

and outside sources to validate the importance of our ideas, the thoroughness of our knowledge, and the contribution of our work to the communities from which we came and cared about. It was not just extreme encounters with racism, or sexism, or homophobia that were most debilitating to my confidence, but also the unquestioned assumptions about who and what was worth studying that wore most consistently on my determination. I remember one senior professor stating in a statistics seminar, "If you can't count it, it isn't science." The class sat there in apparent agreement, while I raised my hand to confront once again a professor's narrow understanding of political science. My guess is that my professor never contemplated the fact that not all the relevant parties were represented in those "objective" databases he believed to be the foundation of good political science. Nowhere in his consciousness was there an understanding of what it meant to live in marginal communities and therefore what it meant to teach students how to study these communities.

This contradiction between superficial acceptance and the absence of real structures to facilitate and *respect* such work is indicative of political science in the 1990s, and it follows me and many of my junior friends to our first positions

as assistant professors. However, despite my frustration with the amount of time needed to develop programs, write grants, recruit women and graduate students of color, and pressure departments to hire in areas like race and politics, feminist theory, or lesbian and gay politics, I recognize this as an essential part of my own scholarly production. I never would have made it through graduate school without the community of those of us struggling to make central the study of marginal communities. Through this community of scholars comes some of the most interesting, innovative, and important work to cross the boundaries of political science, affirming my research interests, but also the experiences of people most often discounted and excluded in political science.

Note

1. Special thanks are given to Jane Mansbridge, President, and Judith Stiehm, President-Elect of the Women's Caucus for Political Science, for their strong support and encouragement of the roundtable project that surrounds this article.

Reference

Benjamin, Walter. 1968. "The Storyteller: Reflections on the Works of Nikolai

Leskov." In *Illuminations*, ed Hannah Arendt, Trans. Harry Zohn, New York: Schocken Books.

About the Authors

Cynthia Duquette studies political theory and cultural studies in the Ph.D. program of the Department of Political Science at Wayne State University. She will be chairing the roundtable "Gender and Generations: Let's Talk" at the 1996 APSA Meetings in San Francisco.

Jo Freeman received the 1993 Mary Lepper Award from the Women's Caucus, given in recognition of effective actions towards women's equality. Her anthology, *Women: A Feminist Perspective*, is currently in its fifth edition.

Virginia Sapiro holds the Sophonisba P. Breckinridge Chair in the Department of Political Science at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Her book, *A Vindication of Political Virtue: The Political Theory of Mary Wollstonecraft*, won the 1993 Victoria Schuck Award for the best book on women and politics.

Peregrine Schwartz-Shea is associate professor at the University of Utah. She teaches in the areas of American politics and public administration, and her research examines the application of rational choice theory to organizations, individual-group relations, and gender inequality.

Cathy Cohen is an assistant professor in African and African-American Studies at Yale University. She is currently working on two books: an edited volume on women and politics, and a book on black communities' response to AIDS.

The Role of the Historical Advisory Committee, 1990–94, in the Declassification of U.S. Foreign Policy Documents and Related Issues*

Betty Glad and Jonathan Smith, *University of South Carolina, Columbia*

The *Foreign Relations of the United States (FRUS)* volume, *Iran, 1952–54*, published in 1990, contained no mention of U.S. involvement in the overthrow of Iranian Prime Minister Mosadegh, and the subsequent installation of the Shah as Head of State. This significant gap occurred despite the fact that President Dwight D. Eisen-

hower had bragged of U.S. involvement in that episode in *Mandate for Change* (1963), and Kermit Roosevelt, the CIA's head officer in Iran during the episode, even detailed his exploits in his book, *Countercoup* (1979). As Bruce Kuniholm (1990, 1) noted in his review of this volume for the American Historical Association,

these "omissions combine to make the Iran volume in the period of 1952–54 a *fraud* (italics added)."

Earlier, on February 14, 1990, Warren Cohen, the Chairman of the State Department's Advisory Committee on Historical Diplomatic Documentation (HAC, hereafter), had resigned as a protest measure. In his letter to Secretary

of State James Baker, Cohen noted, "I cannot protect the integrity of the series, the reputation of the Department, or testify to the concern of this administration for providing an honest historical record (Miller 1991, 318)."¹

Cohen's resignation was not just over the inadequacy of one volume, but rather the whole process of declassification, HAC's role in the process, and an apparent backtracking by the Department on the access of the entire committee to classified documents. In earlier years, HAC had access to documents that the declassifiers in State had removed from volumes of the *Foreign Relations of the United States* series. This allowed HAC members, at the very least, to see whether the deletions substantially distorted the historical record. However, in the mid-1980s, HAC was denied access to these deleted materials. A 1989 agreement to restore committee access to this documentation apparently settled the issue. But the whole matter was reopened when State Department officials decided that only Cohen could see the deleted material. Their view was that to permit seven or eight committee members to have access would give too many people access to secret information (Cohen 1989, 38).

