Abstract

As the field of International Relations has become increasingly quantitative, one way that graduate students can set themselves apart is by constructing original datasets on previously neglected topics. Yet, graduate programs provide little training in this respect. This case study gives an account of my effort to pursue such a project, with the goal of sharing practical tips and lessons learned. During 2008–2012, I completed a doctoral dissertation on U.S. military basing abroad. The centerpiece of this project was an original, comprehensive dataset on U.S. basing negotiations and agreements during 1939–1971. I constructed this dataset from more than 25,000 primary documents from the U.S. State Department, most of which were archival records. The State Department archives represented an incredibly rich but largely untapped resource for International Relations students interested in doing cutting-edge quantitative research using original, fine-grained data. This case study will help such students better understand the promise and the pitfalls of pursuing this type of project. Success requires mastering two practical problems: time management and information overload. These can be handled with careful planning, tactical flexibility, creative framing, and perseverance.

Learning Outcomes

By the end of this case, students should be able to

- Discuss how to use historical documents for constructing an original dataset
- Describe the availability of U.S. State Department records
- Identify time management techniques for conducting archival research
- Develop practical strategies for handling information overload

Project Overview and Context

In December 2008, I defended a doctoral dissertation prospectus on the negotiation and design of U.S. military basing agreements abroad. I chose this topic for several reasons. Overseas basing is a prominent and controversial foreign policy activity with historical and contemporary relevance that speaks to broad theoretical issues in the field of international security. Yet, empirically, little was known about basing relationships generally because previous scholarship was limited to qualitative studies of U.S. relations with only a handful of major allies. And though theorizing about how countries design cooperative agreements was in vogue among International Relations (IR) scholars at that time, very few datasets existed for evaluating such arguments quantitatively. In view of all that, my prospectus laid out a plan to build an original dataset capturing all instances of U.S. basing negotiations during 1940–2001 and cataloging variation in the design of basing agreements. My goal was to use this dataset for conducting statistical tests of different theories of international security cooperation.
Building that dataset proved daunting—and ultimately unmanageable, because I wanted to complete my PhD and get an academic job in a reasonable timeframe. Nearly 4 years later, I defended a dissertation on secrecy and U.S. basing. This project centered on an original dataset, but not the one I originally proposed. It covered the period 1939–1971 rather than 1940–2001. It was comprehensive to a degree, capturing all instances of new negotiations and agreements for U.S. base rights, but setting aside cases of renegotiated relationships. And it cataloged only one design feature (secrecy) rather than all of them. I have since published two peer-reviewed articles from this project and landed a tenure-track professorship with a job talk based on this research. So all ended well, just not as originally proposed.

IR research has become increasingly quantitative. One way for young IR scholars to make their mark is to construct original datasets on previously neglected topics. Yet graduate programs provide little, if any, training in this respect. This case study gives an account of my effort to pursue such a project, with the goal of sharing practical tips and some lessons learned. Specifically, this case study explores my experience researching primary records from the U.S. State Department, with a particular focus on archival materials. These records remain a largely untapped resource for IR students interested in designing and conducting quantitative research. This case study will help such students better understand the promise and the pitfalls of pursuing this type of project.

Practicalities of Research Design

When constructing an original dataset from historical documents, it is essential to be clear from the outset on exactly what types of cases will be included and excluded, and exactly how you will identify them. It took me several months—and much trial and error—to fully appreciate and address the minutiae of this initial phase. Simply put, large datasets are built on small details. Figuring this out ahead of time will spare you a lot of grief.

Develop Clear Scope Conditions

The United States conducts myriad military activities abroad, so the first step in designing my project was defining “negotiations and agreements for foreign military basing” in a clear, accurate, and manageable way. An extensive literature review yielded the following definitions.

- Foreign military basing is a cooperative security relationship where one country (the sending state) is granted privileges to station its military personnel at installations on another country’s territory (the host state).
- An installation is any real-property entity at a fixed land location used to launch or support military activities by foreign forces.

To avoid practical problems of data collection and cross-case comparability, I eventually decided to exclude several types of foreign military presence. These included the following:
Privileges of military overflight, air transit, en route access, ad hoc staging, or technical stop;
Naval port calls;
Use of offshore anchorages within sovereign maritime limits;
Military missions (i.e., small groups of military advisors);
Pre-positioned materiel, fuel depots, or pipelines;
Weapon systems (i.e., missiles);
Training exercises, maneuvers, or weapon testing;
Technical platforms for intelligence gathering and communications.

