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In the midst of an extraordinary primary election season for the American presidency, we are excited to give you the Spring/Summer 2016 issue of The PEP Report.

We get a unique perspective on the Iowa Caucus from a political scientist, Dave Andersen of Iowa State University. As a proud lifelong resident of New Jersey, Andersen was skeptical of the celebrated “first in the nation” caucus. Now, he’s a convert. He argues that Iowans take their role earnestly as they respectfully interrogate candidates in search of the ever elusive trait of authenticity.

A once in a lifetime opportunity to interview President Bill Clinton informs Michael Genovese’s thoughtful exercise on questioning presidents. He challenges all PEP scholars to think about questions that probe for thoughtful responses rather than provoke gotcha moments for cable news fodder.

This issue’s symposium on George C. Edwards III was conceived at a panel at the Southern Political Science Association in Puerto Rico. Justin Vaughn, former editor of this newsletter, assembled some of the leading scholars of the American presidency to reflect on the quantitative and substantive contributions of George Edwards to the PEP subfield. We are honored that an admirable group of PEP scholars contributed to this issue.

We welcome and strongly encourage suggestions for future issues. Please contact us at PEPReportAPSA@gmail.com

Here’s to a safe, enjoyable, and productive summer!

The PEP Report Editors
Mark Major
(with Ian Ostrander and Anne Pluta)
An Outsider’s Inside View of the Iowa Caucuses

David J. Andersen
Iowa State University

Every four years the state of Iowa leads off the presidential primary season by voting in its famed “First in the Nation” caucuses. And every four years academics, journalists, and citizens question whether Iowa is a suitable candidate to start the primary election season. As a lifelong New Jerseyan, I joined this oppositional view, and favored a different system – whether regional primaries, a rotating first state, or, well, anything else. Then, three years ago I moved from New Jersey to Iowa, providing me an inside view of the state’s role in the nominating process and forcing me to see the caucuses in a new light. What I have seen, and will discuss here, are the reasons for changing my mind.

Starting in summer 2015, I started seeing campaign material appear throughout Ames, where I now live, and began hearing about events as candidates began “making the rounds.” It started with a smattering of lawn signs, and grew into almost daily mailers and canvassers from the respective candidates. The canvassers in particular were fun (for a political scientist), because they would avidly and actively try to solicit my support while I played dumb about American politics. (Yes, this is how political scientists have fun in Iowa.)

The real energy of the campaigns, however, are the candidate visits. The candidates don’t quite swarm like flies, but they do travel all over the state doing as many events as they can before returning home to their day jobs (assuming they have one). Most of this I expected, and found enjoyable. I was even shocked to hear people say things like, “Oh, I’m not going to the XXXX event tomorrow. S/He is all the way on the other side of town (a 5-minute drive). I’ll wait until he does something closer to home.” Candidates do so
many events throughout the state that voters can pick and choose which to attend based upon convenience, because honestly, we know they’ll be back.

I was impressed at the seriousness that most Iowans approach the process and the candidates. Being from New Jersey, I had never seen a presidential candidate campaign in my state, and certainly would never expect to talk to one of them directly. But in Iowa that seems to be treated as standard practice. Beyond being able to see the candidates, many Iowans feel that it is their responsibility to personally talk to them. It is as if each Iowan plays an important function in vetting the candidates and making sure that we don’t let any sick chickens escape out into the yard.

Whereas I had previously viewed candidates as spectacles to see, or campaign events as political events to witness, I discovered that Iowans treat the campaigns with earnestness. Few Iowans are impressed with the candidates (at least not simply because they are potentially the next president), or awed by their presence. To Iowans, candidates are just people seeking a job, and these candidates have to evaluated and grilled to make sure they can hack it. The candidates come to Iowa to solicit votes, but they certainly don’t find Iowans wearing those votes on their sleeves. Votes are closely guarded awards that must be earned through effort and authenticity.

Some of my previous disdain towards the Iowa caucuses was created by a sense of the unfairness of the process – whereby a small sliver of an unrepresentative state got to anoint the frontrunners in the presidential nomination contests. I didn’t feel that Iowa, with its homogenous white, agricultural population, was a fair choice to make such an important early decision. But in all my time talking to Iowans, attending events and reading local newspapers, I rarely encountered voters who advocated for a particular candidate because of specific issue stances. Almost always, the vote decision hinged upon character and a “presidential demeanor.”
This seemed odd to me, because I had thought that presidential nominees gained support here in Iowa by supporting ethanol, glorifying pork, and declaring homage to egg production (three of the largest agricultural products of Iowa). But then I discovered that agriculture represents only about 3% of the Iowa economy, and that, while many Iowans have some connection to farming one way or another, they don’t treat farming issues as litmus tests.

They are important, sure, but when you have seen seven candidates talk about how much they admire pigs, you really stop caring so much. Yes, Iowans do care about pork production, but they are also smart enough to realize that pork requires consumers, and consumers need jobs, and that presidents affect a much bigger world than Iowa. And besides, within the parties, how much variance is there in what candidates advocate? Much more important, when you see them talking, is how candidates advocate for what they purport to believe.

The real beauty of the caucus system, as I saw it, was in watching people grill candidates about what they really believed, and what they truly cared about. Sound bites don’t cut it at town halls in Iowa, because the crowd has already been to six other events, have already seen the commercials, and most have been attending events like this for decades now. Regurgitating your prepared statement is nice, but people want to hear what you really think, in your own words. What Iowans want to hear is who you are, what you stand for, and how you propose to govern. This is well beyond the starry-eyed crowd goers I expected, and typically resembled much more of a thesis defense than a political rally. Sure, people grant a certain amount of deference and respect to the candidate. But they better answer the questions.

I attribute this to the seriousness that Iowans take towards the process. It sounds cheesy to say, but the Iowans I met at campaign events typically cared a great deal about the
role Iowans played in the nomination process. It is a source of state pride that Iowa goes first, and the citizens of the state honor that by taking their roles to heart. People didn’t just attend the events of a preferred candidate, but typically go to many events, and often for candidates of both parties. They want to look at multiple candidates, use their responses against each other, and wear down each campaign until all that remains is a strong candidate, standing alone in front of a crowd.