The whole declassification process, moreover, had become so unwieldy that the *FRUS* volumes, traditionally published 30 years after the fact, were well behind schedule. Indeed, despite occasional congressional rumblings and presidential memorandums expressing concern with this problem, the trend continued to grow. As the 1989 annual report of the advisory committee stated, "the twenty year rule eroded into a twenty-five year rule, then into a thirty-year rule—and now we fail to meet even that (Cohen 1989, 38)."

A new HAC met in the fall of 1990 in a somewhat demoralized atmosphere.² The *FRUS* series was no longer being mailed to all official governmental repository libraries, and rumors were circulating around Washington that the whole *FRUS* series, like the *Department of State Bulletin* before it, might be discon-

tinued. And though this new committee was assured that all of its members could secure top secret security classifications and have access to all the denied documents as they had in the early eighties, several members were apprehensive that there might be some other barriers to performing their function. The Historian's Office in the State Department clearly wanted to help. However, committee members learned, in one exchange with a classifier, that the guidelines used by the declassifiers were themselves classified.

Four years later, by the fall of 1994, publication of the *FRUS* series was required by law; circulation had been restored to repository libraries, and the whole publications process had been expedited. A declassification unit, as recommended by HAC, had been established in the Historian's Office to accelerate the declassification process, and it seemed to be working effectively. Indeed, HAC noted "with pleasure that the thirty-year publication mark is nearly within grasp (Kimball 1994a)." HAC members were also assessing selected volumes of *FRUS*, having obtained access to denied documents. Some of the appeals undertaken by the Historian's Office at the request of HAC, resulted in the release of extra documents. The CIA, in response to one appeal, allowed the use of the term "covert operations" to describe some of their activities. Also, in a HAC meeting with representatives from the State Department's Bureau of Intelligence and Research (INR), the Historian's Office discovered a whole new treasure trove of documents they had not previously had access to. The committee, moreover, was having an impact on systematic declassification policies at State, as well as policies regarding the transcription of tapes at presidential libraries and the provisions of President Clinton's new executive order on information security policy.

One of the authors of this article has written a paper delineating the reasons for these positive developments (Smith 1995). Some of these reasons will be briefly mentioned

here. The end of the Cold War had created a new political climate in which openness was the spirit of the time. The members of HAC ironed out some minor differences between themselves and rallied around a dedicated and vigorous new chairman, Warren Kimball, a diplomatic historian from Rutgers University.

Outside the committee, Warren Cohen and other historians made the whole matter of handling official papers a public issue. As Cohen (1994a) noted, "the Iran thing was just a tool . . . it was something we could use to get everybody's attention." During the spring and summer of 1990, Cohen (1990a, b, c) authored articles in the *New York Times*, *World Monitor*, and the *Foreign Service Journal*. Page Miller (1991), the executive director of The National Coordinating Committee for the Promotion of History, a lobbying organization for the historical and political science professions, authored a piece in *Government Publications Review*. She also attracted the interest of editorial writers at the *New York Times*, journalists at the *Washington Post* (Dewar 1990) and the *Chronicle of Higher Education* (Winkler 1990) in this time period. As Warren Cohen (1994) noted, Page Miller was "the real whirlwind" behind the spate of stories that appeared in the popular press.

The broader political science and historical community weighed in on the issue. The Organization of American Historians (OAH), the American Historical Association (AHA), and the Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations (SHAFR) passed strongly worded resolutions calling on Secretary of State James Baker to take the necessary steps to restore the integrity of the *FRUS* series (*Congressional Record*, 1990, S16292-94.)