These are important types of military cooperation, but I concluded that the access privileges they entail differ markedly from those encompassed by hosting foreign troops at fixed installations. Conceptual issues aside, I also quickly realized that gathering comprehensive data on all of these activities was simply impractical.

For example, the Swedish government allowed the U.S. military to use a secret flight path over southwestern Sweden during the 1950s. Though interesting, I decided to exclude this case because the United States sought only to use Swedish airspace. However, I did include negotiations with Norway during the same period because the United States sought to deploy troops at Norwegian airfields. Thus, it became clear to me over time that what mattered for purposes of inclusion in my dataset was that the United States specifically requested rights to station its military personnel at fixed installations on the host’s territory.

Another important scope restriction concerned the installations themselves. While operating overseas bases is a military activity overseen by the Defense Department, negotiating the agreements that grant and govern base access is a diplomatic affair managed by the State Department. I was most interested in the latter activity, so I decided to exclude all instances where bases developed organically during the course of fighting a war rather than from a specific proposal to enter into a basing relationship. This scope condition was crucial for practical purposes because the United States constructed innumerable operational bases during World War II.

**Bottom line:** if you want to build a comprehensive dataset, the first thing you need to do—ironically—is carefully limit the scope of your topic.

**Specify Clear Observable Implications**

Once you have defined the scope conditions of your data collection, the next step is to specify the units of analysis that you will use to organize the dataset. The observational referents for U.S. basing proposals, host acceptances or rejections, and final agreements were relatively intuitive and straightforward. I simply needed to identify written requests and responses for negotiations and then locate the existence and text of any final signed document containing terms of cooperation.

Rounds of talks, however, proved more difficult to classify. In fact, I discovered that IR scholars had yet to clearly conceptualize “negotiation round,” instead using the term loosely in four ways:
• Treat each meeting as a round of talks.
  • As each case of negotiations can involve hundreds of meetings, this conceptualization risked artificially inflating the number of observations in the dataset (e.g., Shellman, 2004).
• Group meetings covering individual issues as separate rounds.
  • As each meeting can encompass multiple issues at a time—that may be tabled, withdrawn, or reopened at any point—this conceptualization raised concerns about the independence of observations in the dataset.
• Treat each iteration of the proposal/counterproposal process as a round of talks.
  • As any given meeting can involve multiple proposals and counterproposals on separate issues, this option raised all of the previous concerns.
• Separate negotiation rounds by identifiable beginning and end points or periods of inactivity/impasse lasting at least 1 month.
  • I used this option because it offered the most operationally feasible and substantively meaningful conceptualization of a negotiation round for studying a large number of cases.

Consider, for example, U.S. basing negotiations with Norway during 1951–1952, where rounds were easily separated by beginning and end points:

  • Round 1: On 27 August 1951, the American Embassy in Oslo sent a telegram to State Department headquarters in Washington, DC, indicating the first meeting of basing talks was held that morning. After 12 meetings, a memorandum of conversation was signed on 20 December 1951, adjourning the talks until further notice.
  • Round 2: On 24 July 1952, Norwegian negotiations presented a revised draft of the proposed agreement. After nine meetings, an aide-memoire was signed on 17 October 1952, granting secret airbase rights.

Bottom line: Building a dataset from primary records requires translating thousands of documents into singular data points that sit at the intersection of rows and columns in a spreadsheet. Without a precise sense of what each row and column captures—and how each relates to all the others—your carefully gathered data can quickly become an unwieldy jumble of 0s and 1s.

Doing the Research

Many State Department records are readily available through your local university library or online, but the vast majority of material is available only through direct archival research. I spent 17 months (January 2009—May 2010) doing preliminary research in published primary documents and secondary scholarship related to U.S. basing. I then completed 4 months (June–September 2010) of full-time archival research.

Getting Started
The State Department’s Office of the Historian produces the *Foreign Relations of the United States (FRUS)* series, which presents the official documentary record of U.S. diplomacy since 1861. This collection offers a carefully edited snapshot of primary documents for key events rather than a complete picture of U.S. foreign policy. Nevertheless, it is the essential starting point for research in State Department records.