The attention that going first brings to Iowans have molded the civic duty of the citizens into one where people feel it is their responsibility to go out and personally vet the candidates. The vetting process is not a passive one – where voters sit and listen to speeches – but is an active one – where individuals ask candidates direct and pointed questions. The expectation is that candidates answer directly and honestly, revealing a great deal about their temperament, character, and personality.

This is where I found votes to be won, in the personal interactions between candidates and voters. While the typical event began with a standard stump speech, they then transitioned into more open question-and-answer sessions. The candidates that were more comfortable in this setting (Bernie Sanders, Ted Cruz, Chris Christie and John Kasich come to mind) earned the respect of the crowd. Those who didn’t (Jeb Bush and Carly Fiorina stand out), made less of an impression.

Successful candidates in Iowa succeed not because of what they say, but for how they say it. Those candidates who can go off script, who can chat freely and casually, are the ones voters prefer. These candidates seem to convey a sense of authenticity that they truly believe in what they say, and thus don’t need to hide, constrain or prepare their statements. Words flow freely off their tongue, conferring a sense that this is a candidate who can be trusted to do what they say, and not just what their campaign manager tells them is focus-group tested.
This is not to say that issues don’t matter in Iowa, of course they do. And yes, the population here is very white and evangelical, and farming is a big deal here. All of that is true. But those things are not what make candidates do well in Iowa. The true value of the Iowa caucuses, and why I now support this state’s right to go first, is that the people of Iowa dedicate themselves to the process, taking pride in the campaigning process. Maybe other states could learn to do this too, but Iowa does it now.

Iowans weed out those candidates who just can’t handle the pressure, and reward those who can. The caucuses don’t always pick the eventual nominee, but have always picked that person as one of the top three finishers. And this is an extremely valuable function to have – that of weeding out candidates who just aren’t ready for the rigors, responsibilities, and difficulties of campaigning for the presidency.

Yes, the state does tend to elevate the prospects of Republican candidates who cater to Christian evangelicals, and Democrats who tend to be more liberal. But overall, the caucuses serve to eliminate those candidates who don’t “resonate” or don’t have “what it takes” to make a strong campaign. Unlike other states, where televised commercials play a dominant role, Iowa prides itself on retail politics and hard work. Iowans want to see that candidates are willing to put in the effort to meet the public, explain their views, and then do that over and over again for a sustained period of time. What better test of presidential ability is there?

Perhaps another state could go first, and could approach the process with similar energy and focus. But I would caution any state that wants to try it have huge shoes to fill.

Iowa truly does it well.
On May 7, 2016, President Bill Clinton delivered the commencement address at Loyola Marymount University (LMU). Clinton, a graduate of Georgetown University, another Jesuit University, received an honorary degree and he also celebrated the graduation of his nephew from LMU.

As part of the activities surrounding the former president’s visit, I was asked to conduct a thirty-minute interview with President Clinton that would become a part of a story in the university magazine, and would also be uploaded onto the website of the World Policy Institute at Loyola Marymount University, for which I serve as President. It was a great opportunity, spoiled by the fact that on Friday morning, just one day before the interview was to take place, the Clinton “people” informed me that due to a change in logistics (part of the reason was that Hillary Clinton too would be attending the ceremony), the interview was cancelled. Disappointed, yet armed with my already prepared interview questions, I wondered just how good (or bad) my questions were.

How many times have we as presidency scholars turned to the television and said (or screamed) at the debate moderator or interviewer, “That is the dumbest question I’ve ever heard,” or “What a softball,” or “This guy (woman) is a total idiot. I’d ask better questions than that!”? Well, now I had my chance. It was a wonderful opportunity, but also a bit nerve-wracking.

I sent an email to my departmental colleagues asking for help. What questions might they ask President Clinton? My departmental colleagues were of little help. The questions they submitted were almost all of the snarky variety. “How could you have been so
hostile to the LGBT community?” (that was a real question) or “NAFTA killed more American jobs than...”. Somehow I did not think snarkiness was the way to go. I sent a similar request to a few of my friends in PEP. My PEP colleagues were much more helpful, and I included two of their questions in my final list.

Mid-way through the question development process (less than one week) I was told I had to limit my questions to nine (I added my own follow-up questions to push that limit up a bit). Below are the final nine questions on my list for President Bill Clinton:

Q1: **Yours was an activist presidency, yet your two successors pushed the boundaries of the office much further, articulating claims of unilateral presidential powers that are constitutionally mind-boggling. How can succeeding presidents find the right balance between the exercise of legitimate power and the rule of law on the one hand, and the demands of governing in an age of terrorism on the other?**
   
   Follow-up Q: How tempted were you to use more executive orders in an effort to circumvent Congress and achieve policy goals?

Q2: **Are presidents the victims of history or are they the architects of history? Can presidents dominate their eras or must they adjust to the winds already blowing?**
   
   Follow-up Q: What are the conditions necessary for presidents to actually “lead”?

Q3: **Today we have an 18th Century Constitution, guiding a 21st Century Superpower. Have we outgrown our original Constitution and, in an age of terrorism and rapid change, how, if at all, would you change the Constitution?**
   
   Follow-up Q: I often refer to modern presidential power as a “Goldilocks Dilemma”: Presidential power is either “too hot” (war) or “too cold” (domestic and economic policy), we can’t seem to get it “just right.” Clearly Congress has demonstrated
that it cannot lead. Does that mean we are to alternate between deadlock on the one hand, and presidential domination on the other?

Q4: We live in an age of hyper-partisanship and political rancor. You faced that when you were president. President Obama came into office hoping to change that but has not succeeded. Is there a way to make our politics reflect the best in us rather than the worst?

Follow-up Q: Why is it easier to build fear instead of trust? Why do we have such a hard time pulling our oars in the same direction? And as President, how did you confront the high level of individualism in our society at the times we most needed to work together?