One of the most important factors bringing about the positive changes noted above was the passage of Public Law 102-138 on October 28, 1991. The National Coordinating Committee for the Promotion of History (NCC) had initiated the call for a statutory foundation for the *Foreign Relations of the United States* series

and the Historical Advisory Committee. As the Executive Director of that organization, Page Miller had approached Democratic and Republican leaders on the Senate Foreign Relations and Intelligence Committees. A letter was sent to Claiborne Pell, the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and the staff of Jesse Helms, the senior Republican on the committee, was approached. Some of these individuals on Helm's staff were historians by training, and it was hoped they could provide some tacit support. But then Senator Helms, himself, indicated that he was in favor of the proposed legislation. As Miller (1994) noted, "it was made very clear to me from the beginning that (Senator) Helms was a populist, and that he believed in access to information for the people." This support, as Miller noted, was "absolutely valuable." When the chair and ranking minority members (David Boren and William Cohen) of the Select Committee on Intelligence lent their backing to the new legislation, it sailed through the Senate.³

Concerned about presidential prerogatives, the Bush White House attempted to have its allies in the House of Representatives stop the legislation. However, the reforms regarding HAC and the *FRUS* series were attached to a larger bill, the Foreign Relations Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1992 and 1993, which included such things as continued funding for the new U.S. embassy in Moscow. President Bush (1991, 2) did not veto the measure, but, in his signing statement, he noted that the new provisions regarding *FRUS* would be interpreted "to effect no change in the standards set forth in the existing executive order on national security information."

The new legislation established the HAC on a statutory basis, with the provision that its members be appointed by the Secretary of State from among "distinguished historians, political scientists, archivists, international lawyers and other social scientists . . ." (U.S. Statutes, 1991, 43). Six of the nine nominations would be made by stipulated professional associations. These

provisions made it likely that HAC would maintain its independence in dealing with the Department of State and other agencies of government.

HAC was further empowered by specific responsibilities allocated to it in the statute. If HAC determined that the selection of documents for the *FRUS* volume would be "misleading or lead to an inaccurate or incomplete historical record," then it should so advise the Secretary of State and submit recommendations to resolve the issue. HAC was also given the authority to monitor the declassification and transfer to the National Archives of all State Department historical records 30 years or older. Further, the committee would have access to the guidelines used in declassification, as well as the right to sample documents that were still restricted. The legislation also required the publication of the *FRUS* series, no later than 30 years after the events. To meet these responsibilities, HAC members were to be given security clearances, subject to standard procedures for granting such clearances, enabling them to view the denied documents.

The Historian's Office was directly empowered by the requirement that within six months of the enactment of the legislation, other agencies of government should form agreements with it, in order to provide them access to relevant foreign policy files.

Though space does not permit a complete review of the work of HAC after the passage of this legislation, we will go into some detail as to its most important activities. Once their security clearances had been issued, members of a reenergized HAC proceeded to look at *FRUS* volumes that were nearly ready for publication. The members of the committee agreed that they could not be expected to review all volumes. Instead, the Historian's Office would alert committee members to possible problem volumes and the committee itself could also ask to see forthcoming issues for which they saw some potential difficulties. In the process, committee members would see the documents that the Historian's Office had se-

lected for publication that the relevant agencies were refusing to declassify. The full HAC would then make recommendations as to how the volume should be handled. Recommendations might be made to appeal the declassification decision, and/or to issue caveats in the preface of problem volumes. They might also recommend against publication altogether.

From 1991 through 1994, HAC reviewed eight volumes in accord with these concerns. The senior author of this paper served on a subcommittee reviewing the nearly complete volume on *Japan, Indonesia, 1958–60*. We had the most success with the Indonesia portion of this volume. Though it was well known throughout the scholarly world that the United States had provided covert support for a rebellion against the Sukarno government in Indonesia, the State Department's Historical Documents Review (HDR) staff, anticipating objections from the CIA, cut out all usage of the term "covert operations." HAC members argued that these kinds of deletions would not result in a "thorough, and accurate and reliable" record of US foreign policy and diplomatic activity relative to Indonesia. In a subsequent meeting with John Pereira, Director of the Historical Review Group at CIA, members of the HAC subcommittee discovered something that HDR in State had not yet learned. The CIA had dropped its earlier policy of objecting to all mention of covert operations. Only information regarding sources and details of operations could not be made public. When the separate volume, *Indonesia, 1958–60*, was published (LaFantasie 1994a), it included in the preface a statement to the effect that the U.S. government admitted that it had provided covert support to the Indonesian rebellion in Sumatra and Sulzawesi (Celebes) in liaison with other countries interested and involved in this operation. As noted in the preface, except for a recent volume on Vietnam 1963, this was the first time that the U.S. government had admitted to the existence of policy deliberations about a major covert operation. Moreover, the docu-

ments omitted in their entirety were identified at the place in the volume where they would have been published by title, date, and archival provenance with a promise that the State Department would publish these records in the appropriate format at a time when such records could be declassified consistent with national security criteria.