The State Department also has published collections of U.S. treaties and international agreements since 1776. These include the *Treaties and Other International Agreements of the United States of America, 1776–1949* series; the *U.S. Treaty Series* covering 1902–1944; the *Executive Agreement Series* covering 1929–1946; the *U.S. Treaties and International Agreements* series covering 1950–1984; and the *TIAS Agreements* series covering 1982–2017. These collections contain full texts of many, but certainly not all, U.S. agreements with other countries. For instance, you will not find any secret agreements.

**Going Deeper**

Original State Department records are housed at the National Archives and Records Administration building in College Park, Maryland. This facility is known informally as Archives II to distinguish it from the National Archives building in downtown Washington, DC. State Department records at Archives II fall into four categories: Central Files (RG 59), Lot Files (RG 59), Foreign Service Post Files (RG 84), and Specialized Files (RGs 43, 76, and 353). I dealt extensively with the Central Files and the Foreign Service Post files, so I will limit my overview to these.

The Central Files are the largest and most inclusive set of records on American foreign policy and should be the starting point for any archival research project. These files contain correspondence between the State Department headquarters in Washington, DC, American overseas posts, and other U.S. government departments, encompassing diplomatic notes, negotiation instructions, memoranda, and myriad-related documentation. Archives II holds central files for five chronological periods covering 1789–1979, each with its own record-keeping system. Navigating these different classification systems is daunting at first, but they do facilitate precise record searches once you get a handle of the different organizational schemes. Detailed filing manuals contain all the information and can be viewed online prior to your research trip or onsite in the Research Consultation Room. All central files since 1980 remain at the State Department, accessible only through Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests.

The Foreign Service Post Files contain records originally held at American embassies, legations, and consulates overseas. Some material duplicates the central files, but the post files also contain unique documentation that captures local dynamics. Archives II holds post files for 1789–1980. For a few of these years, the classification schemes used to organize the post files closely resemble the ones used for the central files. But for most years, a variety of unique classification schemes were employed. Reviewing these records can be cumbersome for that reason, but detailed filing manuals are available online and onsite to help locate materials.
Practicalities of Archival Research

Archival research is an intensive endeavor under any circumstance, but reviewing records on hundreds of countries for a 60-year period takes matters to a different level. In my experience, the various practicalities of archival research can be distilled into a single issue: time management.

Prepare Thoroughly

Preparation is vital. Archivists are experts at navigating their records, and they will help point you in the right direction. But they expect you to be the expert on your research. And no amount of directional guidance from an archivist can compensate for an unclear sense of the specific material you want to find. Despite arriving at the archives with hundreds of pages of notes, I was overwhelmed by the scale of original records available to review. It is very easy to get lost if you lack a firm grasp of your research target.

In this respect, it would have been wise to devote a few weeks ahead of time to gaining familiarity with the State Department’s various classification schemes and finding manuals. It simply never occurred to me that I could or should study those materials before going to the archives. Luckily, once there, archivists can help you master those details, but it still took me several weeks to get comfortable identifying and requesting records—time that could have been used much more effectively, had I prepared a bit more thoroughly.

Wait Productively

Once you have identified specific records, you may not be able to view them all at once. Researchers can request and hold a limited amount of material at one time for five reasons:

- **Pull times:** Record retrievals at Archives II occur only six times each weekday. During these “pull times,” you can request up to 16 boxes from the same record group and stack area.
- **Hold limits:** Across these pull times, you can hold a maximum of two “cart pulls” up to 16 boxes each and one “shelf pull” up to three boxes. But you can access only one of these pulls at a time.
- **Refiling deadlines:** You cannot hold records indefinitely. Any records not accessed for three consecutive days get refilled automatically, and all records have to be refilled after 30 days. If you are not finished using these records, you must submit a new pull request.
- **Other researchers:** When someone else has pulled the records you want, all you can do is wait for the records to be refilled—and hope that it does not take too long.
- **Access restrictions:** You may encounter classified documents. Sometimes these can be cleared within a few weeks. Other times you may need to submit an FOIA request, which can take years to fill.

By the time I finished my research at Archives II, I was managing this process like a carefully choreographed dance. But during the first month, these procedures and contingencies were sources of much angst and
frustration. On more than one occasion, I had records refiled due to the 3-day rule—because I was too busy working on other records and simply forgot. And by the end of my first month, I was working intensely on two full cart pulls, only to be informed that I had to refile them in accordance with the 30-day rule. Requesting a second pull can be a hassle because it requires remembering all the details from the first pull request and then getting the records back can take at least a day or two.

