanket the American political landscape" (overleaf). The three case study libraries analyzed in this paper illustrate rich interactions among all three branches of the federal government, state and local governments, the private sector, members of Congress, members of Executive agencies, politicians, bureaucrats, presidential families, citizens in the localities where libraries reside, and national and international scholarly researchers.

As this study has shown, there is a high degree of individuality among the libraries, and some constitute more robust subsystems than others; but the differences are in degree, not kind. For example, the JFK Library is something of an aberration because it has received proportionately more public and private attention and funding than most other libraries, it is located in a major metropolitan area with higher potential and actual visitorship, and its archival collections are fundamentally more controversial. After President Kennedy's assassination, his papers, as well as others in the collection, were deposited by deed-of-gift, but with significant and long-lasting restrictions. The continuing influence of Kennedy family members through the library's foundation raises the specter of unfair and/or privileged access to archival materials for favorites (referred to as "court historians"). Nevertheless, evidence suggests that this library, while complying with donor restrictions, follows federal policies and procedures in fulfilling its archival responsibilities and is able to be expansive in both its museum and educational programs because of its healthy private funding base.

The Carter Library in Atlanta is at the opposite end of the spectrum of presidential libraries. Although this library is also located in a major metropolitan area, visitorship is not particularly

strong, and the Carter Center places priority on its other charitable endeavors, so there is little funding for revitalizing museum exhibits or educational outreach programs. The library is reportedly not a beloved institution among Atlantans, who still remember the land use battles attendant upon its creation. The library's director appears to be more concerned with archival matters than entrepreneurial endeavors. The director's approach also undoubtedly reflects the continuing presence and influence of President and Mrs. Carter, who reside in their apartment adjacent to the library while conducting their international activities. Mr. Carter was always concerned that the library present the "facts" of his presidency and its era without embellishment.

Nevertheless, even in these extreme cases, every presidential library operates in a complex web of federal, state, and local environments and depends on the public and private sectors for their sustenance.

*How Government Is Organized to Fulfill the Mission of Presidential Libraries*

The Presidential Library System is an example of an institution based on a Jeffersonian rather than a Hamiltonian model. That is, the system embodies the concepts of Thomas Jefferson, who promoted decentralization and a weak executive, versus the ideas of Alexander Hamilton, who promoted centralization and a strong executive. Given the system's founder, Franklin Roosevelt, the Jeffersonian model is surprising. Roosevelt as president was himself much more Hamiltonian than Jeffersonian. Nevertheless, Roosevelt was responding to the legal ownership of presidential documents (private) at the time he formulated the library system.

Even today, 60 years after their birth, a significant question lingers: "What exactly is the mission of presidential libraries and what is the federal government's role in fulfilling that mission?" Although the archival mission is clear, the mission of the other functions of the libraries is murky. Strategic planning efforts for the presidential libraries as a system are almost non-existent. There are very few good measures for illustrating how the libraries justify even the small number of federal dollars they now receive. There are few organized methods for evaluating the museum and educational missions and functions of the libraries. Overall, a significant amount of private money and some public funds go toward the latter functions. Basically, in congruence with NARA's larger archival mission, the Office of Presidential Libraries has fewer legislative mandates regarding the non-archival side of the libraries' operations, and no mandate to do public programming. Therefore, its priorities must lie first with the mission stipulated in legislation. To help presidential libraries protect themselves for the future, they need to formulate and implement a system for centralized planning and establishment of criteria for evaluation of all presidential library operations.

From the viewpoint of several library directors, the Office of Presidential Libraries used to, but does not now, provide some essential support and nurture for all of the libraries. The office looked at everything from budgets and guidance on mission questions to donations and educational programs. Today, directors believe that office has become an administrative unit. It does not involve itself in mission questions, research programs, or other programmatic details. In the directors' view, the office moves paper around. It is more concerned with administration than

policy. This shift has made the libraries more autonomous. Ironically, it appears that Archivist of the U.S. John Carlin wanted more control over the libraries, but to date it appears that has not happened. The libraries are more independent now than they have been at times in the past, particularly the 1970s and early 1980s. Also, beginning with the Bush Library, which had a full endowment the day it opened, each library will have more of its "own" money and can afford to be more autonomous. The older libraries have more need for the resources NARA can provide, because they have small or non-existent endowments. These perceptions by the directors may begin to change as the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) reaches full implementation and more accountability demands are placed on the Presidential Library System as a whole and on each library. Similarly, initiatives underway at the Office of Presidential Libraries over the past year or so also indicate a shift toward the kind of support from headquarters that some libraries need and want. I have observed that actions and initiatives in the Office of Presidential Libraries do not become obvious in the libraries for months, sometimes up to a year. Now that presidential libraries have stable leadership in the central office, I anticipate the situation described by the library directors will begin to swing back toward more leadership from NARA.

### *The Future of the Presidential Library System*

Today's Presidential Library System exists because Franklin Roosevelt indulged in an act of noblesse oblige by creating his library on the family estate at Hyde Park. The library was designed to protect and provide access to his papers and collections for future generations. These objects were his personal possessions and his to do with as he pleased. He wanted to have everything available and convenient during the retirement he did not live to see. Cognizant that he was setting a precedent for future presidents, Roosevelt could not have foreseen that within 50 years presidential documents would become public property, subject to FOIA requests and strict declassification schedules, and available in various media to a worldwide audience. The current decentralized public system dependent on private support with a library/museum for each president arose for historic reasons. It continues today, despite enormous changes in the underlying rationale for its existence and almost constant criticism, because it has the necessary political and economic support to sustain it, and no president wants to be the first not to have a library built in his honor. The system as it now exists is unlikely to change substantially until even more dramatic changes in information technology make physical archival collections completely obsolete. If and when that happens, we can assume that privately funded presidential museums will continue to be built but that the need for publicly funded archival facilities may disappear.

Based on their own previous experiences and biases, the subjects I interviewed for this dissertation, along with my colleagues and acquaintances, assumed at the outset that my purpose was to "expose" the inefficiency of the system and show its failures. They will therefore probably assume I have "gone native" now, when I conclude that the system is a relative bargain and well worth the resources American citizens invest in it. For very few federal dollars we have presidential libraries in communities that want and need them, while researchers (often supported by private study grants) and museum visitors get an enriched picture of the president under examination, of the presidency as institution,  and of our country's history.

### *Utility of the Policy Subsystems Model*

The policy subsystem model is a robust theoretical tool for analyzing and describing the Presidential Library System. It allows me to see, describe, and understand features of these complex organizations that I might otherwise have overlooked, and that I almost surely would have overlooked if I had used a less robust construct, such as the iron triangle model.

For example, the iron triangle metaphor, which has now entered the conventional wisdom, is usually illustrated as an equilateral triangle. The triangle misrepresents as equals the component lines and the points of the triangle, i.e., the government agency, Congress, and the affiliated interest groups. In the case of presidential libraries, the triangle metaphor fails to highlight the varying ascendancy of component members of the subsystem at different times in its history, or the importance of the library director's characteristics to the health of a particular library, or the influence of NARA's leadership (or lack of it) at any given time.

The policy subsystem model, as illustrated by the spiral metaphor, does a much better job of capturing the interconnectedness of numerous elements in the subsystem and the swirling nature of relationships at any particular moment. The model requires not merely the examination of the internal and external economy and polity of the institution(s) under study but also the relationships between and among those features.

Specifically, Wamsley's eleven characteristics of policy subsystems (presented in this paper starting on p. 36) as applied to the Presidential Library System, either permitted or prodded me to find the following.

The policy subsystem model gave me a useful analytical construct for mapping the Presidential Library System, and allowing me to  observe that the libraries themselves are negotiating at least somewhat self-consciously their internal and external economies and polities.

The policy subsystem model enhanced my ability to observe empirically the patterns taking place within the network.

I realized that presidential libraries operate as one of the numerous and multifarious policy subsystems throughout our federal system, including such examples as the public lands policy subsystem (the National Park Service, the National Forest Service, and the Bureau of Land Management) and the national emergency management system.

I noted that members of the Presidential Library System policy subsystem are functionally interdependent in many less than obvious ways, mostly through their ties with NARA and the necessity for standardization in their archival operations. Controversies or procedural questions that arise in one library and result in resolutions become NARA policy, then apply to all libraries. Initiatives for renovations or additions at individual libraries must be scheduled through NARA and "get in line" for ascendancy on the agency's list of budget priority. Traveling exhibits will soon become a joint endeavor throughout all levels and elements of the subsystem.

I saw that the Presidential Library System policy subsystem cuts across the conventional divisions of power (legislative, executive, and judicial) and levels of government with varied internal distributions of power. The configurations of power vary across the subsystem and from year-to-year depending on relationships between the branches and levels of government interacting with the private sector. The collections emanate from the executive branch and the system is run by an executive agency, the legislative branch funds the libraries and provides oversight, and the judicial branch settles disputes over policy and access.

I understood that the structure of functional differentiation and task interdependency is consciously structured in federal law and policy and interrelated in complex ways with the private sector and localities.

The Presidential Library System policy subsystem exhibits a visible normative order with recurring symbols, myths, rituals, and a special language throughout the 10 libraries and the Office of Presidential Libraries at NARA. I found, for example, the life cycle concept for presidential libraries to be a commonly held, but flawed, view of "reality" throughout the system. Likewise, coping mechanisms that allow administrators and line staff to deal with foundation supporters, declassification, FOIA requests, preservation of archival materials and artifacts, relations with local constituencies, and other unique features of the libraries have become institutionalized, while still allowing for local idiosyncrasies. Allegiance to professional archival practices and ethical principles is a strongly held value throughout the system. Museum operations and professional norms are much less standardized throughout the Presidential Library System than those in the archival area.

This dissertation has shown conclusively that the Presidential Library System policy subsystem is comprised of actors seeking to influence the authoritative allocation of values in our political system and the economy, both rewards (financial support) and deprivation (exemption from undue federal control). These actors maintain and operate within an internal incentive structure that allows them to affect public policy. Each library with greater or lesser effectiveness, along with NARA, manages to maintain survival through interactions with its complex environment of federal, state, and local politics, as well as the private-sector.

Each presidential library exhibits its own unique level of cohesion and internal complexity, which varies over time depending on the qualities of the personnel on staff, community relations, foundation support, and other variable factors. Likewise, the overall policy subsystem represented by the Office of Presidential Libraries and NARA exhibits variable levels of cohesion and internal complexity depending on its leadership, relations with Congress, credibility with the researcher community, private sector support, and others.

Again, each presidential library and the Presidential Library System as a whole exhibits an unremitting and successful drive for functional autonomy within the larger political system of the United States. Self-perpetuation of the system has been assured for the foreseeable future through reliance on a complex arrangement which plays to both the political and economic characteristics inherent in our capitalistic federal republican form of government.

As illustrated in this paper, the Presidential Library System exhibits horizontal and vertical integration with clusters of institutions linked to each other horizontally and vertically. Horizontal attachments include their similar approaches to local institutions and political groups and staff who have moved from library to library via the NARA bureaucracy. Vertical attachment is to NARA and, under that agency's auspices, to Congress and the Executive Branch. Likewise, each library operates as its own small policy subsystem, exhibiting horizontal and vertical integration within its local milieu.

In sum, if we assume that a theory means "to see," not merely a way of seeing but a tool for seeing things one would not see otherwise, then the policy subsystem model is not only a tool, but a good tool, which allows the student to make true (i.e., testable outside the theory as well as inside) statements that would not have been recognized otherwise. A good theory has three powers: *descriptive* (allowing one to account for and arrange or classify all objects under study), *explanatory* (allowing one to see and name relationships between and among objects), and *predictive* power (allowing one to infer future or as yet unobserved states of the objects in terms of 'if-then' exercises). In this case that means seeing a rich, complex whole where otherwise one might perceive only the parts; relationships or subordination and cause and effect where otherwise one might perceive only discrete, unrelated entities. Therefore, my conclusion isn't just, or even primarily, that the Presidential Library System is a policy subsystem, but that the concept of the policy subsystem is an effective theoretical tool for permitting fruitful analysis and synthesis of human organizations that would be difficult or impossible to understand without this tool.

Despite the fact that policy subsystems are now one of the scapegoats for all of the ills of ineffective government (see Stein & Bickers references to "pork barrel" politics), policy subsystems provide opportunities for building a broadly-defined community of interested parties. Policy subsystems are capable of fostering dialogue at the public interest level in an effort to build a "community of communities" within a given policy arena. The richness of the Presidential Library System policy subsystem depends on the "multifarious," if sometimes contentious, forces involved in the system's operations. Describing the Presidential Library System policy subsystem using the policy subsystem lens enables me to say with some authority that the system fulfills its mission, perhaps idiosyncratically, but overall successfully.