Q5: Are we entering a new Cold War with Russia? And how best can we deal with Mr. Putin?

Q6: When you were President, the media was pretty rough on you, but the Republicans were even rougher. How do you compare your treatment with the GOP’s treatment of President Obama, and in what way do you think race might have played a role in the criticism of him?

Q7: In what way do you think Pope Francis has changed the global conversation and influenced policy?

Q8: The Clinton Foundation created the “20/30 Program” which focuses on young professionals in their 20s and 30s who will be entering the leadership stream in business, government, and civil society. What piece of advice would you give young women and men as they step into public leadership positions for the first time?
Q9: Many political leaders as well as educators and businesspeople are promoting a greater educational focus on STEM courses in college. As important as such programs are, what do you see as the value of a liberal arts education, in general, and a Jesuit education – and you are the first president to have graduated from a Jesuit university - in particular, in a world of rapid change?

Just in case President Clinton’s responses were brief and we had more time (unlikely as that prospect was) I also had some backup questions I was prepared to ask the following questions:

Q: We are in the middle of a hotly contested presidential nomination battle for the presidency, and I wanted to ask you a question about process: What changes would you make in the way we select presidents especially concerning the role of money in the process, the length of time the race takes, and the current rules of engagement?

Q: Has American global leadership been good for America? And has it been good for the world?

Q: What is the endgame in our global struggle with terrorism?

Q: Should we close Guantanamo?

Q: You have said that one of your biggest regrets as President was not ordering humanitarian intervention in Rwanda. What is the standard or test for when to (and when not to) intervene in humanitarian crises?
This was a very useful intellectual exercise for me. So what would you ask the president? If the opportunity presented itself, what would you want to know? Go ahead, play the game, and I do hope you come up with great questions.

And by all means, do send them to me at: mgenovese@lmu.edu
This past January, during the SPSA meeting in Puerto Rico, a roomful of scholars gathered for a discussion of how presidency studies has evolved and, specifically, the role George C. Edwards III played (and continues to play) in shaping that evolution. Audience members were treated to thoughtful commentaries on the topic from august members of our field such as Will Howell, Karen Hult, and Rick Waterman.

As chair of the presidency and executive politics section of that meeting, and the individual who organized this particular discussion, I owe these participants a great deal of gratitude for not only their time but their intellectual energy. As one of George’s last graduate students, I have benefitted from not only his mentorship, but also a redirected generosity from colleagues who repaid their intellectual debt to George in part by showering others and myself with professional kindnesses. Without those kindnesses, I would not have been in a position to organize what I hope will go down in history as the San Juan Summit. Without the great fortune of having George as my teacher, mentor, and now friend, however, I would not be a political scientist at all.

As a result, the comments that follow are particularly meaningful for me, though even those few in the field who have not had the opportunity to interact with and learn from George much will find a great deal of valuable insight in them. This series of brief reflections starts with one from George himself, as he takes us on a first-person journey through the analytical revolution that he pioneered in the field of presidential studies, one that began while he was a graduate student at the University of Wisconsin and...
continued through his landmark study of presidential prestige and success in Congress that was published in the APSR in 1976 until today. His concluding observations should prove as profitable as they are astute for the younger generations of scholars who read them in this issue of the PEP Report.

Subsequent commentary by Karen, Rick, and Will underscores what George introduces. Karen traces the influence George’s work has had on existing work and goes on to suggest ways we can approach the future of presidential studies that reflect the rigor and discipline introduced by George decades ago. Rick celebrates the humane contributions George has made, acknowledge the number of members of our community he has mentored directly at Texas A&M University, and the dozens of others for whom he provided both individual support and an intellectual home at Presidential Studies Quarterly, which he resurrected and turned into the leading journal focused on executive politics. Finally, Will reinforces the effect George and others had on what precisely constituted presidency research, the affects of their intervention still seen today in the form of greater attention to conceptualization and measurement, theory-driven investigations of causal relationships, and an inescapable dedication to evidence and logic.

I expect that as you read these pieces, many of you will have your own recollections of both specific instances where George made an impact on your career and more general observations of how had he and others not taken the pioneering steps they did, your work today would be impossible.

I encourage you to share those observations, whether with me, with the PEP editors, with George, or perhaps best of all, with the students you now mentor.
One hundred and ten years ago, in the first article in the first issue of the *American Political Science Review*, A. Maurice Low criticized scholars who had complained of “executive usurpation” of power from Congress for “relying upon their rhetoric rather than their facts” (Low 1906). In fact, he argued, if there had been usurpation, it was on the part of the Senate, not the president. Thus the critics had not gotten their facts straight and completely missed the real pattern of behavior. More than a century later, political scientists are still exploring presidential leadership, yet for most of the decades since Low wrote, the study of the presidency was a backwater of the discipline.

**The Revolution Begins**

In the fall of 1973, I faced a dilemma. A newly-minted Ph.D., I was assigned to teach a graduate seminar on the presidency at Tulane. I looked forward to the class, but what readings would I assign the students, aside from Dick Neustadt's *Presidential Power*. Edwards Corwin’s magisterial *The President: Office and Powers* was considerably out of date (Corwin died in 1963), and I wanted to move beyond the formal powers of the presidency anyway. Some scholars in international relations such as Alexander George and Graham Allison were doing interesting work on decision making, and James David Barber was just publishing his wildly successful but deeply flawed *The Presidential Character*. Yet there was very little work on the presidency by presidential scholars. There was especially a dearth of work with an analytical bent that focused on explaining

---

the causes and consequences of presidential behavior rather than describing that behavior or the development of the institutions of the presidency.

I could not turn to the subfield for advice, as there was no organization of presidency scholars. Indeed, there was nothing that could sensibly be termed a field of presidential studies. I could not review syllabi from the leading departments of political science, as most of them (including the one I attended) did not offer a graduate course on the presidency. The absence of rigorous research on the presidency had encouraged these departments to simply avoid the topic in training graduate students.