When you learn that another researcher has the records you want, a sense of dread inevitably follows. Perhaps someone else is doing the same project and will finish before you. Perhaps they will not return the records in time for you to access them, thus leaving a gaping hole in your otherwise comprehensive dataset. Neither doomsday scenario turned out to be true for me, but the anxiety was real enough.

I also encountered a few classification restrictions, raising similar concerns. I found two practical workarounds. First, I came across only a few instances of classified records prior to 1971, but quickly noticed that larger amounts of records were unavailable following that year. I could file FOIA requests for those records, but there was no guarantee I would gain access. After a week of nervous contemplation, it dawned on me that I could simply end my data collection in 1971, on the justifiable grounds that I could confidently collect comprehensive data up to that point but not afterward. That still gave me 32 years of data. It proved to be enough, but it was only half of what I initially proposed.

Second, I had to file only two FOIA requests, in July and August 2010, for the Central File records on U.S.–Norway negotiations during the 1950s. I had no sense of how long the FOIA process would take. But shortly after filing, I stumbled upon all of the U.S.–Norway documentation when doing research in the Foreign Service Post Files for the American Embassy in Paris, France. Why? Because Norway and France were members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), and NATO Headquarters were located in Paris at that time. Accordingly, the American Embassy in Paris was copied on all U.S.–Norway negotiation records. I was lucky to discover these parallel files because my FOIA requests were not filled until October and November 2013—more than 3 years later!

*Bottom line:* Contrary to the popular image of archival research as a sedentary endeavor, success in this line of work requires perpetual motion. You need to keep things moving by continuously pulling and reviewing records. That way, anytime you are forced to wait on records, for any reason, there is some other set of records already waiting on you.

**Copy With Abandon**

After 4 months of full-time work, I left Archives II with digital scans of more than 17,000 documents. And that was only a fraction of the material I reviewed. For any archival research project, but especially one that covers hundreds of countries over several decades, it is not practicable to study the documents carefully as you go through them.

Unless you happen to live in close proximity to the archives, you will incur travel expenses every day you...
spend there. These quickly add up. Most recently, I spent 5 days at Archives II in May 2018, which cost a total of US$3,256.29. Fortunately, as a tenure-track faculty member, my department picked up this expense. But as a graduate student doing research for my dissertation in 2010, I had access to no such funds. I was lucky to have a few friends in College Park, Maryland, one of whom lived about a 5-min drive from Archives II and let me sleep on a couch in her basement for 4 months. Another friend lent me his 1994 Dodge Neon. It had a failing transmission, no right-turn indicator light, and an ant infestation under the passenger-side floorboard. But it got the job done every day. If you are not as lucky to have a local support network in the vicinity of the archives, the travel bill that accompanies your research trip will motivate you to cover as much ground as quickly as possible.

Handling the documents on site is also a cumbersome exercise. In the Research Room at Archives II, you can view only one document from one folder from one box from one pull at a time—and the document you are viewing must remain flat on the desk. You cannot pick it up, lean back, and casually reflect on its contents. If you do—and I did, once—you will soon hear from one of the supervisors who continuously pace the Research Room. And if something you are reading in one document happens to spark a connection with something you read in another document a while back, you are more likely to forget than to follow up on that insight in the time it takes to reaccess those previously held records.

Rather than closely studying the documents at the archives, you need to copy them for later review at home. At the time of my dissertation project, using a camera mounted on a tripod was the fastest way to do this. With some practice, you can photograph about 40 pages a minute. As I was collecting material on hundreds of countries over many decades, I needed to keep the documents organized by host country as I went through them. I found that using a flatbed scanner connected to my laptop enabled me to efficiently organize images of different documents—along with their full location information (box number, stack area, etc.)—electronically in country folders. This took more time than using a camera, but it was a worthwhile investment. During my most recent trip to Archives II, however, I used a smartphone to photograph relevant documents. I was able to copy almost 60 pages a minute, which enabled me to cover much more ground than would have been possible using a scanner. I left with 4,191 images after only 5 days of research.

Bottom line: You will not have time to copy everything, but you should try to copy anything that appears even remotely relevant. You do not want to get home, start reviewing the material, and find that your copying was too selective. I did this for a few cases and came to regret it.