### *Implications for Future Research*

Full case studies need to be provided for all of the presidential libraries. These additional case studies will improve the description of the presidential library system and enhance the power of the policy subsystem as a theoretical model.

Given NARA's placement of an archivist in the Clinton White House, there is an opportunity to do an in-depth analysis of the Clinton Library's development well before the administration ends. No such analysis exists for any of the ten libraries in place, and it could be very valuable in planning for future libraries.

As we approach the millenium, an academic conference on presidential libraries in the 21st century is needed. This conference should be sponsored by a university not affiliated with a

presidential library (i.e., an "impartial" one), and it could be underwritten with foundation support.  The need for such a conference exists because of continuing controversy surrounding the presidential library system, its mission, access to its collections, its funding mechanisms, and its place in the digital age. The goal of the conference should be to present the full spectrum of viewpoints from within and without the presidential library system in the service of defining its mission and what will constitute fulfillment of that mission. Publication of the conference proceedings will be a valuable addition to the literature on presidential libraries.

Additional classification schemes for viewing the presidential library system (beyond the four political economy quadrants presented in this paper) may provide scholars with a rich opportunity to enhance knowledge of the system. Researchers can graphically illustrate the system's characteristics in a variety of ways, such as the following:

- Location: Rural, Urban, Suburban, East-Middle-West

- University affiliation: Full, intermediate, none

- Mission/focus emphasis: Archival, Educational, Public programs, Peripheral

- Controversies: Site of the Library, Researcher Access, Role of Supporters

- Library's View of Itself: Traditional, Futuristic(high tech), Middle-of-the-road

- Relations with NARA: Strained, Moderately close, Successful/Cordial

- Relations with the local community

- Relations with its foundation

Finally, I am left with several puzzles that may provide a source for future research. Why were some of the libraries' foundations unwilling to share information about their contributions? One would think they would be proud of their support and want to publicize it. Why doesn't Congress demand this information? Is NARA afraid the federal funding will disappear if Congress finds out how much private money is out there to support these institutions? Why would NARA deny me attendance at the non-confidential  parts of the Directors' Conference held in College Station in Nov. 1997? I am a professional librarian, a university dean, and a Ph.D. candidate in a respected program in Public Administration. What do they have to hide? These and other questions indicate that the presidential library system may keep me and other researchers busy for many years to come.

# References

Anderson, Jack. (1991, August 1). Deaver supervising Reagan gala event. <u>Washington Post,</u> D12.

As an ex-President prunes his perks. (1985 March 25). <u>U.S. News and World Report, 98,</u> 14.

Bellah, Robert N. (1967, Winter).  The American civil religion <u>Daedalus, 96,</u> 1-21.

Benedetto, Richard. (1997, November 4). Bush hopes library will catalog his successes. <u>USA Today,</u> p. 9A.

Berman, Larry. (1983). Presidential libraries: how not to be a stranger in a strange land. In George C. Edwards, III and Stephen J.Wayne (Eds)., <u>Studying the presidency</u> (pp. 225-256). Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press.

Brooks, Philip C. (1962). The Harry S. Truman Library-plans and reality. <u>American Archivist, 25,</u> 25-37.

Buck, Elizabeth Hawthorn. (1955). General legislation for presidential libraries. <u>American Archivist, 18,</u> 337-41.

Cater, Douglas. (1964). <u>Power in Washington</u>. New York: Random House.

Chandler, Ralph C. & Plano, Jack C. (1988). <u>The public administration dictionary.</u> (2nd ed.). Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO.

Clotworthy, William G. (1995). <u>Homes and libraries of the presidents: An interpretive guide.</u> Blacksburg, VA: The McDonald & Woodward Publishing Company.

Daellenbach, Dennis. (1994, November). The Presidential Records Act: The experience of the Reagan Library. <u>The record: News from the National Archives and Records Administration, 1</u>(2): 19.

Daellenbach, Dennis. (1994). The Ronald Reagan Presidential Library. <u>Government Information Quarterly, 11</u>(1)., 29.

Danilov, V.J. (1991). Proferring presidents (curators of presidential museums and libraries must balance the desires of ex-presidents with the history of the nation). <u>Museum News, 70</u> (1)., 58-60.

Davison, Kenneth. (1991). Presidential libraries. <u>Hayes Historical Journal, 10</u> (2)., 8-11.

Edwards, George C. III, & Wayne, Stephen J.(Eds.). (1983). <u>Studying the presidency</u>. Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press.

Exec. Order No. 12958, 3 C.F.R. 333 (1995).

Fat hits fire on financing Clinton Library: Little Rock resists rise in 'Hamburger Tax' to buy land for memorial. (1997, December 17). The Washington Post, p. A4.

Fischer, Linda. (1991). The role and function of presidential libraries. (CIDS 1991 Fischer). Washington: National Archives.

Fletcher, Sherrie M. (1990). The impact of the computer on the Ronald Reagan Presidential Materials staff. Washington, DC: National Archives and Records Administration.

Foley, Thomas J. (1983, May 2). The 'imperial' life of our former presidents. U.S. News and World Report, 94, 23-24.

Forbes, Malcolm S., Jr. (1993). Enhancing our heritage. Forbes, 152, (4)., 26.

Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), 5 U.S.C. § 552 (1974).

Freedom of Information Reform Act, 5 U.S.C. §§ 552, 552 notes (1986).

Freeman, J. Leiper. (1955). The political process: Executive-bureau-legislative committee relations. Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company.

Freidel, Frank. (1989, Summer). Roosevelt to Reagan: The birth and growth of presidential libraries. Prologue, 21, 103-113.

Fritschler, A. Lee. (1975). Smoking and politics. (2nd ed.). New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Goodsell, Charles. (1983). The case for bureaucracy. Chatham, NJ: Chatham House.

Government Performance and Results Act of 1993, 5 U.S.C. § 306; 31 §§ 1101 note, 1105, 1115, 1115 note, 1116 to 1119, 9703, 9704; 39 §§ 2801 to 2805 (1993).

Griffith, E.S. (1939). The impass of democracy. New York: Harrison Hilton Books, Inc.

Hamby, Alonzo L. (1992). Do presidential libraries facilitate or hinder the study of politics? Chronicle of Higher Education, 39, (2)., B3-B4.

Harris, John F. (February 13,1997) Clinton picks Little Rock for his library. Washington Post, p. A23.

Historians agree: Clinton Library must include Starr info. (October 15, 1998) Library Journal, 123, (17), 11.

Honan, William H. (1997). *11 ridiculed but rewarding institutions.* www.nytimes.com/1997/November/7/news/washpol/presidential-libraries.html

Horn, Miriam. (1991, November 11). All the truth that's fit to tint. U.S. News and World Report, 111, 36-38.

Horrocks, David A. (1994). Access and accessibility at the Gerald R. Ford Library. Government Information Quarterly, 11, (1), 47-65.

Huxtable, Ada Louise. (1971). A success as architecture and as monument. American Libraries, 2, (7), 669-671.

Hyland, Pat. (1995). Presidential libraries and museums: An illustrated guide. Washington, DC: Congressional Quarterly Inc.

The 'imperial' life of our former presidents: When Uncle Sam turns librarian. (1983, May 2) U.S. News and World Report, 94, 24.

Jaschik, Scott. (1990). Long a mainstay for studies on American politics presidential libraries draw praise, complaints. Chronicle of Higher Education, 37, (2), A4.

Jenkins-Smith, Hank C., St. Clair, Gilbert K., & Woods, Brian. (1991). Explaining change in policy subsystems: Analysis of coalition stability and defection over time. American Journal of Political Science, 35, (4)., 851-80.

Johnson, William (1990) The Kennedy Library does not seek to restrict research. Chronicle of Higher Education, 37(4), B3.

Jones, H.G. (1975). Presidential libraries: Is there a case for a national presidential library? American Archivist, 38, 325-328.

Kamath, P.M. (1994). Presidential libraries of the United States. Herald of Library Science, 33, 3-4, 200-204.

Kelman, Steven. (1987). Making public policy: A hopeful view of American government. New York: Basic Books.

Kirkendall, Richard S. (1962). Presidential libraries: One researcher's point of view. American Archivist, 25, 441-448.

Kirkendall, Richard S. (1966). A second look at presidential libraries. American Archivist, 29, 371-386.

Kochmann, Rachel M. (1993). Presidents: A pictorial guide to the presidents birthplaces, homes, and burial sites. Detroit Lakes, MN: Midwest Printing.

Kumar, Martha Joynt. (1986). The Presidential Libraries Act of 1986. Presidential Studies Quarterly, 16, (3), 614-19.

Kumar, Martha Joynt. (1983). Presidential libraries: Gold mine, booby trap, or both? in Edwards, George C. III & Wayne, Stephen J., (Eds). Studying the presidency (pp.199-224). Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press.

Lardner, George Jr. (1993, March 13). Eleventh-hour covenant: Lost memory computes to gain for Bush. The Washington Post, p. A12.

Lee, Chang C. (1991). American presidential libraries: A model for establishing presidential libraries in the Republic of China. Journal of Library and Information Science (USA/Taiwan)17, (2), 36-51.

Linde, Janet R. (1986). The role of educational programs in presidential libraries (CIDS 1986 Linde). Washington: National Archives.

Little Rock site chosen for Clinton Library. (1997, November 9). The Washington Post, p. A22.

Lloyd, David D. (1955). The Harry S. Truman Library. American Archivist 18, (2), pp. 99-110.

Maass, Arthur. (1951). Muddy waters: The Army engineers and the nation's rivers. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

McCoy, Donald R. (1976). How an 'it' became FDR's 'library'…And launched the Office of Presidential Libraries in the National Archives. American Libraries 7, (3), 154-155.

Miles, Matthew B. & Huberman, A. Michael. (1994). Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Milward, H. Brinton & Wamsley, Gary L. (1984). Policy subsystems, networks and the tools of public management. In Eyestone, Robert (Ed.), Public policy formation and implementation (pp. 3-25). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Morris, Edmund. (1998, February 16). A celebration of Reagan: What the presidential library reveals about the man. The New Yorker, 74, (6), 50-57.

O'Neill, James E. (1973). Will success spoil the presidential libraries? American Archivist, 36, 339-351.

Online NewsHour: Presidential Libraries (1997, November 6). [WWW document]. URL http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/white_house/july-dec97/library_11-6.html

O'Sullivan, Elizabethann & Rassel, Gary R. (1989). Research methods for public administrators. New York: Longman.

Packer, Barbara. (n.d./1997) "Cooperation and Innovation: Education at the New Gerald R. Ford Museum" [WWW document]. URL http://www.lbjlib.utexas.edu/ford/museum/educatio.htm).

Polenberg, Richard. (1971). The Roosevelt library case: A review article. American Archivist, 34, 277-284.

Presidential Libraries Act, 44 U.S.C. §§ 210, 2107 to 2118  (1955 and 1968).

Presidential Libraries Act of 1986, 44 U.S.C. §§ 101 note, 2101, 2112, 2112 note (1986).

Presidential Recordings and Materials Preservation Act, 44 U.S.C. § 2107 note, 3315 to 3324 (1974 and 1984).

Presidential Records Act of 1978, 44 U.S.C. §§ 2201-2207 (1978).

Pressley Sue Ann. (1997, November 6). The collected George Bush, man & leader: Presidential library to be dedicated today. The Washington Post, p. C1.

Redford, Emmette S. (1969). Democracy in the administrative state. New York: Oxford University Press.

Relyea, Harold C. (1995). CRS report for Congress: Federal presidential libraries. Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress.

Rohr, John A. (1986). To run a Constitution: The legitimacy of the administrative state. Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Press.

Rosenblatt, Roger. (1997, December 1). Underbooked: Our empty presidential libraries. New Republic, 217 (22), 16-17.

Rowland, Buford. (1950). The papers of the presidents. American Archivist, 13, 195-211.

Schick, Frank L. (1989). Records of the presidency: Presidential papers and libraries from Washington to Reagan. Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.

Schrag, P.G. (1994). Working papers as federal records: The need for new legislation to preserve the history of national policy. Administrative Law Review, 46, 95-140.

Smith, Richard Norton. (1989, Summer). A presidential revival: How the Hoover Library overcame a mid-life crisis. Prologue, 21, 115-123.

Smith, Thomas A. (1991). Creation of the nation's first presidential library and museum: A study in cooperation. Hayes Historical Journal, 10 (2), 12-30.

Sommer, Barbara & Sommer, Robert. (1991). A practical guide to behavioral research: Tools and techniques. New York: Oxford University Press.