It was a frustrating time to be a scholar of the presidency. As I declared, perhaps impertinently, a few years later, the presidency subfield had failed adopt the basic norms of social science. I argued that

Research on the presidency too often fails to meet the standards of contemporary political science, including the careful definition and measurement of concepts, the rigorous specification and testing of propositions, the employment of appropriate quantitative methods, and the use of empirical theory to develop hypotheses and explain findings (Edwards 1981, 146).²

Scholars needed to think theoretically to develop falsifiable propositions about presidential leadership and test these systematically with relevant data and appropriate econometric techniques. They should seek to discover generalizations about behavior rather than produce discrete, ad hoc analyses, repeat colorful anecdotes from presidential press clippings, or reach facile conclusions about Lyndon Johnson’s skill at swaying members of Congress or Ronald Reagan’s ability to mobilize the public behind his proposals. Thus, the research on the presidency presented a striking irony: The

The single most important and powerful institution in American politics was the one that political scientists understood the least.

This was the context in which I wrote “Presidential Influence in the House: Presidential Prestige as a Source of Presidential Power” (I submitted the piece in the fall of 1973 and it was accepted in May 1974. There was such a long backlog in the APSR that it did not appear in print until March 1976). I knew that scholars had not employed quantitative methods or empirical theory before in writing about presidential leadership, but I did not set out to revolutionize presidential studies. I was just trying to do research as best as I could.

The piece and others I wrote at about the same time made a splash. On the one hand, a number of readers thought that there was little future of quantitative work in the presidency. Much like the old baseball scouts in Moneyball, they did not feel that matters such as leadership could be quantified. They knew it when they saw it, and that was good enough for them. There was a brighter side, however. Many younger scholars responded favorably to my approach and began doing their own work in the more modern vein.

Within a decade, there was an identifiable literature on presidential-congressional relations and one on what I called the public presidency. Scholars were also making strides in researching other important aspects of the presidency. Before long, we formed a section on presidential studies within APSA. At last there was a real presidency field.

The Revolution Continues

Although we have made great progress in increasing our understanding of the presidency, it is natural that scholars, including myself, have focused on the areas of

---

presidential politics most accessible to research, especially those dimensions most easily lending themselves to quantitative measurement.

For example, presidential approval was the hot topic for a while. It offered a long time series and allowed the application of the latest times series techniques. Yet the theory behind these studies was often primitive and the results frequently indecipherable.

I fear that we have often missed the key questions about the presidency. For example, in 1992 I chaired a panel of distinguished scholars that reviewed the presidency of George H. W. Bush at the APSA annual meeting. Dave Barber asked a very good question from the floor: What should we be looking for in a president, aside from policy aspirations? We did not offer insightful answers. Some years later, I commissioned a special issue of Presidential Studies Quarterly, asking leading scholars what questions we should be asking about the presidency. Once again, the effort was not a great success.

I find it convenient to organize presidential studies into four broad areas:

- Leading the public.
- Leading Congress.
- Making decisions.
- Implementing policy.

These wide categories incorporate agenda setting, media relations, legal issues, and other important topics.

We have learned a lot about leading the public and Congress. There is much more to learn, of course, but I think we have a clear understanding of the basic parameters of the relationships here. It seems to me that we need to focus on the important issues of decision making and implementation. I am not suggesting we know nothing about them or that there has been no useful research on the topics, only that we have made much less progress in these areas. There exists a body of theory about decision making, but
we typically ignore it altogether. Similarly, presidency scholars rarely exploit broader work on policy implementation. And just what should we be looking for in a president?

Like scholars in other areas, we tend toward the easy work. For example, it is fine to study signing statements, but what difference do they make for actual policymaking? Similarly, our analyses of presidential decision making are generally no better than those by journalists, and these are not especially astute.

Accessibility to decision making and implementation is always a problem in studying the presidency. Nevertheless, if we do not ask the right questions, we are unlikely to arrive at the right answers. There is nothing more important to study than decision making. Aside from their consequences for the nation, decisions are what make presidents unique.

**The field is wide open, and I envy the possibilities available to younger scholars.**
It is an honor to have been invited to reflect on George Edwards’s contributions to presidency scholarship and to our field more generally. Like many, I have benefited from George’s mentorship, intellectual challenges, and professional guidance. He is a treasured colleague, role model, and friend.

I welcomed the excuse to return to the *APSR* article with which we were asked to begin – “Presidential Influence in the House: Presidential Prestige as a Source of Presidential Power.” It has the hallmarks of all of George’s works: the research and analysis are careful, clear, systematic, nuanced, and insightful. The work reminds us as well of the changes that have followed its publication: parties and politics have polarized, party coalitions have transformed, and the links between mass and elites have frayed and altered. Even so, its variables (if not their values and specific relationships) and analysis are sturdy.

Like virtually all of George’s scholarship, this article has been influential: A Google scholar search (using the keywords “presidential influence,” “Congress,” and “presidential prestige”) produced 99 cites from 1977 through 2015 in multiple scholarly journals (including *APSR, AJPS, JOP, PRQ, APR, Presidential Studies Quarterly* and *Congress and the Presidency*); excluded were the numerous books that also draw on the article. Meanwhile, how he (and we) study the presidency and the political system in which it is embedded and that it reflects and shapes has evolved. We use different measures and statistical techniques, more systematically incorporate qualitative evidence, and include other policy areas and political systems.
More generally, George’s 1976 article heralded what has become a broadening and deepening of scholarship on the U.S. presidency. First, we have more cumulative research. Among the myriad examples are work on the dynamics, generalizations, and lessons of presidential transitions and on the patterns of legislative, presidential and executive branch relationships at multiple points of the policy process and across policy arenas.

Second, presidency scholars are among those exploring influences on and the implications of change and stability. Works on the “unilateral presidency,” for instance, have traced its evolution to the founding, probed contemporary presidents’ strategic employment of specific tools (e.g., Obama’s shift to “quasi-proclamations”), compared influences of its use and achievement of presidential objectives, and raised concerns about its frequency, constitutionality, and lasting effects. Others examine how presidencies try to cope with increasingly diversifying and fragmenting media, their growing reliance on social media, and the seemingly relentless contraction of space in which presidents can be heard, much less try to influence others. As George has highlighted, the primary narrative is one of presidential facilitation, not direction, and of tactical adjustments.