Pitfall and Lessons Learned

Before arriving at Archives II, I did not know what to expect about the quantity, quality, and detail of available records on basing. It seemed possible that I might find too little substantive material for constructing a dataset. As it turns out, though, I had to grapple with the opposite problem: information overload. The State Department keeps track of seemingly everything that happens in the world, often in minute detail. This is what makes the State Department archives a fantastic resource for IR students. But this depth and richness also
gave rise to three pitfalls that I had to address during and after my research.

**Tactical Flexibility**

I originally planned to build a dataset that captured all instances of U.S. basing negotiations and that cataloged all possible design features for basing agreements. Five weeks of full-time archival research disabused me of the fanciful notion that I might build a truly comprehensive dataset of negotiations. By that point, I had managed only to scratch the surface, perhaps covering about 15% of possible cases. I distinctly remember one afternoon in early July 2010 when I realized that researching all negotiations and renegotiations of the long-standing U.S.–Saudi Arabia basing relationship alone would take about 6 weeks to complete.

At the start of my project, I set aside 4 months for archival research. It was not practical to extend this timeframe, so I confronted two possible paths forward. I could abandon the goal of building a comprehensive dataset, focusing instead on just a handful of cases. But doing that would have completely undermined the project. So, instead, I decided to reframe the “comprehensiveness” of my dataset. Based on the rate of my archival research to that point, it seemed plausible that I could review the records for all instances of negotiations and agreements for base rights on foreign territory where the United States did not already possess such privileges. This approach enabled me to set aside all renegotiations of existing relationships, which otherwise would have quadrupled the number of cases in the dataset and the number of months spent at the archives. There were justifiable conceptual grounds for dropping these cases, but the real reason for doing so was purely practical.

Once I completed my archival research and started reviewing all the scanned materials, I similarly was disabused of the other fanciful notion that I might catalog all possible design features of basing agreements. My original dissertation prospectus included a 21-page codebook specifying measurements for 93 design variables, such as duration, territorial applicability, and so on. Coding this many design features for more than 100 agreements proved impracticable for two reasons.

The first, as always, was time constraints. Carefully working through the full codebook for a single agreement required about a week, sometimes longer. That meant I was facing approximately 2 years of work just to code the agreements, not to mention the various negotiation rounds. Instead of coding all possible design features, I decided to catalog just one: secrecy. This decision was monumental for time-management purposes and enabled me to complete my dissertation by the scheduled deadline of summer 2012.

The second reason was resource constraints. When you code variables based on textual analysis, the issue of reliability becomes a concern as more interpretation is required. Reliability captures the extent that a particular measurement generates the same result when repeated (Shively, 2005, p. 45). Measurements that require subjective interpretation of evidence are more likely to be unreliable because different coders might analyze the material differently. This can cast doubt on the usefulness of a dataset, so ensuring intercoder reliability is essential. But it is also expensive. You will need to hire, train, and pay at least two
additional coders who will separately review all of the material. Most graduate students—and many faculty members—lack the financial resources to do this.

Determining whether reliability is a concern—and whether hiring additional coders is necessary—often hinges on two characteristics of the variables being coded: distinguishability and observability. Less interpretation is needed as the object being identified becomes more easily distinguishable within the body of evidence and when the variable being coded is directly observable rather than latent (Rothman, 2007, pp. 438–440). Descriptive objects generally have high levels of distinguishability and observability, especially when compared to inferential objects that capture “intentions and impacts that confer meaning” (Druckman, 2005, p. 258).

I chose to measure “secrecy” in terms of officials’ public acknowledgment of basing negotiations and agreements. This measurement strategy had the benefit of being descriptive and directly observable, thus requiring little interpretation. After all, determining whether a country publicly acknowledges the occurrence of negotiations is a straightforward matter: officials either acknowledge whether negotiations are taking place—by issuing a public statement—or they do not. No interpretation of intentions or impact is required to identify this basic act of acknowledgment. That enabled me to avoid the impossible expense of hiring additional coders.