St. Lifer, Evan & Rogers, Michael. (1993, March 15). Conduct of U.S. Archivist under scrutiny in Bush deal. Library Journal, 118(5): 14-15.

Stein, Robert M. & Bickers, Kenneth N. (1995). Perpetuating the pork barrel: Policy subsystems and American democracy. New York: Cambridge University Press.

U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Appropriations. (1997, March 18). Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government appropriations for fiscal year 1998. [WWW document]. URL http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/getdoc.cgi?dbname=1998-happ-tre-1&docid=f:40569.dat.

U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Appropriations. (1998, March 24). Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government appropriations for fiscal year 1999. [WWW document]. URL http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/getdoc.cgi?dbname=1999-happ-tre-1&docid=f:48677.dat.

U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Government Operations. (1985a, March 26).  Hearing on H.R. 1349 to reduce the costs of operating  presidential libraries, and for other purposes. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Government Operations. (1984, June 21). Preservation and management of presidential records. House Report 98-856.  Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office,  22 pages.

U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Government Operations. (1985b, March 26). Presidential libraries funding proposal. H.R. 1349. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 14 p.

U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Government Operations. (1982). Presidential libraries: Unexplored funding alternatives. House Report 97-732. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Government Operations. (1978). Presidential Records Act of 1978: hearings before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, House of Representatives, 95th Congress, 2nd session, on H.R. 10998 and related bills….. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Government Operations. (1985c, May 15). Reduction of costs of presidential libraries. House Report 99-125. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 23 p.

U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Government Operations. (1955, June 13). To provide for the acceptance and maintenance of presidential libraries, and for other purposes. Hearings before a Special Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations on House Joint Resolution 330, House Joint Resolution 331, and House Joint Resolution 332, Bills to Provide for the Acceptance and Maintenance of Presidential Libraries, and for other purposes. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Congress. Senate. Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government, Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Civil Service and General Services, Committee on Governmental Affairs. (1979, November 6). Oversight-cost of former presidents. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 297 p.

U.S. General Services Administration, Office of Plans, Programs, and Financial Management and the Office of Planning and Analysis. (1980) Presidential library study, May 16, 1980. In U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Government Affairs, Benefits to former presidents: Hearings before a Subcommittee of the Committee, 97th Congress, 2nd session, 1982, 81-139.

U.S. National Archives and Records Administration. (1998, November). Annual Performance Plan, Revised Final Plan. [WWW document]. URL http://www.nara.gov/nara/vision/f99pplan.html

U.S. National Archives and Records Administration. (1997, September 30). Ready Access to Essential Evidence: The Strategic Plan of the National Archives and Records Administration 1997-2007. [WWW document]. URL http://www.nara.gov/nara/vision/naraplan.html

U.S. National Archives and Records Administration. Office of Presidential Libraries. (1995). Office of Presidential Libraries briefing book FY 1995. Washington, DC: Office of Presidential Libraries.

U.S. National Archives and Records Administration. Office of Presidential Libraries. (1992, September). Presidential library program statement. 106 p., plus appendices.

U.S. National Archives and Records Administration. Office of Presidential Libraries and Space and Security Management Division-Office of Administrative Services. (1997, December 19). Architectural and design standards for presidential libraries: NARA internal review draft. [Washington, DC: NARA].

U.S. National Archives and Records Administration. (1985, April 15). Presidential libraries manual. Washington, DC: NARA.

Veit, Fritz. (1987). Presidential libraries and collections. New York: Greenwood Press.

Verhovek, Sam Howe. (1997). Five Years After Finishing Second, the 41st President is No. 1. www.nytimes.com/1997/November/7/news/washpol/bush-library.html.

Wamsley, Gary L. (1983). Policy subsystems as a unit of analysis in implementation studies: A struggle for theoretical syntehsis. In Henf, Kenneth & Toones, Theo A.J. Policy implementation in federal and unitary systems. Boston: Martinus Nyhoff Publishers.

Wamsley, Gary L. (1996). A public philosophy and ontological disclosure as the basis for normatively grounded theorizing in public administration. In Wamsley, Gary L. & Wolf, James F. Refounding democratic public administration: Modern paradoxes, postmodern challenges. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Wamsley, Gary L. & Schroeder, Aaron D. (1996). Escalating in a quagmire: The changing dynamics of the emergency management policy subsystem. Public Administration Review, 56, (3), 235-244.

Wamsley, Gary L. & Zald, Mayer N. (1976). The political economy of public organizations. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Warner, Robert M. (1978). The prologue is past. American Archivist, 41, (1), 5-15.

White, Jay D. & Adams, Guy B. (Eds.). (1994). Research in public administration: Reflections on theory and practice. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Wildavsky, Aaron. (1988). The new politics of the budgetary process. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman and Company.

Wilson, Don W. (1989, Summer). Presidential libraries. Prologue, 21, 100-101.

Wilson, Don W. (1991).  Presidential libraries: Developing to maturity. <u>Presidential Studies Quarterly, 21,</u> (4), 771-779.

Wolff, Cynthia J. (1989). Necessary monuments: The making of the Presidential Library System. <u>Government Publications Review, 16</u> (1), 47-62.

Yin, Robert K. (1994). <u>Case study research: Design and methods.</u> Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Zobrist, Benedict. (1983). <u>Whistle Stop: Harry S. Truman Library Institute Newsletter</u>.

# Appendix A: Descriptions of the Seven Other Libraries

The format for the following brief summaries of information (in chronological order by the presidents' terms of office) about the presidential libraries not highlighted as individual case studies will be: introduction, overall vital statistics, FY 1997 statistics and budget data, highlights of my interview with the library director, the status of the library today, information on the library's foundation, and a few remarks about the library's likely future prospects.

## *Hoover Library*

Sometimes described as an "afterthought," the Herbert Hoover Library was dedicated on the president's 88th birthday, August 10, 1962, at his West Branch, Iowa, birthplace. The afterthought appellation arose because Hoover's library opened after those of his successors, Franklin Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower. The story of Hoover's archival papers began in 1919, when after many years of public service, but before his presidency, Herbert Hoover established the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace at his alma mater, Stanford University in California. The Institution was established as an "international center of documentation and research on problems of political, social and economic change since the beginning of the twentieth century." (http://www-hoover.stanford.edu/LIBRARY/MOLLY_5.27/MOLLOY.HTM) When Hoover left the White House in 1933 after one term, his presidential papers and other archival materials were deposited at the Hoover Institution.

As we know, the Presidential Library System was subsequently established by Hoover's successor, Franklin D. Roosevelt. According to NARA sources, the Hoover Library in West Bend would not exist today if President Hoover had not developed conflicts with the president of Stanford. When these conflicts arose, the former president decided to endorse the concept of a Hoover presidential library to adjoin his birthplace museum in Iowa. By 1935 the birthplace had been restored and opened to the public by Hoover's sons, with later help from the Herbert Hoover Birthplace Foundation, Inc. Eventually the birthplace was transferred to the National Park Service, and the library-museum became part of the Presidential Library System under NARA. While the library was still under construction, Hoover offered the United States government all of his papers from his public service career, excluding the "war and peace" documents he had already given to the Hoover Institution. The transfer was completed after his death in 1964 under the terms of his will. The library is very small, with holdings amounting to only 10% of those found at the Bush Library. The original 4,000 square foot facility has been expanded four times, with the most recent 11,000 square foot project completed in 1992. The total square footage today is 47,102, making the Hoover the smallest presidential library. A combination of public and private funds supported the renovations.

In FY 1997 the library hosted 75,146 museum visitors, down from the record of 104,483 visitors in 1989. Researcher visits on the other hand almost doubled between FY 1996 and FY 1997 to 912, which approaches the record number of 949 in FY 1976. Federal funding for the

library in FY 1997 was $1,364,000 for personnel (19 staff), travel, operations, and maintenance. Reflecting the library's size and age, it receives the least federal funding of any presidential library. The additional $30,000 to $40,000 provided each year by the Herbert Hoover Presidential Library Foundation is spent primarily on advertising and public relations activities, and amounts to less than 3% of the overall budget. The museum store and other revenue generating operations posted a loss of $15,000 in FY 1997 after expenses were deducted.

I interviewed current Hoover Library director Dr. Timothy Walch in December 1997. A career public historian and archivist, Walch previously worked for the Society of American Archivists and then in six different offices of NARA over 9 years before accepting the job in West Branch when John Fawcett offered him the opportunity to be the Hoover's sixth director. Walch believes the Hoover Library's particular contribution to the Presidential Library System lies in pioneering a path for the newer libraries to follow when they have finished processing and opening collections and their president's administration is long past. At the Hoover Library there are no new sources to offer the press, and the staff's work is less involved with Hoover himself than with the institution of the Presidency and American history in general.

The library has established itself as a key historical museum in Iowa, as illustrated in its quarterly and annual reports and plans submitted to NARA. Outreach efforts reflect a diverse and very active programming schedule, including tours and educational events for school children and cyber tours for those too far away to travel here. Non-governmental special collections are a particular draw at the Hoover Library, especially those of Rose Wilder Lane, a prominent journalist, who authored The Making of Herbert Hoover (1920) and edited the Economic Council Review of Books, 1945-50. Lane was the daughter of Laura Ingalls Wilder, well-known author of the "Little House" children's books, and her mother's papers and manuscripts constitute a series within the Lane collection. Since the Hoover Library is one of the presidential libraries that receives state funding, as well as federal and foundation money, it therefore requires federal, state, and local cooperation to fulfill its role in the region's quality of life. Walch sees it as part of his role to promote the idea that "We're from the federal government and we're here to help you."

Walch stated that relations with the Hoover family and the Herbert Hoover Presidential Library Association today are cordial and rather informal, but nevertheless powerful. He cultivates those relationships as a vital source of support, yet the two groups do not have a direct influence on his daily work. According to Richard Norton Smith, when he was director of the Hoover Library, the relationship between him and the foundation executive director was fine at first. The executive director was good friends with Pete Hoover, President Hoover's grandson. Over time, the executive director became concerned about the well-publicized success and the large number of projects Smith was engaged in. It finally came to a show-down, and the foundation board decided to appoint Smith to the executive director position, while he continued as library director.

According to Smith, the Hoover Library as the smallest of the libraries was often overlooked when he first went there as director. Smith saw the Hoover's challenges as very different from those of the newer libraries, which had to worry about processing loads of materials AND satisfying vast constituencies, all of whom expected to be at the head of the line. Since the Hoover Library covers an administration now 70 years in the past, and the collections

are largely processed and open to the public, one mission here is to collect collateral materials. For example, since Hoover himself had an interest in management and appointed more than 60 commissions, Smith wants those archival collections distributed from DC to the appropriate libraries. In his professional opinion, the papers of these commissions are just as legitimately "presidential" as the White House files. If they were moved to West Bend, they would get more attention than they do in DC, and they would enhance scholarship on the Hoover period.

### *Truman Library*

The Harry S. Truman Library was the first presidential library created under the 1955 Presidential Libraries Act, though the planning and construction phase for the library were well under way by the time the legislation was enacted. According to Truman's administrative assistant, George Elsey, the president was well aware of his role in institutionalizing the model initiated by Franklin Roosevelt almost 20 years before. When Elsey expressed some initial skepticism about having presidential libraries scattered throughout the country, President Truman quickly dismissed his concerns, and Elsey eventually became a strong supporter of the libraries. Until his retirement, he served on the Advisory Council on Presidential Libraries, which advises NARA on matters related to the entire Presidential Library System.

Elsey tells a wonderful story about being sent to Missouri to work on the site selection for the Truman Library. When Elsey got to the Truman family farm in Grandview to consult with the president's brother, Vivian, about the president's favored hillside site with a magnificant view of rolling fields, Vivian affirmed that building a library on the elevated site would be a waste of valuable farm land. He suggested a site about a quarter mile away, next to the railroad tracks. Fortunately, before the two brothers had to confront which site was preferable, the city of Independence came through with the offer of an ideal 16 acre park setting for the library only five blocks from President and Mrs. Truman's home on Delaware Street. This location was selected, and it later allowed Truman to spend his retirement years using the library as his office and acting as a teacher for many visiting school groups.

Dedicated July 6, 1957, the original library building cost of $1,750,000, paid for by the private Harry S. Truman Library Inc., which raised the money from more than 17,000 individuals and organizations nationwide. As soon as the library was complete, the corporation was disbanded, and the Truman Library Institute was established with the goal of fostering the library's growth and development as a national center for study and research. Additions to the library were completed in 1968 and 1980, bringing the current total square footage to 96,612. A multi-phase renovation program has been underway since the early 1990s. Projected costs for the renovations will be approximately $25 million, supported by $9.1 million in federal appropriations and $16.5 million from non-federal sources, primarily the Truman Library Institute.