The committee had less success with the Japan volume for 1958–60. Certain documents that we thought were essential to a full and comprehensive treatment of U.S.-Japanese foreign relations for the time period covered were being denied by the country desk in the State Department. An appeal by the Historian's Office (upon the recommendation of HAC) was rejected by the State Department. This volume was published as *Japan; Korea, 1958–1960*, with a statement in the preface that “except for documents related to the negotiation of the United States Japan Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security of 1960 and its related arrangement,” the publication meets “generally accepted scholarly standard of accuracy and completeness.” HAC's proposal that an even more detailed caveat be published was also noted in the preface. A full explication of the United States-Japan Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security of 1960 and its related arrangements, as the committee saw it, was “integral and essential to a comprehensive and accurate record of US-Japan relations” (LaFantasie 1994b).

Another result of the new legislation was the negotiation of a series of agreements between the Historian's Office and other agencies in the government to establish procedures that would allow the Historian's Office to have access to their records. Though Public Law 102-138 indicated that each agency involved in the conduct of US foreign policy should make specific arrangements along these lines with the State Department within 180 days, few agencies met those guidelines. By May 1992, of the 17 departments and agencies that had been approached by the Historian's Office, only five had signed memoranda of understanding.⁴ The Department of Agriculture contended

that it was unnecessary, since the National Archives (NARA) had all of their relevant data. Coordination with the Defense Department was difficult, as DOD wanted to rely on the agreement it had signed in December 1991. Eventually this situation was corrected. Finally, as the 1994 HAC annual report notes, “access to Department of Defense records has been regularized by a memoranda of understanding, leaving the National Security Agency as the only government entity that has not complied with the provisions of the Foreign Relations statute (Kimball 1994a, 30).”

In the midst of these activities, the Historian's Office at the State Department decided to move to a new format. Under the direction of Glenn La Fantasie, the general editor, the selection of documents for publication in each volume would be more selective, with each volume limited to approximately 800 pages. This change entailed a tighter selection criteria in order to avoid repetition and greater use of bibliographic annotations to direct researchers to the archival sources. Initially, several committee members had some concerns that this process might truncate the record and delay the compilation process. However, committee review of an early volume, *US Foreign Economic Policy, 1958–60*, (LaFantasie 1995) suggested that the new format might work well. As the annual report of HAC (Kimball 1994a, 29) notes, “an appropriate balance between quality and quantity is being achieved.”

Another duty assigned to HAC by the statute was to give advice to the department on how it might proceed to meet the new statutory charge that all 30-year-old diplomatic records, with exceptions for national security reasons, be declassified by November 1, 1992. The State Department also had the option to extend this date to November 1, 1993, provided it could provide the Senate Foreign Relations and House Foreign Affairs Committees with a description of “how the Department of State intends to meet the requirements” of the statute. Given the size of the diplomatic archives not yet declassi-

fied, the nature of the review process, and the limited staff and money assigned to the Historian's Office in State and the National Archives, this seemed to be an impossible task. The practice had been for the originating agency to provide declassification guidelines for individuals at the National Archives for a page-by-page review process. Their decisions were subsequently checked by a second NARA reviewer. Finally, a third review would then be undertaken by the originating agency to check NARA's decisions. Other units with an “equity” (i.e., interest or role) in the matter would also be consulted. When State/HDR undertook this task, all classified documents in a box of records were reviewed, though not on a line by line basis as during NARA's reviews. Given this process, it was not surprising that HDR and the National Archives representatives had to report to HAC that the implementation of the statutory requirement for the declassification of 30-year-old records could not be achieved until 2010.

In April 1993, at the suggestion of HAC, a working group was formed by the Under Secretary of State for Management (M. Genta Hawkins Holmes, Acting) to deal with the problem. The chairman of HAC (Warren Kimball), the Acting Assistant Archivist of NARA (Michael Kurtz), the Historian (William Slany), and other officials of the State Department sat on the committee. The working group concluded that the whole declassification process would have to be changed. The various files would have to be prioritized in terms of their importance to researchers and subjected to a form of risk analysis. Whole blocks of files that dealt with sensitive national security issues could be separated from blocks of files that did not. The former would be subjected to a page-by-page review. The latter would be subjected to sampling only. To minimize the delays caused by the review process, the declassification process for State Department documents would be centralized in a Center for Declassification at State, working in a fa-

cility with the files under its control, before they were transferred to the Archives. For those documents in which other agencies had an “equity,” the team at State would be responsible for the coordination.