Multiple Historical Records

Given the scale of material available in State Department archives, I felt confident in the thoroughness of my research. But this reliance on U.S. primary sources left my project open to a charge commonly leveled against American diplomatic historians: it only captured the “view from Washington” (e.g., Marks, 1988). This is a valid criticism, and it could have been a major weak spot in my project, especially if my dataset had hinged on weighing subtle perceptual differences across countries. I was not able to visit foreign archives for obvious reasons concerning time, money, and language constraints. But I was able to dodge this problem in three ways.

Upon reflection, it did not seem overly problematic to rely on American documents for identifying the basic population and general contours of cases. After all, the dates associated with key events—like U.S. basing proposals, host acceptances or rejections, the beginning and end of negotiation rounds, the signing of agreements, and the issuing of public statements—were not likely to vary dramatically in the official accounts kept by host countries. I also concluded that even the coding of more substantive details like negotiation demands could be accomplished with a reasonable degree of accuracy because State Department archives contain myriad translated documents—like position papers and draft agreements—written and presented by foreign officials. Finally, I read extensively in secondary historical scholarship by host-state nationals who drew material from foreign archives.

Getting Lost in the Weeds
One of the most memorable—and devastating—moments of my dissertation project came shortly after compiling the first full draft of my new dataset. I walked into my advisor’s office with a sense of true accomplishment, and he asked me one question, “What’s your theory?” For a moment, I felt as if all the oxygen had been sucked out of the room. I had a dataset, but not a response to that question. I thought the data collection effort would speak for itself. It didn’t.

IR is a theory-oriented discipline, where the goal of empirical analysis is to test generalizable hypotheses. I completely lost sight of this fact after 2 years of primary-source research. I was immersed in the details of U.S. basing relationships and could rattle off rich historical examples to satisfy any passing curiosity expressed by fellow graduate students. But I did not have a general argument about basing relationships—and thus did not have a theory to test with my new dataset.

Focusing the project on secrecy helped with this problem, but I still needed something to say about secrecy that was theoretically interesting. Going into this project, I expected that building the dataset would be the biggest hurdle—and it was a big hurdle. But after spending so much time in the details of individual cases and the rigors of dataset construction, developing a theory to evaluate with that dataset proved equally daunting. Indeed, surprisingly, the theoretical side of this project received the lion’s share of attention at my dissertation defense, and it was the principal source of anxiety during the subsequent review process at academic journals.

Don’t get me wrong: everyone was impressed by the dataset. My experience doing archival research, in particular, was an especially popular topic during academic job interviews. But in the end, these aspects of the project often were seen as little more than window dressing in the absence of a corresponding theory. So if you pursue this type of project, try not to lose sight of the forest for the trees.

Conclusion

Good quantitative analysis rests in part on good qualitative analysis. Say that to most IR scholars and graduate students, and you are likely to get puzzled looks and a few scoffs. Rigorous statistical techniques can provide important insights into world politics by identifying patterns and relationships among data points. But if the data are bad, the insights will be too. Primary records from the U.S. State Department, particularly archival materials, represent an incredibly rich resource for IR students interested in doing cutting-edge quantitative research using original, fine-grained datasets. Pursuing that type of project holds great promise and great peril. Pitfalls lie at every step along the way. Successfully avoiding them requires mastering two practical problems: time management and information overload. These can be handled with careful planning, tactical flexibility, creative framing, and perseverance. And they are worth handling, because there is no substitute for the experiences gained from this type of research: from holding an original document signed by the likes of Franklin Roosevelt or identifying cases you have never seen referenced—or from being the first to piece it all together.
Exercises and Discussion Questions

1. Identify a research topic on foreign policy. How would you define that topic to measure it reliably across different cases or over time?

2. Locate a document in the *Foreign Relations of the United States* series that pertains to a research topic of interest to you. (You can conduct online searches within select *FRUS* volumes at: https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments.)

3. Using the online filing manuals for the State Department Central Files at the National Archives, identify a relevant category of records for a research topic of interest to you. (You can access State Department archival filing manuals online at: https://www.archives.gov/research/foreign-policy/state-dept/rg-59-central-files.)

4. Visit the State Department’s FOIA website at: https://foia.state.gov/Request/Guide.aspx. What types of records are available without an FOIA request? What types are exempt or excluded from FOIA? Where and how do you make an FOIA request?

Further Reading


Web Resources

Department of State, Office of the Historian: https://history.state.gov/

Department of State, Freedom of Information Act: https://foia.state.gov/#3

National Archives and Records Administration, Department of State Records: https://www.archives.gov/
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