The library has been undergoing a renaissance in the past three years. In 1995 Larry Hackman arrived as only the third director in the library's history. A Missouri native, Hackman brought with him a strong background in archival administration, as well as masters degrees in history and public administration. He had previously worked at NARA's National Historical

Publications and Records Commission, the John F. Kennedy Library, and as Assistant Commissioner of Education, State Archivist of New York, and Executive Officer of the New York State Archives Partnership Trust (the last three were simultaneous appointments). Hackman introduced numerous innovations at the Truman Library, including the first significant locally initiated strategic planning process in a presidential library, peer review of the library's archival and educational programs by outside consultants, a marketing study, implementation of the long-sought renovation project, revitalization of the Truman Library Institute and its capital campaign in his role as Secretary (i.e., the de facto Executive Director), establishment of a significant training and development agenda for the staff, fostering the move toward new information technologies, and in general building a better institutional infrastructure to support the short and long-term health of a fully "mature" presidential library.

In 1997 the library celebrated its 40th anniversary with a heightened level of publicity, an increase in public awareness generated by the celebrations, and by the publication of several new biographies of Truman. The celebration year (FY97) statistics for the library include 158,762 museum visitors and 2,153 researcher daily visits. While the museum visitorship increased by 40,000 from the previous year, the total is still less than half the numbers generated in the 1970s and 80s. The researcher visits have increased slowly, but fairly steadily, over the past 15 years, probably at least in part because this library enjoys among historians one of the best reputations of any presidential library. Federal funding for the library in FY 1997 was $1,747,000 for personnel (23 full-time and 14 part-time and intermittent staff), travel, operations, and maintenance. Approximately 50% of the staff are funded by the library's revenue generating operations. The library's net income after expenses was $165,640.00 in FY 1997. Unlike some other presidential library foundations, which have multiple missions and constituencies, the Truman Library Institute devotes itself exclusively to supporting the library, providing significant financial resources, especially through the funding of the positions that support public relations, fund-raising, and educational programs.

I interviewed Hackman in December 1997 and found his comments particularly insightful and penetrating about both the Truman Library and the Presidential Library System as a whole. Hackman's previous experience inside NARA and in New York State have allowed him to bring a new perspective to the Truman Library, which had become somewhat isolated over the years, with a long-term staff who had not had many opportunities to venture far beyond Independence. He sent me the best documentation of any library. Particularly helpful were the quarterly, two-page "Harry S. Truman Library Director's Briefings," designed for the Institute board, library staff and volunteers, other presidential library directors, and other interested parties. They are concise, but surprisingly detailed, reports of progress at the library. If it had not been for the November 1997 briefing, I might have missed the fact that the library moved its World Wide Web page from a University of North Carolina host to the LBJ Library host at the University of Texas. I had missed this change because, as of June, 1998 the NARA home page still pointed users to the previous Truman web page host at UNC. (This is another instance of NARA's continuing web lapses.) Consultants' reports, fact sheets for the library and the Institute, and strategic planning documents, along with the usual reports filed with NARA, combine to provide a rich picture of how the Truman Library functions, what its plans are, and how it proposes to achieve its goals.

Along with the revised web site, "Whistle Stop," the Institute's 25-year-old newsletter, is a lively quarterly with color photos and effective informational and promotional articles about the library's various activities.


*Eisenhower Library*

Seeds of what was to become today's Dwight D. Eisenhower Library (often referred to as the Eisenhower Center) were sown early in 1945, months before the end of World War II. Friends and admirers of then-General Eisenhower met to plan the construction of a museum in his hometown of Abilene, Kansas. The group's desire was to feature the General's souvenirs and those of his fellow war veterans, provide a meeting place for veterans, and display a series of murals in the museum lobby. When General Eisenhower's mother died in September 1946, the family home was deeded to the Eisenhower Foundation by the General and his brothers. The Foundation opened the home to the public in June 1947, and the new museum opened in 1954, the same year President Eisenhower signed the Presidential Libraries Act into law. Shortly thereafter, Kansas set up a state Presidential Library Commission to acquire property and raise funds for building the Eisenhower Library adjacent to the museum and home. The state also provided a  grant of $275,000 to support the effort and gave the commission the right of eminent domain for acquiring property. The new library was dedicated and deeded to the federal government May 1, 1962. By early 1966 the Eisenhower Foundation had turned the family home, the museum, and 22.5 acres of property over the federal government as well. The president's papers started arriving in 1961 and the last installment arrived after his death in 1969.

Unique among presidential libraries is the fact that the Eisenhower family home on its original site is owned and operated by the National Archives, along with separate facilities for the museum, the library, the visitors center, and the place of meditation where President and Mrs. Eisenhower are buried. The National Park Service is not involved in the Eisenhower memorials in Abilene. After an addition to the museum in 1971 and the construction of the visitors center in 1975, the total square footage for all five buildings stands at 109,254. Overall, it cost less than $7 million to build the entire compound here.

The Eisenhower Library is now planning an expansion program, which was initiated by NARA with approval of the GSA Administrator and approved by Congress through the prospectus system, but no appropriation has been made. The foundation is currently raising $3 million for the renovations/expansion project. Counting on the precedent set from the beginning of the Eisenhower Center, the library is also requesting that the state legislature contribute to the fund drive.

In FY 1997 the library hosted 88,914 museum visitors, up almost 20,000 from the previous year, but still less than one-third the number who came in bicentennial 1976 (the highest attendance year for almost all of the presidential libraries). Researcher daily visits equaled 1,373, up slightly from the previous year, but still below the 1,522 such visits in 1994. Federal funding for the library in FY 1997 was $2,230,000 for personnel (approximately 49 staff for the five facilities), travel, operations, and maintenance. The Eisenhower Foundation contributes another

$30,000 to $40,000 per year for funding all public programs. The foundation also funds research grants for scholars and projects such as the indexing for the newly published book on Eisenhower's pre-World War II diaries edited by Library Director Dan Holt. The museum store and other revenue generating operations posted a net loss of $696 in FY 1997 after expenses were deducted.

I interviewed current Eisenhower Library Director Holt in December 1997.  A native Kansan with bachelors and masters degrees in history, Holt came to the Eisenhower Library in 1990 bringing an excellent publication record as well as deep experience in archives, museums, and historical agency administration. He had previously worked at the Kansas State Historical Society, the General Mark Clark Collection at The Citadel in South Carolina, the Illinois State Historical Society, the Liberty Memorial Museum and Archives in Kansas City, and the National Frontier Trails Center in Independence, Missouri. Holt is obviously proud of the contribution the Eisenhower Library and the town of Abilene make in supporting both researchers and museum visitors by illustrating the role the locational context played in the life of Eisenhower and many of his contemporaries.

Both constituencies enjoy coming to Abilene, which is a major tourist town for Kansas, with eleven museums, a restored carousel, an excursion train, and a Russell Stover candy factory outlet, in addition to the Eisenhower Center. Unique among presidential library foundations, the Eisenhower Foundation sponsors a host committee to welcome researchers by offering transportation, dinner in local homes, and other support. Researchers tend to stay in local bed and breakfasts and form sometimes lasting friendships with local citizens.

Holt expressed concern that future presidential libraries will lose this sense of context, and researchers may become more lax about traveling to the sites as more and more information becomes available online. In his view, the web gives the power of deciding what is available to those who decide what goes online. He illustrated this conundrum of selectivity vs. conprehensiveness by citing the Johns Hopkins University 25-year project of publishing Ike's papers, which is only now beginning his second term as president (and even at that they are only publishing 20% of the available papers). Clearly, he would rather have researchers come to a presidential library and peruse the entire collections, rather than depend on publications that select only a small proportion of the available materials.

The Eisenhower Library today is a complex organization with five distinct facilities, which it must manage with a very small staff, a minimal federal funding base, and a foundation that has only begun to revitalize itself over the past eight years or so. Major fund-raising is underway for a renovation project. Declassification is a major push for the Eisenhower archives because of the large volume of classified materials associated with World War II and the Cold War and because of the need to comply with E.O. 12958. Director Holt is the key decision-maker at the library, and he is in constant contact with NARA headquarters, i.e., four to five e-mails daily. Discussions revolve around exhibit planning, facilities management, computer and public relations issues, and personnel matters. External relations are also vital, especially working with the Eisenhower Foundation on fund-raising efforts.

The Eisenhower Foundation is currently lead by its President, Stewart R. Etherington, and a board of trustees which includes Senator Nancy Kassebaum Baker (R-KS), former Senator Bob Dole (R-KS), and Honorary Chairman, John S.D. Eisenhower. Over the years the foundation has provided almost $4 million to support construction of facilities, public programs and commemorations, travel grants for researchers, and a newsletter. The members of the Eisenhower family, including the president's son, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren are involved with and very helpful to the foundation and the library, but they do not try to exercise control of the institution's operations. Nevertheless, the foundation has no full-time staff, only a part-time bookkeeper. The members are proud of their work for the foundation, but there needs to be more of a national membership in order to raise the necessary funds for the renovation project. There was no friends group here until 1990, and there is no large base of membership. Net income for the foundation in FY 1996 was approximately $75,000 and net worth stands at about $500,000. These are relatively modest amounts, given the responsibilities of the foundation.

The Eisenhower Library's future is secure because of its status as a major cultural institution for the state of Kansas and the region. It is well-managed and productive in meeting its multiple and complex missions. Nevertheless, the financial resources required if the institution is to thrive rest on the financial health of the foundation and at least some state support, which precedent indicates there is every reason to believe will be forthcoming.

### Kennedy Library

The John Fitzgerald Kennedy Library was dedicated in October 1979 after one of the most contentious and difficult births of any presidential library. Within nine months of taking office, President Kennedy contacted the National Archives about establishing his presidential library at his alma mater, Harvard University in Cambridge, Massachusetts. Preliminary negotiations for a site were under way when Kennedy was assassinated in November 1963. Less than a month after the president's death, a non-profit corporation under the chairmanship of Robert F. Kennedy was chartered in Massachusetts to construct and equip a library for the papers and historical collections of Kennedy and his associates. The president's family and prominent individuals identified with the Kennedy presidency composed the principals of the corporation, including Stephen Smith, Robert McNamara, Douglas Dillon, and Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr. By early 1965 the trustees of President Kennedy's estate deeded his papers and historical materials to the United States, which were housed in temporary quarters in Waltham, Massachusetts. By late 1969 the first records were opened for research.

No one anticipated then that it would take another 10 years before the library would become a reality. Although the corporation had successfully raised the funds to build the library, originally conceived to be small in size and an integral part of the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard, negotiations with the university and the city of Cambridge broke down over local concerns about increasing the already significant urban congestion around Harvard Square.

Eventually, with the consent of the state legislature, the University of Massachusetts-Boston offered the Kennedy Library a site at Columbia Point in Dorchester overlooking Boston Harbor.

The groundbreaking ceremony was held June 12, 1977. I.M. Pei Associates of New York had been selected by Jacqueline B. Kennedy to design the facility. The building is stunning - huge (134,293 square feet), white, and glass on the water side. The staff offices on the upper floors are cramped, but they have magnificent views of the harbor and the city skyline beyond. The most urban of the presidential libraries, the JFK is a major cultural institution in the northeast and prides itself on having perhaps the richest educational program offerings of any presidential library. The relationship between the library and UMass-Boston is cordial, but rather insignificant, amounting only to occasional co-sponsorship of conferences or the university's use of the library's facilities for meetings.

In FY 1997 the library hosted 216,668 visitors, a healthy number. In that year it was second only to the Johnson Library, which offers free admission. Nevertheless, this figure is less than half the record attendance of the library's initial year in 1980. Researcher visits were 1,772, well below the averages for the 15 years from 1980 to 1995.

Federal funding for the library in FY 1997 was by far the highest of any presidential library at $3,287,000 for personnel (approximately 45 full and part-time federal employees), travel, operations, and maintenance. Since at least 1985 controversy has surrounded Congress's repeated special appropriations to the Kennedy Library of a total of $17.3 million in "no year funds" under the sponsorship of Senator Edward M. Kennedy (D-MA). These funds were provided for building a 20,000 square foot addition to the library, for a boat dock, and for renovations and improvements. As of FY 1997 all but $14,000 of the special appropriations had been obligated. These financial maneuvers are unprecedented in the Presidential Library System, and they have created some tension between NARA, the other libraries, and the JFK Library. Obviously, NARA prefers to decide the special funding priorities on a system-wide basis, and the libraries usually have to "wait their turns" to get federal support for renovations or additions.