These proposals were adopted by the State Department, and an action plan agreed to in the summer of 1993 was forwarded to the respective chairmen of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and House Foreign Affairs Committee. In a cover letter, Wendy Sherman, Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, explained that though it would be impossible for State to meet the 30-year-old deadline by October 1993, the enclosed plan was indicative of the Department’s commitment to reach, within a reasonable period of time, the 30-year line for the opening of its documents at the National Archives.

HAC also concerned itself with broader archival issues. Increasingly, recordkeeping is done on tapes and electronic forms. The Eisenhower library, for example, had only 25 memos summarizing discussions that were recorded by the president, all open to researchers (though neither the original recordings, nor the actual transcripts exist). The Kennedy Library, by way of contrast, has 125 reels of taped conversations and 27 dictabelt tapes of telephone conversations. Less than 20% of this material is currently available to researchers. The material in this form, including several meetings during the Cuban Missile Crisis, are largely unprocessed. The Johnson library has approximately 3,000 presidential telephone conversations on dictabelt, of which over 2,000 have been transcribed or summarized by the LBJ library’s staff. The Nixon library has over 4,000 hours of presidential conversations and meetings on tape, of which only 60 hours have been transcribed.

When HAC first approached the issue of using tapes in the presidential libraries for the *FRUS* series, representatives of the National Archives and the Historian’s Office had no plans for transcribing them. Upon HAC’s recommendation, the

Historian’s Office provided a subvention for an additional researcher at the Johnson Library to assist in the transcription of tapes. After listening to some of the tapes, one Historian’s Office researcher reported back to HAC that they were a particularly valuable resource, given the fact that Johnson wrote so little.

When the Historian’s Office moves on to the Nixon library, it will have to confront other issues. Nixon resisted the opening of these tapes, and a series of court decisions and congressional actions on this subject has impeded any significant progress in their availability to presidential scholars. However, under a separate provision of the Presidential Records and Materials Preservation Act of 1974, Public Affairs in State and its Historians Office can request access to the Nixon recordings for the purpose of ongoing governmental business. The *FRUS* series, in short, may be used to process some of this information.

The issue of electronic mail remains unresolved. At a meeting in March 1994, HAC was informed by Kenneth Rossman, Chief of Records Management in the Bureau of Administration in the State Department, that if the present trend of communications via electronic mail continues, there will be no central paper files relative to contemporary diplomacy in the Department of State by the turn of the century. Ann Van Camp, a committee member from the Hoover Library, is in charge of a subcommittee now working on these issues.

After the presidential election of 1992, one of HAC’s most important activities was to weigh in for a more liberal executive order regarding information policy. Governmental officials at that time were still operating under Executive Order 12356 issued by President Reagan (Relyea 1992). In early February 1993, Claiborne Pell, Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, wrote the Secretary of State advocating an overhaul of U.S. information security policy. A few days later, Warren Kimball, in his role as president of SHAFR,

sent a resolution with a similar request to the Secretary of State.

In late April 1993, the guidelines for drawing up a new information policy were issued, though they were not what the proponents of openness had in mind. In a letter to Secretary of State Warren Christopher, on June 10, HAC noted that the directive contained “no mention of the need to balance the public’s right to know with national security, or the importance of government accountability in a democracy.” A new executive order, the committee stated, “must set a new tone, recognizing that the post-Cold War world, calls for a greater emphasis on the public’s right to know.”

In a letter to President Clinton on June 22, Warren Kimball as President of SHAFR noted that the “membership of the Task Force and the assignment given its various subcommittees indicate that old habits of secrecy dominate its approach. Those in the government who are involved in making the historical record available are not adequately represented, and there is no representation for historical researchers. . . . Nor is there any spokesperson for the general public on the Task Force.” Moreover, the task force charged with drawing up the new policies was dominated by security officials in the various agencies. Kimball also sent an even more detailed letter assessing the proposed executive order to Steven Garfinkle, Director of the Information Security Oversight Office, the main governmental agency overseeing governmental classification processes.

HAC responded to subsequent drafts of the Presidential Review Directive 29 with calls for earlier dates for automatic and systematic declassification, and fewer and more precisely defined exemptions to the declassification process (including a more limited definition of the kinds of foreign governmental information that may be withheld). HAC members also would give the proposed Information Security Policy Advisory Council more power and prestige and would change the composition of that Council from an interdepartmental governmental committee to one composed of ci-

vilian users of public information. The committee's concerns were discussed with State Department officials, as well as representatives of the National Security Council staff, and were forwarded to other officials, including the heads of other advisory councils within the government and presidents or executive directors of major professional associations.⁵

The final version of the executive order, signed by President Clinton on April 17, 1995, was the product of the opposing forces. The CIA and other security-conscious agencies weighed in against some of the more liberal provisions inserted in the early drafts of the order in response to HAC and other proponents of openness. The result, journalist Douglas Jehl (1995) noted, was that "the new policy was less open than the one the National Security Council proposed a year ago." The number of categories which were exempted from automatic declassification was raised from seven to nine.