Third, since the 1970s, presidency research has been enriched by access to greater amounts and more diverse types of data. Archival materials continue to be digitized; the American Presidency Project, the Miller Center, and NARA remain scholarly treasure troves; social media archives and associated “Big Data” analytics point to promising opportunities. Of course, like other social scientists we wrestle with ongoing challenges of measurement validity and of shifts in use and meaning (e.g., “executive orders,” “dual vetoes”).
Fourth, presidency research now relies on a broader range of research designs and methodological approaches, including survey experiments, process tracing, and comparative case analyses. Meanwhile, scholars employ increasingly sophisticated statistical techniques and game theoretic and other formal modeling.

Where do we go from here? Like Ian Shapiro, I value problem-driven scholarship. That said, paying attention to theoretical and methodological foci clearly is critical as well. Theoretically, it appears to me to be useful to begin as Edwards and Terry Moe do, with a view of presidents as strategic, purposive actors. Deserving consideration as well, though, is how such an actor (viewed variously as an individual and as an institution) is embedded in and influenced by complex, dynamic, and overlapping networks.

This in turn underscores a need to self-consciously model specific types of context. Key contexts might encompass several important, if not as fully studied areas. These evidently include intergovernmental arenas in the U.S. (e.g., presidential direct action in granting waivers, policy dynamics when states and nonprofits are contractors in areas of presidential priority). Researchers also might continue to explore relationships inside the federal executive branch much as Rudalevige (2002) and Lewis (2008) have done. An systematic emphasis on decision-making in differing contexts, albeit challenging, appears valuable as well.

Relatedly, less frequently used research designs might receive greater stress. For instance, the logic of comparison (including attention to embedded case and cross case comparative analyses) might be employed, consistent with conventional disciplinary terminology, this might include cross-national comparison of “core executives” presidential and parliamentary systems (following B. Guy Peters), looking perhaps for evidence of rising “centralization” (“presidentialization”). One also might compare executives within the U.S. (and possibly other federal systems, like Australia, Canada,
Germany, and Mexico); one could probe the generalizability of hypotheses from presidency research about, for instance, the impact of formal powers, evolution of staffs.

Inevitably, issues of contemporary governance occupy at least some of our attention, much as George has usefully joined conversations about the Electoral College and presidential impact on approval levels. Our scholarship raises concerns about both presidential weakness (in responding to climate change, in addressing gun control) and overreach (e.g., using the state secrets doctrine, employing drones).

Challenges remain.
For many years, historians attempted to identify the so-called “great presidents.”

At the recent Southern Political Science Association meeting in San Juan, Puerto Rico, I had the honor of serving on a panel with three of the great scholars of the American presidency: Karen Hult, William Howell, and the main subject of the panel, George Edwards. The particular focus of the panel was to remember and honor the 40th anniversary of George Edwards’ seminal American Political Science Review article on presidential/congressional influence. In that article, Edwards not only presented an empirical analysis, he also identified the goals for a quantitative study of the American presidency. The article was an amazingly prescient work that surely encouraged other scholars to follow in George Edwards’ illustrious footsteps.

Over the past forty years no one has done more to advance the quantitative study of the American presidency than George Edwards. His APSR article did so by demonstrating that quantitative methods could be used to examine presidential influence, as well as pointing scholars toward a new direction in the study of the American presidency. Since then, in a series of books and articles, George Edwards developed a theoretical model of the American presidency, as a facilitator-in-chief, that is both compelling and edifying. In an accomplishment that was quite rare for its time, he continued to publish research on the American presidency in top political science journals such as the APSR, as well as a writing a highly influential series of books. In such works, Dr. Edwards has impacted scholars and officials at the very highest levels of government and created new paradigms for research in American politics.
Yet George Edwards’ research, while certainly sufficient to justify a reputation as a great scholar of the American presidency, is merely the tip of the iceberg regarding his continuing influence on our profession. Over the years, as a teacher, he mentored a number of excellent graduate students who have become influential scholars in their own right. Additionally, his editorship of the Presidential Studies Quarterly utterly transformed that journal, making it a home for important empirical and theoretical writings on the presidency. George Edwards also has been kind and generous to young, emerging scholars. Over the years, he provided constant support and encouragement for my own work. I therefore see myself in many ways as a disciple of George Edwards.

No matter how many honors George Edwards receives, they will pale in comparison to the impact he has engendered on the study of the American presidency.
A Word of Thanks to George Edwards

WILLIAM G. HOWELL
University of Chicago

I was indebted to George Edwards long before I knew him. For me, as for so many others, George laid the groundwork for a kind of scholarship on the American presidency that now seems commonplace—one that relies on the tools, standards, and sensibilities of modern social science; and one that largely eschews personal ideology, biography, and narrative. George didn’t erect the methods of social scientific inquiry. But with steadfast determination, he brought them to our subfield. And we are all better for it.

Without George, the standards and methods of modern social science still would have come to studies of the American presidency. It is difficult to see how our corner of the discipline, which for so long took pride in the deft deployment of a snappy anecdote for every observation about politics, could resist the undercurrents shaping the larger discipline. Such deterministic accounts of disciplinary change, however, overlook the controversies that can erupt along the way, just as they miss the unique contributions that individuals stand to deliver. It takes hard work and keen insight to redirect the gaze and self-understandings of a community of scholars. For decades, George offered both.

Through his scholarship, his advocacy, and his unbridled spirit, George shone a bright light on the benefits of quantitative methods for studying executive politics. He demonstrated how new datasets could be assembled and analyzed in order to reveal important new dimensions of presidential behavior. He illustrated how we might systematically evaluate claims about when presidents can advance a policy agenda, and when institutional constraints on their power keep them from doing so. He encouraged
us not merely to adopt and refine inherited truths about the relevance of a president's reputation or prestige, but to carefully assess the evidentiary basis for believing them. And perhaps most consequentially, he argued against those who insisted that the presidency was fundamentally personal in nature and that, as a result, all knowledge about subject was at once provisional and idiosyncratic.