My interviews have revealed at least one other occasion in recent years when a library's foundation president, who happened to be a former member of Congress, went to Capitol Hill seeking funds for a renovation project. This caused serious dismay at NARA and fences are still being mended almost a decade later. Even though the federal budget provides only baseline funding for each presidential library, the necessity of working with NARA to maintain these funds and to get special appropriations for additions and renovations is obvious. The individual libraries and/or their foundation supporters go around this structure at some risk, unless they have such deep and extensive private networks that they can afford to ignore the usual protocols. This appears to have been the case at the Kennedy Library. Perhaps we should call it a policy submarine system.

In FY 1997 the library had adjusted gross sales of almost $2.1 million, but its expenses for the museum store, reproduction services, and admissions activities amounted to over $2.3 million, for an adjusted net loss of $177,283.00 for the year.

The financial relationships between the library and the John F. Kennedy Library Foundation are intertwined and complex. The foundation's executive director is former JFK Library director Charles U. Daly, who retired from federal service to take the job. The foundation, now under the chairmanship of Caroline Kennedy and with numerous other Kennedy family and friends as

participants, was revitalized in the mid-1980s after a very quiet period. After some years in downtown Boston, the foundation is now housed at the library, along with its approximately 50 staff, some of whom report to library personnel, such as Director of Education John Stewart. Other foundation staff perform functions for both entities, such as the Director of Communications, who handles public relations and marketing for both. Library staff participate in the foundation's budgeting process, which focuses its extensive resources on support for the non-federal programs of education and outreach. It is clear that the John F. Kennedy Library Foundation is powerful and effective in supporting the library. The foundation devotes its entire efforts to supporting this institution and is able to draw on the large and exceptionally well connected Kennedy family for financial and in-kind backing.

In July 1997 I visited the Kennedy Library and interviewed Library Director Bradley Gerratt, Chief Archivist Will Johnson, Director of Education John Stewart, and Audio-visual Archivist Allen Goodrich. Gerratt served under Daly as Deputy Director for six years before becoming director in 1994. A career bureaucrat and native of Massachusetts, Gerratt has masters degrees in business and social service administration from the University of Chicago. His work history before coming to the library is unusual among presidential library directors, who tend to be public historians. Gerratt helped establish the Massachusetts Department of Social Services, then served as financial officer for first the Boston Neighborhood Development and Employment Agency and then the city's Public Facilities Department. He clearly relishes his role as leader of a major museum but appears to leave the archival policies and functions up to the archivists.

Many of the staff, such as Stewart and Johnson, have been with the JFK Library all or most of their long careers. They take pride in surviving the frequent controversies surrounding the library. Stewart worked with the first director, Dan Finn, to establish the education department as a key component of the library, and with the encouragement of the foundation and the Kennedy family that remains a cornerstone of the operations. Stewart was quick to point out, however, that the family does not exert any pressure on him or the library regarding what they offer or how it is done. He works autonomously with the library director to plan the programs for each year based on their potential popularity and significant anniversaries. Stewart believes that the presidential libraries would be better off if they were part of the Smithsonian Institution, rather than NARA, which tends to place all its emphasis on archives and the handling of papers. Stewart sees the papers as only one small part of what the libraries should be doing, and he clearly believes the outreach, educational, and museum functions should be federally supported, along with the archival operations. Nevertheless, he has done a masterful job of using the rather generous foundation funds and staff available to him in creating a massive educational program. He also pointed out that Congress over the past 30 to 40 years has set up and funded endowments for institutes based loosely on the presidential library model and named them after its own members, such as Carl Albert, Everett Dierksen, and Claude Pepper. Stewart's views about federal support for museum, education and outreach programs echo those of several other staff I talked with throughout the system, but all of them seemed oblivious to the fact that their own salaries are paid by the federal government, no small investment on the government's part (especially at the GS 15 level Stewart has risen to).

The extent of the Kennedy Library's commitment to educational programming has sometimes been a sore point between the library and NARA. In a 1986 paper written for an internal audience, Janet R. Linde of the Office of Presidential Libraries expressed the archivists' point of view that "educational programs divert scarce resources from more traditional archival programs" (Linde, 1986, p. 1). Her primary example of such a case was the Kennedy Library "where the enthusiasm of the support group, the administrative perception of the library's mission, and the interest and proximity of a large and diverse public have combined to greatly expand the library's educational programs. The John F. Kennedy Library Foundation is a group which has felt a strong sense of mission to make the Library a place to carry on the active idealism of the Kennedy administration" (Linde, 1986, p. 14). She went on to claim that the library was overextended in its educational programs, that the administrators were reluctant to oppose ideas proposed by the foundation or other members of their perceived constituency, and that archival operations were accordingly suffering. Linde concluded by asserting, "Given the scarcity of resources available for the support of presidential libraries, educational programs cannot be given the same priority as the basic archival and museum programs…[and] control over the libraries' programs must be kept in the hands of library administrators" (Linde, 1986, p. 23). Of course, this view of where presidential library priorities should lie supports the position of many researchers, who have been very critical of several libraries, the Kennedy in particular. Although the sometimes open conflict expressed in this paper more than a decade ago seems to have subsided somewhat, the basic tension remains, and the Kennedy Library continues to be a lightning rod for such conflict.

Chief Archivist Will Johnson came to the JFK Library direct from the NARA intern program, which he entered after getting a masters degree in history. He heads a staff of 12, who serve diverse researchers by providing access to a complex collection of manuscripts and documents, many of which are subject to donor restrictions. Johnson provided a detailed description of the different types of documents the library houses, including "closed" documents, which have been deeded to the library, but restricted by the donor. Some of these are still unprocessed. Some documents are here "on deposit," but not deeded to the library. Very few items came to this library as official government documents, because the Kennedy administration preceded the Presidential Records Act, and therefore, most of the documents here were private property.

Congress's 1992 President John F. Kennedy Assassination Records Act (ARA), PL 102-526 and 1994 revisions PL103-345 have put the JFK Library archival staff in an awkward position. The act grew out of public concern that information about the assassination was being withheld. This perception has been fostered by several celebrity cases, including the Oliver Stone film about the assassination and, much earlier, the interviews that author William Manchester conducted in 1964, just after the Kennedy assassination. Manchester used those interviews in his subsequent books about Kennedy. Those interviews are restricted by a New York Court Order and closed until 2067. Nevertheless, the ARA demands that all government records concerning the assassination be housed in a single collection in NARA and opened as soon as possible, in every case by 2017. In summarizing a very complex situation, Will Johnson said it is legally very awkward for the archivists, who are federal employees and must, of course, comply fully with the law, yet their profession's basic ethical principle is that the donor's wishes must be honored above

all else. For complete information on the Assassination Records Review Board and the ARA see http://www.redacted.com/arrb.txt.

Of all the libraries, the Kennedy Library seems to generate the highest level of hostility from the researcher community. Charges of favoritism in access to collections and even deliberate withholding of documentary evidence continue to swirl around this library almost 20 years after its opening. From my own observations these controversies arise from the unique nature of the Kennedy administration and the way it ended, the continuing political and financial power of the Kennedy family, and the way in which collections have come to be deposited at the library. Unfortunately, the plan of the current study does not permit further discussion of this fascinating topic here, for the Kennedy Library as an individual policy subsystem could easily constitute a full dissertation.

### Johnson Library

Early in 1965, within months of Lyndon Johnson's inauguration to his own term of office, the Chancellor of the University of Texas brought several university trustees to call on the president. They proposed that the LBJ Library be located on the Austin campus of the university. The university promised to provide the land, buildings, and equipment, to maintain and operate the archival depository as part of the National Archives, and to create the LBJ School of Public Affairs. In a unique arrangement for the Presidential Library System, title to the 14 acre site and the facilities was not transferred to the federal government, but was retained by the state and dedicated for use by the United States in perpetuity.

The state of Texas has turned out to be a generous and effective partner with NARA. For example, admission to the LBJ Library is underwritten and provided free to the public. Likewise, the renovation/expansion project undertaken at the library in the 1980s was entirely funded by the University of Texas. The LBJ Library was the first presidential library to have a direct relationship with a university. Today the value of that relationship is evident, especially through such cooperation as the symposium planning committee, the grants-in-aid faculty review committee for proposals (removing library staff from any charge of favoritism or conflict-of-interest), and the faculty committee which selects the D.B. Hardiman Prize winning book on Congress.

The library was dedicated May 22, 1971 and at 134,695 square feet was the largest in the system at the time. The size and grandeur of the library were the subject of some derision, and the complaints that it constituted the "pyramid on the Perdenales" and an "unabashed bid for immortality using the curious new hybrid, the presidential library-museum…" (Huxtable, 1971, p. 669) eventually led to the passage of the 1986 revisions to the Presidential Libraries Act. That legislation placed rather dramatic restrictions on the size of all libraries after Reagan's, and it required privately funded endowments to provide support for the libraries in perpetuity.

In FY 1997 the LBJ Library hosted 254,374 visitors, the highest of any presidential library, but less than one-third the record year of 1976, and in a declining mode which is inexplicable to administrators. Researcher daily visits for FY 1997 were 2,279, second only to such visits to the Nixon papers at NARA. The researcher visits have been holding steady for some years. Federal

funding for the library in FY 1997 was $2,762,000 for personnel, travel, and operations. This figure was second only to the JFK Library. Revenue generating operations are minimal at the LBJ Library because of its free admissions policy and the fact that the gift shop is a foundation operation. Overall the operations experienced a loss of $26.00 for FY 1997.

The critical element in the library's ability to fulfill its mission is the approximately $700,000 per year provided by the foundation. These funds are used for special exhibits, the speaker series, the annual symposium, publications, and training and supporting volunteers. In 1998 there has also been a special grant of about $200,000 for preservation of critical audio-visual materials on the verge of erosion. Presently, and for the next four years, foundation money is being used to support the declassification mandate required by E.O. 12958 and to open the remaining audio tapes recorded by the Johnson White House. Library Director Harry Middleton stated that foundation money is being used to support NARA missions, especially with regard to staffing and equipment. He is willing to have the foundation do that until these two goals are met, then he wants to see the foundation examine its continuing support for archival functions, which are a federal government obligation.

Michael Beschloss's 1997 book, which provides transcripts of the secret audio tapes LBJ had made during his White House years, was discussed in a segment of the "Diane Rehm Show" on National Public Radio January 1, 1998. Beschloss recounted how he learned about the tapes three years ago over dinner with Harry Middleton. Middleton mentioned the tapes and that some of them were going to be opened soon. Once the tapes were deposited at the library, Middleton worked with Lady Bird Johnson to get her permission to open the tapes, even though LBJ had reportedly instructed his aide Mildred Stegall, in whose possession the tapes originally resided, not to open them for 50 years! One impetus for the opening was the "Oliver Stone" law (the Assassination Records Act discussed above) requiring that closed records about the Kennedy assassination be opened for public scrutiny. Middleton and Mrs. Johnson knew that the LBJ tapes would be subject to litigation once they became known, so they decided to "jump before they were pushed." Beschloss played excerpts from the tapes on the show. They were priceless, especially the one where LBJ is asking Helen Gahagan Douglas to go to Liberia in three days time to represent the U.S. at a ceremonial event. LBJ had supposedly had an affair with Douglas when she served in Congress, and LBJ never forgave Nixon for his infamous treatment of her during the California U.S. Senate race in which he called her a communist. One can hear Mrs. Douglas calling out to "Melvin" (the famous movie star) to see whether he'd object to her going to Liberia. LBJ was cajoling her and said something like "Now Helen, come on and get your teddies ready."

Like the JFK Library, the Johnson Library has had prominent researcher critics over the years. The usual arguments are given--that access has been restricted, that favoritism has been practiced by the archivists (Beschloss being cited as an example), and that the library has been slow in opening collections. Nevertheless, from what I can observe and from the documentation available, the only materials suppressed were those under LBJ's deed-of-gift, and then only those that might be embarrassing to an individual and were therefore to be closed during the person's lifetime.

I conducted a telephone interview with Library Director Harry Middleton December 18, 1997. I was eager to hear from the man who is consistently referred to as the "dean" of presidential library directors. Middleton has a degree in journalism from Louisiana State University and practiced as a journalist for the Associated Press, Architecture Forum, and Time before joining the Johnson White House during the second half of LBJ's tenure. Middleton then went to Texas to work on the president's memoirs, and was eventually invited to become the second director of what was then the LBJ project. To his surprise, he has been there ever since. In his view, the LBJ Library was a pioneer in two areas: its emphasis on programming, especially the symposia; and the early presence of the LBJ Library Foundation.