Yet, the final version, as contrasted with the first version of the proposed executive order, did reflect some of the concerns of HAC and the historical profession. It provided for a civilian oversight committee with public representation that would meet twice a year (but not four times annually, as recommended by the HAC). Systematic declassification was reduced from 30 to 25 years. Warren Kimball (1994c) has noted, that he is "absolutely certain our [HAC's] input created a large-scale serious consideration in the State Department." Indeed, the new arrangements, as Steven Aftergood of the Federation of Independent Scientists noted, represents "a distinct improvement over the current system" (Jehl 1995)."

By the summer of 1994, HAC was engaged in several new projects. The committee began to examine State Department publication policies relative to treaties and international agreements. It explored the possibility of a State Department—and eventually government-wide—database for publicly available documents that have been declassified by the Freedom of In-

formation Act or mandatory request actions. Issues presented by the wide usage of electronic communications in the government were beginning to be addressed.

HAC's success, as chair Warren Kimball (1994b) noted in his letter to Secretary of State Warren Christopher accompanying the HAC report of 1994, was partly due to the solid support it received from the Historian's Office and the Historian (the HAC's Executive Secretary, William Slany), as well as his superiors in the State Department Bureau of Public Affairs. Their joint efforts showed "how much can be accomplished, quickly and cost-effectively, when responsible officials become actively involved in the issues facing the HAC and press an agenda of openness rather than secrecy." But Kimball also noted "how essential it has been for us to have the force of law behind us in our dealings with both career officials and political appointees. . . ."

Yet for every two steps forward on the declassification front, there has been one step backward. The new Center for Declassification in State has not been provided with adequate facilities, and hiring limitations in State were threatening progress toward meeting the 30-year publication goal. The risk assessment concept contained in the State Department's Action Plan of June 1993 had not been operationalized; declassifiers continued to use very expensive page-by-page review procedures on all documents (Kimball 1994b). Also, despite its earlier success, HAC was preparing to contest declassification decisions by State and CIA over two Kennedy volumes (Kimball 1994a).

As was the case with the several preceding administrations, the Clinton administration undertook some initiatives that created problems for the preservation of government documents and the public's access to them. In March 1994, the administration changed the government's long-standing commitment to treating the National Security Council (NSC) as a federal agency. Court papers were filed asserting that the NSC's only

function is to advise the president, and as such, the NSC is not subject to record preservation laws. Not long after the report period dealt with here, there was a setback on the electronic mail front. In the spring of 1995, the Clinton administration joined former President George Bush to appeal the decision of District Court Judge Richey declaring the agreement between former Archivist Don Wilson and ex-President George Bush a violation of the Presidential Records Act of 1978. Despite the significant accomplishments in the last four years, it seems that the battle for openness can never be finally won.

Notes

*The authors would like to express their sincere gratitude to Vincent Davis of the Patterson School of International Diplomacy for his valuable comments and critiques on this work. Davis is the current APSA representative on the State Department's Advisory Committee on Historical Diplomatic Documentation.

1. Much of the data in this paper was drawn from the minutes of the State Department's Advisory Committee on Historical Diplomatic Documentation, on deposit at the Bureau of Public Affairs, Department of State. Classified portions of those minutes are not available to the public. This article has been cleared with the Department of State, as required by agreements signed by committee members as a condition of their access to classified documents.

2. Warren Kimball was chairman for the four years under review here. The committee members were George Herring, University of Kentucky; Betty Glad, University of South Carolina; Margaret Hermann, Ohio State University; Stephen Zamora, University of Houston; Anne Van Camp, Hoover Institution; Ronald Spector, George Washington University; Bradford Perkins, University of Michigan; Emily Rosenberg, Macalester College. Margaret Hermann, Stephen Zamora and Ronald Spector were succeeded in subsequent years by Anna Nelson, American University; Jane Picker, Cleveland State University; and Arnold Taylor, Howard University. Melvyn Leffler, University of Virginia, replaced Bradford Perkins during the report year, 1993-94. B. Vincent Davis, Jr. of the University of Kentucky replaced Betty Glad as the American Political Science Association representative in the fall 1994. The authors would like to express their thanks to him for his editorial suggestions on this work.