In his pursuit of progress, George pushed against longstanding scholarly traditions and the scholars who upheld them. During the 1970s and 80s, George rose the ranks of a subfield whose power brokers had very different sensibilities about how knowledge accumulates—indeed, about what knowledge even is. Then, the foundations of presidency scholarship were built upon the testimonies of former politicos, the observations of historians, and the textual readings of constitutional law scholars. Little space was afforded to positivism; and even less for theory building and hypothesis testing.

How things have changed. Because of George and his compatriots, the field of presidency studies has been reconstituted from top to bottom. Scholarly papers on the American presidency now—more than ever before—include long discussions on how key concepts are measured, the appropriate modeling techniques for assessing causal relations, and assessments of the sensitivity of findings. A set of conceptual issues, meanwhile, began to take hold, guiding the research trajectories of young scholars and informing disciplinary assessments of their contributions. How do we know what we think we know? What is the evidentiary basis for conventional understandings? Are we asking the right questions? Again and again, George asked these questions in his own research, and he insisted that others do the same in theirs.

In the wake of vigorous epistemological debates, what were once subjects of controversy become customary; and what were once viewed as stinging critiques
become mere distractions. A space then opens up for new scholars (read graduate students) to attend to the substantive work at hand, which for me and my colleagues in the 1990s and 2000s centered on a host of substantive and theoretical claims about presidential power. We didn’t have to defend our approaches or inclinations. George had already done that for us. Instead, we were able to set straight to the task at hand: trying to discern something new or uncover something overlooked about how presidents behave in a political system that at once exalts and confines them.

If one had to say when things began to change, one could do worse than select the date of George’s first publication. Exactly forty years ago, George published what many believe to be the first major paper published in a peer-reviewed essay that uses quantitative methods to evaluate the presidency. In “Presidential Influence in the House: Presidential Prestige as a Source of Presidential Power,” which appeared in the American Political Science Review in 1976, George subjected a longstanding claim among presidency scholars to empirical scrutiny—namely, that each president’s legislative fortunes hinge upon his broader popularity. His essay is a model of careful empirical research.

Though advances in statistical techniques and computing power today allow researchers to perform more sophisticated regression analyses with ease, in that compact and trenchant essay George effectively identified the basic measurement and modeling challenges that all empirically minded presidency scholars must confront, then and now. George recognized that public opinion is both cause and consequence of legislative activity; he characterized the various sources and kinds of measurement error associated with presidential ratings; he worried about the selection effects that plague any assessments of the correlates of presidential success in Congress; and he investigated the possibility of heterogeneous treatment effects across policies and parties.
In the decades that followed, George would go on to publish a great deal more research along these lines. His books on presidential influence in Congress, public appeals, and strategic leadership remain required reading in undergraduate and graduate seminars across the country. George also wrote numerous essays elucidating the strengths and weaknesses of empirical research on the presidency. He held conferences in which he challenged scholars to identify and pursue new and productive inquiries into the American presidency. And for the last 15 years, he utterly transformed the subfield’s flagship journal—Presidential Studies Quarterly—from a poorly produced gossip column into a first-class outlet featuring serious-minded original research.

George was not alone in these pursuits. A number of other prominent scholars joined his call for a more rigorous subfield—one in which claims would not be fobbed off with a wink and nod, but would be seriously interrogated. For his clear thinking, his entrepreneurialism, and, not least, his boundless energy, however, George was the driving force behind the emergence of a reconstituted subfield. He is the reason why contemporary graduate students who want to study the American presidency routinely take advanced sequences in econometrics; why subjects that were once thought impervious to quantification and analysis now attract widespread attention among empirically minded scholars; and why the field of presidency studies is better integrated into the larger discipline than ever before.

George continues to go strong. In the last decade, he has authored or edited no fewer than seven books. His contributions, however, are not confined to the frontiers of knowledge.

George Edwards leaves behind him a subfield that is at once more rigorous and more interesting than the one he joined almost a half century ago.
RECENTLY PUBLISHED or FORTHCOMING BOOKS

STEVEN E. SCHIER (Carleton College) and TODD E. EBERLY (Saint Mary's College of Maryland)

Polarized: The Rise of Ideology in American Politics
(Rowman & Littlefield)

From campus protests to the Congress floor, the central feature of contemporary American politics is ideological polarization. In this concise, readable, but comprehensive text, Steven E. Schier and Todd E. Eberly introduce students to this contentious subject through an in-depth look at the ideological foundations of the contemporary American political machine of parties, politicians, the media, and the public. Beginning with a redefinition of contemporary liberalism and conservatism, the authors develop a comprehensive examination of ideology in all branches of American national and state governments. Investigations into ideologies reveal a seeming paradox of a representative political system defined by ever growing divisions and a public that continues to describe itself as politically moderate. The work’s breadth makes it a good candidate for a course introducing American politics, while its institutional focus makes it suitable for adoption in more advanced courses on Congress, the Presidency, the courts or political parties.
A feminist, an outspoken activist, a woman without a college education, Midge Costanza was one of the unlikeliest of White House insiders. Yet in 1977 she became the first female Assistant to the President for Public Liaison under Jimmy Carter, emerging as a prominent focal point of the American culture wars. Tasked with bringing the views of special interest groups to the president, Costanza championed progressive causes even as Americans grew increasingly divided on the very issues for which she fought.

In *A Feminist in the White House*, Doreen Mattingly draws on Costanza's personal papers to shed light on the life of this fascinating and controversial woman. Mattingly chronicles Costanza's dramatic rise and fall as a public figure, from her initial popularity to her ultimate clashes with Carter and his aides. While Costanza challenged Carter to support abortion rights, gay and lesbian rights, and feminist policies, Carter faced increased pressure to appease the interests of emerging Religious Right, which directly opposed Costanza's ideals. Ultimately, marginalized both within the White House and by her fellow feminists, Costanza was pressured to resign in 1978.