Unlike other presidential libraries, the LBJ Library did not need private support to get the building constructed because the University of Texas undertook that. Nevertheless, the LBJ Foundation was established early on and has been quite vibrant from the beginning, with the president himself being heavily involved in the initial fund-raising. Middleton has always served simultaneously as library director and as executive director of the Lyndon B. Johnson Library Foundation. Middleton said it is second nature to him to perform both roles. He has excellent assistant directors in both organizations, and they run the day-to-day operations. He is obviously cognizant of the library's needs and can respond to those, but he also has to be even-handed in providing foundation support for the School of Public Affairs, which is also supported by the foundation.

When Middleton retires he will suggest to NL that future LBJ Library directors need not serve in both roles simultaneously because the two entities no longer need the kind of attention he could provide as one who was close to President and Mrs. Johnson. Also, the LBJ School should probably have more of an opportunity to have an executive director from their sphere of interest, perhaps the dean of that school.

According to Linda Fischer's 1991 internal paper written for NARA, the LBJ Foundation is "a model for active support of a library's functions" (Fischer, 1991, p. 12). It has no agenda of its own, it directly finances part of the library's daily operating costs, it allows for free admission to the museum, and it also provides support for the LBJ School of Public Affairs.


*Carter Library*

Planning began within the first month of Carter's inauguration for the Jimmy Carter Library to be built "somewhere in Georgia." After a thorough search process, approximately 30 acres of state-owned land close to downtown Atlanta was selected. Originally designated for construction of an interstate highway, the site and access to it turned out to be a major point of controversy between Carter Library planners and Atlantans. The major issue was the access highway, which critics said was unnecessary and would threaten several historic neighborhoods. One of the chief criticisms was that President Carter refused to foster the neighborhood interests he once espoused as Governor when opposing construction of the interstate highway originally proposed. Nevertheless, after lengthy negotiations and modifications in the original Carter Center plans, the program went forward.

Domestic and international friends of President Carter raised the $26 million needed to build the library and the adjacent Carter Center, which houses President and Mrs. Carter's offices, offices for the ongoing foundation supporting Carter's extensive program of philanthropic activities, and the Carter Center of Emory University. The library and museum were dedicated October 1, 1986. The library building (70,001 square feet) and the real estate forming its "footprint" were deeded to NARA. The library's parking area is controlled by a perpetual use agreement with Georgia and maintained by NARA. The rest of the complex is owned and maintained by the Carter Center.

In FY 1997 the library hosted 75,371 museum visitors, up slightly from FY 1996, but less than half the record attendance of 190,388 in 1987. Researcher visits were up slightly to 687 in FY 1997. Such visits have remained fairly steady since services began in 1987, with the highest attendance at 768 visits in 1992. Federal funding for the library in FY 1997 was $2,041,000 for personnel (approximately 26 full-time-equivalents), travel, operations, and maintenance. The museum store and other revenue-generating operations posted a net income of $138,178.00 in FY 1997 after expenses were deducted.

This library receives insignificant direct funding from its attendant foundation, The Carter Center, because President Carter's priorities lie with his other charitable endeavors. According to Carter Library Director, Don Schewe, if the library has a serious need that cannot be met with federal funds, he goes directly to President Carter and asks for help. For example, the President found support to renovate the film projection system and the new exhibit for the museum. This support is rare, however. Although the Carter Center is currently raising $300 million, these funds are not for the Carter Library. The Carter Center will be discussed in more detail below.

I conducted a telephone interview with Schewe December 18, 1997. Based on this interview, and my brief visit to the Carter Library in 1991 when Schewe gave me a tour of the facilities, I find him possessed of a satirical sense of humor. Schewe also gives the appearance of fitting the stereotypical image (accurate or not) of the career federal bureaucrat. After completing his Ph.D. studies on the Postal Savings Administration, Schewe completed the NARA training program and entered the Presidential Library System as Assistant Director at the FDR Library. When the Carter Library was being formed, he applied for the promotion to director status and has been there ever since.

In my interviews with Schewe and in the reports he files with NARA, one senses a certain tone of a status-quo approach and some frustration with the lack of foundation support that prevents this library from pursuing many projects or initiatives. Although everyone associated with this library supports the Carters' choices and priorities for the Carter Center, these choices do leave the library without the wherewithal to do much other than survive and keep the doors open. Schewe does not attempt any fundraising for the library because that would be seen as an infringement on the Carter Center, which is much more prominent in Atlanta than the library. The director also noted his view of the more positive side of President Carter's lack of interest in raising funds for the library specifically, which is that former presidents who raise lots of money for their libraries tend to have big egos and are prone to interfering with library operations. Carter does not do that.

Schewe also noted his frustration with the lack of press coverage for the library's activities. He cited the day Mrs. Carter and Eunice Kennedy came to the library with 400 handicapped children, but even that did not generate a photograph in the <u>Atlanta Journal and Constitution</u>. This is significantly different from his experience at the FDR Library, where the library is the leading "citizen" of Hyde Park. Despite the Carter Library's steady stream of international visitors, Schewe said there is no real community prominence at this library. In a similar vein, Jim Kratsas, now Exhibits Curator of the Gerald Ford Museum and formerly a curator at the Carter Library, said the Carters do not seem to be well liked in Atlanta. When Jim first moved to Atlanta and told his neighbors where he worked, they "went off." Jim took to telling people he worked for the National Archives. Both Schewe and Kratsas attribute this coolness toward the library to residual resentment over the controversy about the Carter Center's site and its access road.

Schewe described another unique aspect of the Carter Library as a condominium. President and Mrs. Carter are definitely active and hard-working people who frequently occupy their apartment in the Carter Center to oversee their vast network of charitable causes. Supported by the Carter Center, these causes include democratization and development (conflict resolution, global development, human rights, Latin American and the Caribbean), global health (agriculture, Guinea worm eradication, river blindness, interfaith health, Not Even One, and mental health), and urban revitalization (the Atlanta Project and the America Project). The impact of their presence on the library is felt via  unpredictable visits from the former president and other members of his family and via President Carter's renowned attention to details that require the director's immediate attention, especially the physical plant aspects of the library. Schewe gave an example of Mr. Carter popping in one day to find out whose job it is to keep all of the library's clocks synchronized. From then on, it became Schewe's job to be sure all the clocks coincide. On the other hand, the Carters show no interest in the visitorship numbers for the library, so there is less pressure on Schewe in this aspect of his work.

Schewe cited satisfying the researcher community as his biggest concern. He is well aware of the criticisms directed at presidential libraries by scholars over the years who have claimed that favoritism has been shown to particular scholars and in what collections get processed and opened first. Schewe says President Carter has never attempted to restrict access. In fact it is the opposite, with pressure being placed on Schewe to get the materials open faster.

Response to my request that the Carter Center send me its annual report and financial statements was met promptly and very efficiently. I received a personal response from the Carter Center Board chairman, several recent annual reports, program reports, and the 1996 auditors report.  The Carter Center, Inc. has a balanced budget and about $75 million in its endowment, with expenses in 1996 of almost $40 million.  Most significant for our purposes is that the Jimmy Carter Library and Museum are mentioned in the Carter Center documents only briefly, and then usually with just a note that it is owned and operated by NARA. The Carter Center annual report states that the center's donors support the annual operating budget of the library. Nevertheless, the library is not a line item in the displays of either revenues or expenses. The Carter Center is obviously a vibrant and well-funded foundation, but it does not play a significant role in support of the Jimmy Carter Library.

The Carter Library today, despite its presence in a major metropolitan area, has a low profile, and it is one of the least active libraries in terms of museum visitors (outranking only the Hoover Library in FY 1997) and researcher daily visits (ahead of only the Ford and Reagan Libraries). The outlook for increased support for outreach and educational programs is poor, given their non-existent priority with the Carter Center. Several times Schewe mentioned his retirement, which he anticipates before the year 2002. Depending on the demeanor of his successor and how long the Carters keep up their intense pace of international activities, the library's quiet and relative inactivity could change. Significant change will be most likely if the new director is more of a "museum" person than an "archives" person, and is interested in public relations and the establishment of a friends group for the library. Since the Carters will undoubtedly interview candidates, their personal impact will continue to have an influence for some years to come.

### *Bush Library*

On November 6, 1997, on the campus of Texas A&M University in College Station, the George Bush Library was dedicated before an audience of four former presidents, six first ladies, and thousands of Bush supporters, friends, and family. The museum opened to visitors that day, and the library opened for researchers January 20, 1998, five years to the day after Bush left office. That was the first day Bush's presidential records could be made available under federal law. Nevertheless, many of the records have not yet received archival processing and will remain unavailable to scholars for some years to come.

The George Bush Library totals 109,680 square feet, with 69,049 of it occupiable. Interestingly, the 69,000 figure keeps this library's size just under the total of 70,000 square feet allowed by the Presidential Libraries Act of 1986 without a substantial additional endowment above the required 20% of the cost of the land, construction and equipment for facilities under that limit. The library is part of the George Bush Presidential Library Center, which includes an academic building (classrooms, offices, etc.), the International Center, the Presidential Conference Center, the Presidential Library Foundation, and an office and apartment for President and Mrs. Bush. The related buildings are what enable the Bush Library to carry out all of its functions and yet stay under the 70,000 square feet size limit. Academic liaisons with the Texas A&M scholarly programs housed in the center include the George Bush School of Government and Public Service, the Center for Presidential Studies, and the Center for Public Leadership Studies. The liaisons should promote a steady stream of students and scholars, who will be able to mine the Bush Library collections for years to come and publish the results of their investigations. Likewise, the availability of more digitized materials here than at any previous presidential library should promote remote access to the information by scholars around the world via the world wide web. Total federal funding for the Bush Library in FY 1997 (its last year as a project before its opening at the very beginning of FY 1998) was $1,367,000 including operations and personnel.

Like the Johnson Library, the Bush Library benefits from having a huge university (third largest in the U.S.) eager to help fund the facility and host it in perpetuity, as well as the power, money, and influence of the Texas state government itself. Texas is the only state with two presidential libraries. Only about 100 miles separate them, and the rural road linking Austin and

College Station has been renamed "the Presidential Corridor" (Pressley, 1997, p. C1). President Bush's son, Texas Governor George W. Bush, participated in the dedication ceremony.

In describing the new library, columnist Sue Anne Pressley in The Washington Post said it "combines the most high-tech features of any presidential library to date—Compaq Computer Corp. donated $400,000 worth of computers—and big, old-fashioned visuals" (Pressley, 1997, p. C1). The documents and photographs in the library's collection cover Bush's entire public career, including his service as a United States Congressman, ambassador to the United Nations, chairman of the Republican National Committee, chief of the U.S. Liaison office in Beijing, director of the Central Intelligence Agency, vice president, and president.

Like many of its predecessors, the Bush Library has not been able to avoid controversy. Publications as diverse as The Washington Post and Library Journal (a professional news and book review journal for librarians) reported early in 1993 that former President Bush and Archivist of the U.S. Don W. Wilson had struck a suspect deal on January 19, 1993 during the waning hours of Bush's presidency to allow the then-president to take complete control of his White House computer files and back-up tapes, rather than transfer them intact along with his other presidential records to NARA. Under the Presidential Records Act (PRA), Bush's official records in print formats are public property and were required to be transferred to NARA when he left office. Computer files and tapes were not addressed in the 1978 PRA because the technology was in its infancy, and no one then anticipated the invention of ubiquitous electronic mail and other telecommunications innovations. Although paper file copies of the electronic documents were supposed to have been made, critics complained that the paper copies of e-mails would not provide a complete a picture of the correspondence, because they fail to track the dates, times, and proof of receipt that electronic mail exhibits. Similarly, paper files cannot be managed, manipulated, and retrieved in the same ways electronic documents can. The Wilson-Bush agreement of January 19 was signed despite U.S. District Judge Charles R. Richey's ruling of January 6, 1993 that the White House computer files met the statutory definition of records under the Federal Records Act. Judge Richey directed Wilson and the Bush White House not to delete or alter electronic records until archivists could process and preserve the material covered by the act.