3. Boren and Pell (1990) also lent their support to reform with an article in the *Boston Globe*.

4. Those agencies were the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), the National Ar-

chives (NARA), the Agency for International Development (AID), the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (ACDA), and the Department of Commerce.

5. Various drafts of the the proposed presidential directives, and HAC's and Kimball's letters on the subject are on file with HAC's files in the Department of State.

References

- Boren, David, and Clairborne Pell. 1990. "Why U.S. Foreign Policy Records are 'a Fraud.'" *Boston Globe*, May 27. Reproduced in *Congressional Record—Senate* 19 October 1990, pp. S16299–S16301.
- Bush, George. 1991. "Statement by the President," 28 Oct.
- Cohen, Warren. 1989. "Report of the Advisory Committee on Historical Diplomatic Documentation March 1989." Copy in *SHAFR Newsletter*.
- . 1990a. "At the State Department, Historygate," *New York Times* 8 May.
- . 1990b. "Gaps in the Record: How State has Allowed History to be Incomplete." *Foreign Service Journal* 67(8): 27–9.
- . 1990c. "Stop Falsifying U.S. History," *World Monitor* 3(10):14–17.
- . 1994a. Telephone Interview with Jonathan Smith, 21 November 1994.
- . 1994b. "Secret Records Feed Mistrust," *Christian Science Monitor* 17 November: 11.
- Dewar, Helen. 1990. "Senate Panel's Quest: Filling Gaps in History of Foreign Relations," *Washington Post* 11 June: A13.
- Edel, Wilbur. 1991–1992. "Diplomatic History—State Department Style," *Political Science Quarterly* 106 (Winter): 695–712.
- Eisenhower, Dwight D. 1963. *Mandate for Change, 1953–1961*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Flowerree, Charles, et al. (several members of State/HDR), 1990. "History With Integrity." *Foreign Service Journal* 67(11): 4–6.
- Jehl, Douglas. 1995. "Clinton Revamps Policy on Secrecy of U.S. Documents," *New York Times* 18 April: A1.
- Kamen, Al. 1990. "Historians Say Secrecy Distorts Foreign Policy Chronicle," *Washington Post* 16 April: A13.
- Kimball, Warren. 1992. "Report of the Advisory Committee on Historical Diplomatic Documentation for the Period October 1990–November 1991, HAC Files, Department of State.
- . 1993. "Report of the Advisory Committee on Historical Diplomatic Documentation for the Period December 1991–December 1992." HAC Files, Department of State.
- . 1994a. "Report of the Advisory Committee on Historical Diplomatic Documentation for the Period January 1993–June 1994." Copy in *SHAFR Newsletter*, December.
- . 1994b. "Letter to Warren Christopher, 1 July." Copy in *SHAFR Newsletter*, December, pp. 26–27.
- . 1994c. Telephone Interview with Jonathan Smith, 14 December 1994.
- Kuniholm, Bruce. 1990. "Foreign Relations, Public Relations, Accountability and Understanding." *Perspectives* 28 (May/June).
- LaFantasie, Glenn, ed. 1994a. *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1958–1960*, vol. XVII *Indonesia*. Washington: Department of State, Government Printing Office.
- . 1994b. *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1958–1960*, vol. XVIII *Japan and Korea*. Washington: Department of State, Government Printing Office.
- . 1995. *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1961–1963*, vol. IX *Foreign Economic Policy*. Washington: Department of State, Government Printing Office.
- Miller, Page P. 1991. "The Integrity of the US Department of State Historical Series Is at Stake." *Government Publications Review* 18.
- . 1994. Telephone Interview with Jonathan Smith, 15 October 1994.
- New York Times*. 1990. Editorial, "History Bleached at State" 16 May: A26.
- Relyea, Harold C. 1992. *The Evolution of Government Information Security Policy: A Brief Overview (1972–1992)*. Washington: Congressional Research Service.
- Roosevelt, Kermit. 1979. *Countercoup, The Struggle for Control of Iran*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Smith, Jonathan. 1995. "Insider and Outsider Strategies and the Passage of the Foreign Relations Act, Fiscal Years 1992 and 1993." Paper prepared for roundtable discussion at the annual meeting of the International Studies Association, Chicago.
- U.S. Department of State. 1994. *Charter of the Advisory Committee on Historical Diplomatic Documentation*, April.
- United States Congress. 1991. *Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1992 and 1993*, 22 USC 2651, 24 June.
- Winkler, Karen. 1990. "Historians Criticize State Department for 'Distortions' and 'Deletions' in Its Record of U.S. Foreign Policy." *Chronicle of Higher Education* 4 April: A6.