Through the lens of Costanza's story, readers catch a unique perspective of the rise of debates which have defined the feminist movement and sexual politics to this very day. Mattingly also reveals a wider, but heretofore neglected, narrative of the complex era of gender politics in the late 1970's Washington - a history which continues to resonate in politics today. *A Feminist in the White House* is a must-read for anyone with an interest in sexual politics, female politicians, and presidential history.
Our government is failing us. From health care to immigration, from the tax code to climate change, our political institutions cannot deal effectively with the challenges of modern society. Why the dysfunction? Contemporary reformers single out the usual suspects, including polarization and the rise in campaign spending. But what if the roots go much deeper, to the nation’s founding?

In *Relic*, William Howell and Terry Moe point to the Constitution as the main culprit. The framers designed the Constitution some 225 years ago for a simple agrarian society. But the form of government they settled upon, a separation of powers system with a parochial Congress at its center, is entirely ill-equipped to address the serious social problems that arise in a complex, post-industrial nation. We are prisoners of the past, burdened with an antiquated government that cannot make effective policy, and often cannot do anything at all.

The solution is to update the Constitution for modern times. This can be accomplished, Howell and Moe argue, through reforms that push Congress and all its pathologies to the periphery of the lawmaking process, and bring presidents—whose concern for legacy drives them to seek coherent policy solutions—to the center of decision making. As
Howell and Moe reveal, the key to effective government for modern America is a more powerful presidency.

Relic is a bold, provocative, and essential book for our era of political dysfunction and popular despair. It sheds new light on what is wrong with our government and what can be done about it, challenging us to reconsider the very foundation of the American experiment.
KEN GORMLEY (Duquesne University)

*The Presidents and the Constitution: A Living History*  
(NYU Press)

In this sweepingly ambitious volume, the nation’s foremost experts on the American presidency and the U.S. Constitution join together to tell the intertwined stories of how each American president has confronted and shaped the Constitution. Each occupant of the office—the first president to the forty-fourth—has contributed to the story of the Constitution through the decisions he made and the actions he took as the nation’s chief executive.

By examining presidential history through the lens of constitutional conflicts and challenges, *The Presidents and the Constitution* offers a fresh perspective on how the Constitution has evolved in the hands of individual presidents. It delves into key moments in American history, from Washington’s early battles with Congress to the advent of the national security presidency under George W. Bush and Barack Obama, to reveal the dramatic historical forces that drove these presidents to action. Historians and legal experts, including Richard Ellis, Gary Hart, Stanley Kutler and Kenneth Starr, bring the Constitution to life, and show how the awesome powers of the American presidency have been shaped by the men who were granted them. The book brings to the fore the overarching constitutional themes that span this country’s history and ties together presidencies in a way never before accomplished.
Exhaustively researched and compellingly presented, *The Presidents and the Constitution* shines new light on America’s brilliant constitutional and presidential history.
Of the original Gilded Age, historian Richard Hofstadter wrote: “There is no other period in the nation’s history when politics seems so completely dwarfed by economic changes, none in which the life of the country rests so completely in the hands of the industrial entrepreneur.” The era of William Jefferson Clinton’s ascent to the presidency was strikingly similar—nothing less, Clinton himself said, than “a paradigm shift . . . from the industrial age to an information-technology age, from the Cold War to a global society.” How Bill Clinton met the challenges of this new Gilded Age is the subject of Patrick J. Maney’s book: an in-depth perspective on the 42nd president of the United States and the transformative era over which he presided.

Bill Clinton: New Gilded Age President goes beyond personality and politics to examine the critical issues of the day: economic and fiscal policy, business and financial deregulation, healthcare and welfare reform, and foreign affairs in a postCold War world. But at its heart is Bill Clinton in all his guises: the first baby boomer to reach the White House; the “natural”—the most gifted politician of his generation, but one with an inexplicably careless and self-destructive streak; the “Comeback Kid,” repeatedly overcoming long odds; the survivor, frequently down but never out; and, with Hillary Rodham Clinton, part of the most controversial First Couple since Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt.

Maney’s book is, in sum, the most succinct and up-to-date study of the Clinton presidency, invaluable not merely for understanding a transformative era in American history, but presidential, national, and global politics today.
Targeting Americans: The Constitutionality of the U.S. Drone War focuses on the legal debate surrounding drone strikes, the use of which has expanded significantly under the Obama Presidency as part of the continuing war against terror. Despite the political salience of the legal questions raised by targeted killing, the author asserts that there has been remarkably little careful analysis of the fundamental legal question: the constitutionality of the policy.

From a position of deep practical expertise in constitutional issues, Prof. Powell provides a dispassionate and balanced analysis of the issues posed by U.S. targeted killing policy, using the killing of Anwar al-Awlaki in September 2011 as a focus for discussion. While Powell concludes that the al-Awlaki strike was constitutional under 2001 legislation, he rejects the Obama administration's broader claims of authority for its drone policies. Furthermore, he argues, citizens acting as combatants in al-Qaeda and associated groups are not entitled to due process protections: by due process standards, the administration's procedures are legally inadequate.