This simmering conflict (a clear case of external polity against internal polity and economy) over the computer files exploded into the public press three weeks after Bush left office, when Texas A&M announced Don Wilson's appointment to head the foundation at the George Bush Presidential Library Center. Historians and archivists were outraged at what they saw as a clear case of Wilson's conflict-of-interest when he allowed President Bush to take control of the electronic records. The Society of American Archivists (SAA) passed a resolution expressing its disappointment with Wilson's leadership and criticizing NARA for failing to "ensure the preservation of federal records and for not providing leadership in the implementation of a federal information policy" (St. Lifer & Rogers, 1993, p. 14-15). The SAA also indirectly indicted Congress for failing to provide NARA with sufficient legislative authority to "cope with the changing nature of documentation," with adequate resources to carry out its mission, or with "effective communication mechanisms" (St. Lifer & Rogers, 1993, p. 15). Three senators

eventually asked the Attorney General's office to investigate the Wilson-Bush agreement. By the time the Bush Library opened in November, 1997, the controversy had died down, the disputed computer files had been preserved, and Don Wilson remained as head of the Bush Library foundation.

I interviewed George Bush Library Director David Alsobrook by telephone December 11, 1997. Alsobrook joined NARA in 1977 after completing a Ph.D. in History and archives administration at Auburn University. He became the Archives' liaison in the Carter White House in 1977, went to Atlanta with the Carter materials, rose to Supervisory Archivist there and stayed until 1991, when he accepted NARA's offer to conduct the Bush transition and go to Texas with the presidential materials. After his tenure as Acting Director of the George Bush Presidential Materials Project, Alsobrook was recommended for the directorship of the Bush Library by NARA. He interviewed with President Bush and received the appointment in April 1997. Clearly thrilled with the new library and the support he has received from President Bush and from the George Bush Presidential Library Foundation, Alsobrook noted that his long lead time with the Bush project before the library opened allowed him to hire the best people for each of his staff positions (approximately 29), including seven or eight who have previous presidential library experience. He appreciates the high level of autonomy his position allows. Alsobrook said he only needs to consult with the Office of Presidential Libraries when a problem arises that is new to him. Given the newness of his library, Alsobrook spends a great deal of his time with reporters and conducting public relations activities. When President Bush is in residence, the days are unpredictable. Although Alsobrook emphasized that President and Mrs. Bush do not try to "run things," they do maintain a close and effective relationship with him. Alsobrook was very complimentary of President Bush, and he described him as a very thoughtful person who "understands civil servants."

The Bush Library was fully paid for upon its dedication, and an endowment of $4.5 million came under NARA control at that time to insure ongoing private support for the facility. As the first presidential library to come under the requirements of the Presidential Libraries Act of 1986, this type of financial arrangement will be the model for future libraries. The initial fund-raising for this library was unprecedented, and it continues on behalf of the implementation of educational programs and the enhancement of facilities, such as the computer classroom.

Alsobrook is pleased that this library was able to build on the experience of its predecessors and incorporate "all of the things the others wanted" from the beginning. For example, the museum space here is basically a flexible "big black box" that can support a variety of exhibits and projects. The computer classroom and temporary exhibit space were innovations. All of the unclassified materials are housed next to the Research Room, so staff do not have to go up and down stairs all day. Alsobrook and his planners attempted to design the facility so it will be easily adaptable and functional for at least 50 years without major alterations.

The George Bush Presidential Library Foundation, under the leadership of John Ellis "Jeb" Bush as president, and former Archivist of the U.S. Don Wilson as executive director, has, despite the controversy surrounding its birth, been very successful in raising funds for the construction of the facilities and for the endowment to insure its future financial health. Alsobrook expressed the

opinion that, despite the enmity of critics such as historians Dr. Joan Hoff and Dr. Page Miller, Wilson has been very effective in his role as head of the Bush foundation, and that he "helps protect the library." The foundation has not responded to my requests for information, other than to say there are no annual reports or financial statements available yet.

It is too soon to tell how the Bush Library will function in terms of visitorship or its relationship with scholars, but the library's extremely close relationship with a major university probably enhances its prospects as a vital institution for many years to come. The relationship between the Bush Library and Texas A&M is the closest of any between presidential libraries and universities. One small example is the library's employment of many graduate students from disciplines across the curriculum. President Bush desired this kind of arrangement and insured its development.

## Clinton Library

The Clinton White House announced on February 12, 1997, shortly after his second inauguration that the president's library will be located in Little Rock and affiliated with the University of Arkansas (Harris, 1997, p. A23). The announcement prompted some expressions of discontent in Fayetteville, where the President and First Lady served on the law school faculty in the 1970s, and in Hot Springs, where he grew up and graduated from high school. The announcement also named President Clinton's friend Skip Rutherford, a Little Rock public relations executive, to coordinate planning in Arkansas and to work with the university to select a site for the library. Site selection was completed in November, 1997, after the president visited Little Rock and chose 26 acres near the city's River Market. The city agreed to buy the land, clear it, and give it to the Clinton Library Foundation ("Little Rock Site Chosen for Clinton Library," 1997).

Little more than a month later, a furor arose in Little Rock over the city's proposal to increase its hotel and restaurant tax to finance the $15 million purchase and preparation of the site. City officials, including Mayor Jim Dailey, admitted that they had failed to lay the groundwork for the plan by securing public support in advance of their announcement, which was immediately dubbed the "hamburger tax." The tax increase idea was soon dropped in favor of using bond revenues, which will also go to support the city's zoo and golf course improvements. Proponents of the Clinton Library insisted that the furor was not about having the library in Little Rock but about how it should be funded ("Fat Hits Fire on Financing Clinton Library," 1997). Students of the Presidential Library System will note that this controversy is all too typical of the site selection and funding controversies (external polity and economy against internal polity and economy) that have accompanied the initiation of earlier libraries.

# Appendix B: Interview Guides

The following is a list of questions I asked selectively of various interviewees. Not all of these questions were asked of any one interviewee. Before I conducted the interviews, John T. Fawcett, retired administrator in the Office of Presidential Libraries, pretested the questions to refine them.

*Objectives*

What is the main objective of your presidential library?

Is your perception of this main objective shared by Congress, The Executive Branch, staff members of the PLS, stakeholders in the Presidential Library System policy subsystem, the public?

How well do you think your library meets this objective?


*Description of Your Library*

How does your library routinely operate? (i.e. processes, functions, activities)

How long has it operated this way?

How does your library interface with other Federal agencies? Private sector organizations? Other presidential libraries and NARA?

What discretion do you (or your library) have to tailor the focus or direction of your work to meet changing demands?

How are new staff members recruited, trained, and socialized?

In what ways is your library similar to others in the Presidential Library System? In what ways is it different and/or unique?

Are you aware of informal lines of authority that function differently from formal lines of authority inside the library? Outside the library?


*Internal-External Relationships*

Who are the key players in the decision processes at your library?

What roles do they play?

What role do you play?

To what extent do you deal with individuals inside the library? Outside the library?

What are the key interest groups related to your library?

What role do you see these interest groups playing in the internal processes of the library? It's external processes?

*Evaluation*

What criteria do you use to determine whether your library is "doing its job"?

What factors do you consider critical to the efficiency, effectiveness, and productivity of your library?

How do the factors in #2 contribute to or detract from meeting objectives?

How do you hold others accountable for the performance of the library?

# Appendix C: Presidential Library Statistical Profiles

## PRESIDENTIAL LIBRARIES FISCAL YEAR '98, ALL FUNDS

**Section I** - **ACCESSIONS-**
- **HOLDINGS**

| | Hoover | Roosevelt | Truman | Eisenhower | Kennedy | Johnson | Nixon Project | Ford | Carter | Reagan | Bush | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **PAPER(pages)** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Personal | 8,265,495 | 16,006,000 | 14,490,215 | 21,988,825 | 31,013,235 | 32,074,667 | 784,000 | 20,426,181 | 27,440,030 | 5,117,500 | 5,172,600 | 182,779,548 |
| Federal | 153,303 | 711,000 | 715,995 | 693,300 | 654,967 | 2,848,756 | 912,000 | 631,000 | 324,000 | 510,000 | 92,000 | 8,237,321 |
| Presidential | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44,414,000 | 0 | 0 | 43,797,250 | 36,000,000 | 124,211,250 |
| **MICRFMS (rolls/cards)** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Personal | 717 | 749 | 5,714 | 965 | 20,447 | 157 | 0 | 4,333 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33,082 |
| Federal | 663 | 13 | 120 | 0 | 2,223 | 3,312 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6,331 |
| Presidential | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5,312 | 0 | 0 | 7,000 | 0 | 12,313 |
| **AUD.VIS.** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Still Pictures | 44,199 | 134,335 | 104,979 | 3,113,886 | 146,514 | 620,107 | 435,000 | 326,150 | 1,500,253 | 1,625,813 | 1,500,000 | 6,751,236 |
| Film | 155,591 | 308,676 | 335,205 | 760,236 | 7,271,933 | 824,877 | 2,200,000 | 786,607 | 1,120,080 | 772,500 | 203 | 14,535,908 |
| Video Tape | 141 | 28 | 188 | 327 | 1,301 | 8,258 | 3,900 | 1,541 | 1,434 | 19,668 | 1,295 | 38,081 |
| Audio Tape | 532 | 1,024 | 342 | *1118 | 7,351 | 13,587 | 1,490 | 1,602 | 2,000 | 13,400 | 510 | 41,878 |
| Audio Discs | 78 | 1,108 | 462 | **278 | 728 | 0 | 0 | 112 | 0 | 866 | 4 | 3,358 |
| **ORAL HISTORY** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Pages | 11,854 | 3,120 | 54,180 | 31,512 | 58,329 | 62,011 | 2,200 | 1,099 | 3,606 | 6,015 | 0 | 233,936 |
| Hours | 0 | 77 | 1,49 | 789 | 2,605 | 2,483 | 228 | 41 | 548 | 215 | 0 | 8,476 |
| **MUS. OBJ.** | 5,479 | 24,631 | 26,025 | 34,479 | 16,997 | 37,105 | 21,750 | 8,184 | 40,053 | 77,419 | 57,734 | 349,856 |
| **PRINTED MATS.** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Books | 17,962 | 45,951 | 35,345 | 25,274 | 75,550 | 17,052 | 9,022 | 9,627 | 3,010 | 16,319 | 247 | 255,469 |
| Serials | 22,868 | 14,037 | 69,980 | 25,977 | 14,538 | 5,088 | 0 | 782 | 3,446 | 41,820 | 0 | 198,336 |
| Microfilm | 1,505 | 2,514 | 1,476 | 5,171 | 4,731 | 4,541 | 0 | 545 | 7,009 | 4,577 | 0 | 32,069 |
| Other | 1,141 | 84,516 | 107,973 | 24,905 | 24,374 | 31,960 | 0 | 2,719 | 7,744 | 13,514 | 0 | 299,156 |

*includes 137 disc bells, not hrs.     **     includes 113 discs, not hrs.
ncludes 113 discs, not hrs.

## SECTION II - CLIENTELE

| | Hoover | Roosevelt | Truman | Eisenhower | Kennedy | Johnson | Nixon Project | Ford | Carter | Reagan | Bush | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **RESEARCHERS** | 245 | 666 | 1,020 | 303 | 668 | 332 | 1,557 | 100 | 186 | 209 | 169 | 6,455 |
| **RESEARCH INQUIRIES** | 2,731 | 594 | 13,336 | 6,576 | 2,427 | 2,789 | 1,916 | 4,254 | 9,679 | 7,449 | 318 | 52,069 |
| **DAILY VISITS** | 632 | 1,521 | 1,906 | 1,188 | 1,688 | 1,430 | 3,047 | 322 | 473 | 416 | 188 | 12,811 |
| **MUSEUM PAID** | 32,467 | 100,991 | 87,997 | 40,718 | 122,924 | 0 | 0 | 56,868 | 47,061 | 83,603 | 196,500 | 769,129 |
| **MUSEUM FREE** | 44,780 | 22,377 | 16,599 | 48,589 | 44,314 | 240,466 | 0 | 49,678 | 15,170 | 78,464 | 80,575 | 641,012 |
| **EXHIBITS** | 3 | 0 | 20 | 46 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 88 |
| **PUB.PROGS. EVENTS** | 807 | 173 | 179 | 133 | 480 | 35 | 22 | 24 | 22 | 82 | 727 | 2,684 |
| **PUB.PROGS. PEOPLE** | 29,321 | 7,075 | 27,370 | 13,873 | 68,525 | 13,157 | 194 | 13,513 | 1,890 | 22,485 | 25,505 | 222,908 |
| **OUTREACH EVENTS** | 33 | 0 | 56 | 25 | 58 | 24 | 33 | 4 | 22 | 0 | 157 | 412 |
| **OUTREACH PEOPLE** | 3,308 | 0 | 617 | 1,580 | 1,984 | 371 | 674 | 2,486 | 1,571 | 0 | 224 | 12,815 |
| **WKSHP/SEM. EVENTS** | 12 | 0 | 66 | 0 | 86 | 4 | 14 | 14 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 202 |
| **WKSHP/SEM. PEOPLE** | 720 | 0 | 1,430 | 0 | 1,640 | 133 | 135 | 323 | 38 | 0 | 120 | 4,539 |
| **EDUC.PKTS. PROD.** | 4 | 300 | 320 | 0 | 0 | 1,190 | 867 | 0 | 68 | 0 | 359 | 3,108 |
| **MUSEUM ITEMS SOLD** | 52,680 | 70,099 | 98,852 | 52,059 | 146,800 | n/a | n/a | 38,725 | 53,830 | n/a | *2811 | 513,045 |

*Bush Library gallery guides sold at admissions desk.