About the Authors

Betty Glad, the Olin D. Johnston Professor of Political Science at the University of South Carolina, served from 1990–94 on the Advisory Committee on Historic Diplomatic Documentation, U.S. Department of State. Her biographies of *Charles Hughes Evans, Key Pittman*, and *Jimmy Carter* draw heavily from the National Archives.

Jonathan Smith is a doctoral candidate in the Department of Government and International Studies at the University of South Carolina.

Update:

Following is an update of a table that appeared on page 80 in the March 1996 article by Arthur Miller, Charles Tien, and Andrew Peebler—"The American Political Science Review Hall of Fame."

TABLE 6
Professional Visibility Index* (1954-94)

Name	Publications	Citations	PVI
Riker, W.H.	16	3760	60.16
Dahl, R.	7	6238	43.66
Converse, P.E.	8	4773	38.19
Wildavsky, A.	5	7082	35.41
Axelrod, R.	5	5254	26.27
Miller, W.E.	12	2108	25.30
Deutsch, K.W.	5	4562	22.81
Russett, B.M.	8	2789	22.31
Jennings, M.K.	11	1995	21.95
Abramson, P.	11	1980	21.78
Brams, S.J.	11	1954	21.49
Miller, A.H.	10	2100	21.00
Fiorina, M.P.	7	2936	20.55
Inglehart, R.	7	2639	18.47
Lowi, T.	5	3587	17.93
Dawes, R.M.	5	3561	17.81
Shepsle, K.A.	10	1757	17.57
Wolfinger, R.E.	10	1526	15.26
Przeworski, A.	5	2885	14.42
Muller, E.N.	14	968	13.55
Lane, R.E.	6	2194	13.16
Epstein, L.D.	7	1814	12.70
Aldrich, J.H.	7	1680	11.76
Ferejohn, J.	9	1279	11.51
Sullivan, J.L.	6	1796	10.78
Erikson, R.S.	10	1042	10.42
Greenstein, F.I.	5	2050	10.25
Eulau, H.	5	2026	10.13
Walker, J.L.	6	1682	10.09
McClosky, H.	5	1893	9.47
Bueno de Mesquita, B.	8	1171	9.37
Grofman, B.N.	8	1150	9.20
Powell, R.	7	1271	8.89
Ostrom, C.W., Jr.	8	1028	8.23
Page, B.I.	6	1350	8.10
Hibbs, D.A., Jr.	5	1607	8.03
Ordeshook, P.C.	14	515	7.21

TABLE 6 continued
Professional Visibility Index* (1954-94)

Name	Publications	Citations	PVI
Niemi, R.G.	11	638	7.02
Gibson, J.L.	6	1091	6.54
Moe, T.M.	6	1062	6.37
Merelman, R.M.	7	890	6.23
Stokes, D.E.	6	990	5.94
Rothman, S.	5	1098	5.49
Markus, G.B.	5	935	4.67
Aberbach, J.D.	5	922	4.61
Wolin, S.S.	5	901	4.51
Jackson, J.E.	5	878	4.39
Wright, G.C., Jr.	5	850	4.25
Stimson, J.A.	6	686	4.11
Rae, D.W.	5	781	3.90
Orbell, J.M.	8	481	3.85
Beck, P.A.	5	726	3.63
Midlarsky, M.I.	5	717	3.58
Caldeira, G.A.	7	505	3.54
Searing, D.D.	8	412	3.29
Rosenthal, H.	8	411	3.29
Austen-Smith, D.	6	450	2.70
Lodge, M.	5	523	2.62
Norpoth, H.	5	453	2.27
Mackuen, M.B.	7	297	2.08
Bendor, J.	6	323	1.94
Silver, B.D.	6	323	1.94
Hinich, M.J.	5	334	1.67
Schubert, G.A.	6	274	1.64
Keech, W.R.	5	324	1.62
Feld, S.L.	5	313	1.57
Fellman, D.	9	172	1.55
Oppenheim, F.E.	5	287	1.44
Gunnell, J.G.	6	210	1.26
Wallerstein, M.	5	173	0.87
Oppenheimer, J.A.	6	82	0.49
Black, G.S.	5	84	0.42
Rusk, J.G.	5	65	0.32

*PVI = (Publications * Citations)/1000