## SECTION III - PUBLICATIONS

| | Hoover | Roosevelt | Truman | Eisenhower | Kennedy | Johnson | Nixon Project | Ford | Carter | Reagan | Bush | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| DOCUMENTARY | 0 | 0 | 0 | 576 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 300 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 876 |
| DESCRIPTIVE | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,450 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 129 | 0 | 0 | 1,591 |
| PUBLIC INFO | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 185 | 59,243 | 0 | 32 | 139 | 0 | 0 | 59,599 |

# SECTION IV - UNIT PRODUCTION

| | Hoover | Roosevelt | Truman | Eisenhower | Kennedy | Johnson | Nixon Project | Ford | Carter | Reagan | Bush | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **PROCESSING** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arrangement | 70,337 | 131,929 | 65,264 | 5,318 | 129,779 | 89,596 | 6,898 | 146,349 | 847,044 | 30,143 | 582,050 | 2,104,707 |
| Description | 4,507 | 9,490 | 38,058 | 62,519 | 29,823 | 52,319 | 6,527 | 49,723 | 16,960 | 55,403 | 348,413 | 673,742 |
| Reviewing | 29,200 | 39,170 | 62,709 | 42,632 | 82,837 | 360,947 | 19,034 | 16,074 | 129,577 | 507,855 | 802,153 | 2,092,188 |
| Declass - Reviewed | 880 | 0 | 7,918 | 143,626 | 24,306 | 68,371 | 123,184 | 91,555 | 26,852 | 1,631 | 12,750 | 501,073 |
| Declass - Submit | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5,601 | 7,312 | 8,324 | 0 | 688 | 6,306 | 30,450 | 2,137 | 60,826 |
| **REFERENCE** | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Items Furnished | 4,902 | 9,765 | 20,758 | 14,655 | 70,681 | 9,548 | 31,212 | 6,150 | 3,925 | 3,171 | 11,096 | 185,853 |
| Written Responses | 856 | 1,621 | 2,313 | 2,626 | 2,754 | 4,235 | 1.918 | 2,049 | 1,437 | 1,418 | 1,051 | 22,278 |
| Oral Responses | 1,630 | 6,065 | 9,867 | 1,604 | 6,925 | 2,245 | 5,741 | 1,464 | 700 | 5,041 | 1,718 | 43,001 |
| Email Responses | not avail. | not avail. | 1,476 | 759 | not avail. | 191 | 923 | 936 | 1,682 | 1,284 | not avail. | 7,251 |
| Reproductions | 8,843 | 28,502 | 82,461 | 123,232 | 143,522 | 135,247 | 92,427 | 40,629 | 15,854 | 28,836 | 9,243 | 708,796 |
| **PRESERVATION** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Papers | 3,176 | 10,937 | 128,707 | 16,698 | 85,283 | 10,227 | 0 | 4,078 | 706,737 | 6,773 | 69,620 | 1,042,236 |
| Photos | 1,157 | 17 | 4,223 | 7,842 | 112 | 421 | 1,114 | 3,050 | 0 | 79 | 0 | 18,015 |
| Printed Materials | 492 | 32 | 285 | 0 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 846 |
| Film | 26 | 0 | 180 | 93,932 | 24 | 0 | 135 | 10,931 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 105,228 |
| Audio | 174 | 3 | 0 | 1,087 | 73 | 0 | 15 | 37 | 0 | 9,870 | 0 | 11,259 |
| Video | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 0 | 803 | 1 | 0 | 4,348 | 0 | 5,192 |
| Museum Objects | 28 | 221 | 130 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 754 | 1,737 | 0 | 2,909 |
| ORAL HISTORY | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Interview | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Transcript | 0 | 0 | 10 | 33 | 65 | 853 | 0 | 155 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 916 |
| Editing | 0 | 0 | 309 | 0 | 180 | 1,166 | 0 | 442 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,097 |
| TAPES editing | | | | | | | 83 | | | | | 168 |

*NLJ and NLE figures include reimburseable work

**Curriculum Vitae**


**LYNN SCOTT COCHRANE**
Dean for Library and Learning Services
Marymount University, Reinsch Library
2807 North Glebe Road
Arlington, VA 22207-4299
(703) 284-1535/Fax:1685


## EDUCATION

Ph.D., Public Administration, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1998
M.S., Library Science, Catholic University of America, 1980
B.A., History, University of North Carolina-Charlotte, 1969-with Honors


## EMPLOYMENT HISTORY

**Dean for Library and Learning Services**, Marymount University Reinsch Library, Arlington, VA. April 1992 to date.

**Adjunct Professor,** School of Library and Information Science, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C. August 1994 to 1996.

**Reference Librarian/Assistant Professor** (half-time while preparing for Ph.D. comprehensives), Carol M. Newman Library, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, Virginia, August 1991 to January 1992.

**Assistant to the University Librarian/Assistant Professor**, Carol M. Newman Library, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, Virginia, August 1990 to August 1991.

**Head of User Services/Assistant Professor**, User Services Department, Carol M. Newman Library, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, Virginia, January 1987 to August 1990.

**Interlibrary Loan Librarian/Assistant Professor**, User Services Department, Carol M. Newman Library, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, Virginia, April 1985 to January 1987.

**Assistant Social Science Librarian/Assistant Professor**, Social Science Department, Carol M. Newman Library, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, Virginia, September 1984 to April 1985.

**Interlibrary Loan Librarian/Instructor**, Interlibrary Loan, Cabell Library, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, Virginia, April 1982 to August 1983.

**Assistant Librarian/Instructor**, Reference Department, Cabell Library, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, Virginia, September 1980 to March 1982.

**Librarian Trainee**, Executive Office of the President, EOP and White House Information Center, Washington D.C., Fall Semester 1979.

**Library Consultant**, Virginia Center on Aging, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, Virginia, Summer 1979.

**Reading Specialist**, Skills Learning Program, University of Wisconsin-Green Bay, Green Bay, Wisconsin, September 1977 to May 1978.

**Para-Professional Librarian,** University of Wisconsin-Green Bay, Green Bay, Wisconsin, 1974 to 1977.

**Para-Professional Librarian**, Pattee Library, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania, 1971 to 1974.

**Secondary School Teacher**, Dillon School District #2, Dillon, South Carolina, 1969 to 1970.


## HONORS AND AWARDS

Pi Alpha Alpha
Beta Phi Mu
3-M/Junior Members Round Table Professional Development Grant to attend the 1983
American Library Association conference in Los Angeles
*Who's Who in Library and Information Services*, 1982 Edition
JMRT/Baker and Tailor Grassroots Grant to attend the Virginia Library Association
Annual Conference, 1979

## SCHOLARSHIPS AND FELLOWSHIPS

Graduate Assistantship-Center for Public Administration and Policy, VPI&SU, 1984
Graduate Scholarship, Catholic University of America, 1978-80
Graduate Assistantship, University of Wisconsin-Green Bay, 1974

## MEMBERSHIP IN PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

American Library Association, 1978-present
American Society for Public Administration, 1989-present
Rotary Club of Montgomery County (Virginia), 1989-92
Virginia Library Association, 1978-present

## PARTICIPATION IN PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

**American Library Association:**
 Association of College and Research Libraries
  College Library Section - College Library Directors'
  Discussion Group, Co-Chair 1995-1997
  College Library Section - Candidate for Secretary, 1998
 Beta Phi Mu Award Committee
  Member 1993-95, Chair 1994-95
 Chapter Conclave (Virginia representative),1986-87
 Chapter Relations Committee
  Member 1993-95
  Freedom to Read Foundation Liaison
  Sub-Committee on Chapter Presidents-Elect Orientation, 1987-88
 Council - Virginia Chapter Councilor, 1995-1999
 Junior Members Round Table
  Booth Committee, 1982
  Ad Hoc Committee on Name and Image, 1982-83
  Students to ALA Committee, 1983
  Secretary, 1983-1984
  Professional Ethics Committee Liaison, 1984-85
  3M/JMRT Professional Development Grant Committee, Chair, 1985-86
   Nominating Committee, 1986-87
 Library Administration and Management Association
  LOMS, Planning & Evaluation of Library Services Committee, 1991-93
   Membership Committee, 1991-93
  Orientation Committee, 1988-91, Chair, 1988-90
 National Library Week Committee, 1989-91
 Reference and Adult Services Division
  Library Service to an Aging Population Committee, 1981-83
 Staff Organizations Round Table
  Budget Officer, 1984-86

**Capcon Library Network**
  Board of Directors - 1995-1998
  Secretary/Treasurer - 1996-1998
  Vice Chair - 1998-2000

**Virginia Library Association:**

> **\*\***President, 1986-87
> **\*\***Vice President, 1985-86
> Awards and Recognition Committee, Chair, 1984-85
> Ad Hoc Committee on a Certification Survey, 1986
> Ad Hoc Committee on James Madison's Birthday Celebration, 1989-91
> Chapter Councilor to American Library Association
> College and University Section
> Secretary, 1982-83
> *Directory of Virginia Academic Librarians*, Chair, 1983-84
> Committee on Committees, Chair, 1982-84
> Junior Members Round Table
> Vice Chair, 1980-81
> Chair, 1981-82
> Local Arrangements Committee, 1980 Conference and 1989 Conference
> Membership Committee, 1980-81
> Nominating Committee, Chair, 1988-89
> Program Committee, 1985-86
> Region IV Nominating Committee, 1981

**Governor's Conference on Library and Information Services**, 1990

> Delegate from Virginia's Ninth Congressional District

**White House Conference on Library and Information Services**, 1991

> Delegate from Virginia

Attended the **International User's Course** at the British Library Document Supply Centre, Boston Spa, England, May 28-30, 1986 (travel funded by a grant from the Virginia Tech Foundation).


## PUBLICATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

"Belgians of Northeastern Wisconsin" - Paper presented before the Wisconsin Academy of Sciences, Arts, and Letters.  May, 1976. (This was an outgrowth of my work in establishing the Belgian-American Ethnic Resource Collection at the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay Library.)

"Report of the Task Force on Fees for Library Services" - co-authored with Carolyn Wannann. VPI&SU Libraries, May 1988.

"Cost Analysis of Library Services at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University" co-authored with Carolyn Wannann.  Association of College and Research Libraries Fifth National Conference, Cincinnati, Ohio, presentation and publication in the proceedings, p, 55-57, April 1989.

Gherman, Paul and Cochrane, Lynn Scott.  "Developing and Using Unit Costs: The Virginia Tech Experience." *Library Administration and Management,* V. 3, #2 (Spring 1989), p. 93-96.

"Appalachian Mystery Writer Sharyn McCrumb: Famous (if not yet rich!)." *Virginia Librarian,* V. 35, #2 (July/August/September 1989).

"Interlibrary Loan and Its Costs from the Perspective of a Net Lender" Presentation at the Virginia Community College Association Seventh Annual Convention, Roanoke, Virginia; October 13, 1989.

"Diary of a Delegate to the White House Conference on Library and Information Services." *Virginia Librarian,* V. 37, #4 (October/November/December 1991) - In press.

"Forming a National Information Policy: Selections from a White House Conference Diary." *College and Research Libraries News,* V. 52, #11 (Dec. 1991), p. 740-741.

Wand, Patricia A. and Cochrane, Lynn Scott.  "Utilizing White House Conference Recommendations." *College and Research Libraries News***,** V. 53, #1 (January 1992) - In press.

Book Reviews:

*Activities and the "Well Elderly"* by Phyllis M. Foster, Editor in *Science Books and Films,* 1985, V. 20, #3 (Jan./Feb. 1985)

*Family Home Care*: *Critical Issues for Services and Policies* by Robert Perlman, Editor in *Science Books and Films*, 1984, V. 20, #1 (Sept./Oct. 1984)

*The Library of Congress* by Charles A. Goodrum and Helen W. Dalrymple, in *Science Books and Films*, V. 19 #2 (Nov./Dec. 1983)