A fundamental theme of the book is that the conclusion that an action or policy is constitutional should not be confused with claims about its wisdom, morality, or legality under international norms. Part of the purpose of constitutional analysis is to draw attention to these other normative concerns and not, as is too often the case, to occlude them.
ALLAN J. LICHTMAN (American University)

Predicting the Next President: The Keys to the White House, 2016 Edition
(Rowman & Littlefield)

Think that Richard Nixon lost the 1960 presidential election because he sweated on TV? Or that John Kerry was “swiftboated” out of the presidency in 2004? Think again! In Predicting the Next President political analyst and historian Allan J. Lichtman presents thirteen historical factors, or “keys” (four political, seven performance, and two personality), that determine the outcome of presidential elections. In the chronological, successful application of these keys to every election since 1860, Lichtman dispels much of the mystery behind electoral politics and challenges many traditional assumptions. An indispensable resource for political junkies who want to get a head-start on calling Decision 2016.
MATTHEW W. HUGHEY (University of Connecticut) and GREGORY S. PARKS (Wake Forest University School of Law)

The Wrongs of the Right: Language, Race, and the Republican Party in the Age of Obama
(NYU Press)

In *The Wrongs of the Right*, Matthew W. Hughey and Gregory S. Parks set postracial claims into relief against a background of pre- and post-election racial animus directed at President Obama, his administration, and African Americans. They show how the political Right deploys racial fears, coded language and implicit bias to express and build opposition to the Obama administration. Racial meanings are reservoirs rich in political currency, and the race card remains a potent resource for othering the first black president in a context rife with Nativism, xenophobia, white racial fatigue, and serious racial inequality.
In October 1948—one year after the creation of the U.S. Air Force as a separate military branch—a B-29 Superfortress crashed on a test run, killing the plane's crew. The plane was constructed with poor materials, and the families of the dead sued the U.S. government for damages. In the case, the government claimed that releasing information relating to the crash would reveal important state secrets, and refused to hand over the requested documents. Judges at both the U.S. District Court level and Circuit level rejected the government's argument and ruled in favor of the families. However, in 1953, the Supreme Court reversed the lower courts' decisions and ruled that in the realm of national security, the executive branch had a right to withhold information from the public. Judicial deference to the executive on national security matters has increased ever since the issuance of that landmark decision. Today, the government's ability to invoke state secrets privileges goes unquestioned by a largely supine judicial branch.

David Rudenstine's *The Age of Deference* traces the Court's role in the rise of judicial deference to executive power since the end of World War II. He shows how in case after case, going back to the Truman and Eisenhower presidencies, the Court has ceded authority in national security matters to the executive branch. Since 9/11, the executive faces even less oversight. According to Rudenstine, this has had a negative impact both on individual rights and on our ability to check executive authority when necessary. Judges are mindful of the limits of their competence in national security matters; this,
combined with their insulation from political accountability, has caused them in matters as important as the nation's security to defer to the executive. Judges are also afraid of being responsible for a decision that puts the nation at risk and the consequences for the judiciary in the wake of such a decision. Nonetheless, *The Age of Deference* argues that as important as these considerations are in shaping a judicial disposition, the Supreme Court has leaned too far, too often, and for too long in the direction of abdication. There is a broad spectrum separating judicial abdication, at one end, from judicial usurpation, at the other, and *The Age of Deference* argues that the rule of law compels the court to re-define its perspective and the legal doctrines central to the Age.
Though Abraham Lincoln was not a political philosopher per se, in word and in deed he did grapple with many of the most pressing and timeless questions in politics. What is the moral basis of popular sovereignty? What are the proper limits on the will of the majority? When and why should we revere the law? What are we to do when the letter of the law is at odds with what we believe justice requires? How is our devotion to a particular nation related to our commitment to universal ideals? What is the best way to protect the right to liberty for all people? The contributors to this volume, a methodologically and ideologically diverse group of scholars, examine Lincoln's responses to these and other ultimate questions in politics. The result is a fascinating portrait of not only Abraham Lincoln but also the promises and paradoxes of liberal democracy.

The basic liberal democratic idea is that individual liberty is best secured by a democratic political order that treats all citizens as equals before the law and is governed by the law, with its limits on how the state may treat its citizens and on how citizens may treat one another. Though wonderfully coherent in theory, these ideas prove problematic in real-world politics. The authors of this volume approach Lincoln as the embodiment of this paradox—“naturally antislavery” yet unflinchingly committed to defending proslavery laws; defender of the common man but troubled by the excesses of democracy; devoted to the idea of equal natural rights yet unable to imagine a harmonious, interracial democracy. Considering Lincoln as he attempted to work out the meaning and coherence of the liberal democratic project in practice, these authors craft a profile of the 16th president's political thought from a variety of perspectives and through multiple lenses. Together their essays create the first fully-dimensional portrait of Abraham
Lincoln as a political actor, expressing, addressing, and reframing the perennial questions of liberal democracy for his time and our own.
Why Do We Still Have the Electoral College?

ALEXANDER KEYSSAR (Harvard University)

Why Do We Still Have the Electoral College?
(Harvard University Press)

Every four years, millions of Americans find themselves asking why they choose their presidents through the peculiar mechanism called the Electoral College—an arcane institution that narrows election campaigns to swing states and can permit the loser of the popular vote to become president. Why are a state’s electoral votes awarded on a winner-take-all basis? Why not have a national popular vote, which is what most Americans would prefer?

Such questions are not unique to our own time. The Electoral College has had critics since the early nineteenth century, and over the years Congress has considered hundreds of constitutional amendments aimed at transforming the electoral system. On several occasions, such amendments have come close to passage. Alexander Keyssar traces the origins of the Electoral College as a much wrangled-over compromise among delegates to the Philadelphia Constitutional Convention who had no previous experience with electing a chief executive. He explores all of the major efforts to abolish or significantly reform the Electoral College—in the 1810s and 1820s, the post–Civil War era, and the late 1960s—to discover why these efforts have failed. The reasons, which have shifted over time, include the tendency of political parties to elevate partisan advantage above democratic values, America’s fraught legacy of slavery and racism, and the extraordinary difficulty of passing any constitutional amendment. Why Do We Still Have the Electoral College? demonstrates that the most common explanation for the institution’s persistence—that small states have blocked reforms for fear of losing political influence—is simply untrue.
President Obama’s first term in office was subject to intense criticism; not only did many feel that he had failed to live up to his leadership potential, but that he had actually continued the foreign policy framework of the George W. Bush era he was supposed to have abandoned. This edited volume examines whether these issues of continuity have been equally as prevalent during the president’s second term as his first.

Is Obama still acting within the foreign policy shadow of Bush, or has he been able to establish his own approach towards international affairs, distinct from his predecessor? Within this context, the volume also addresses the idea of legacy and whether Obama has succeeded in establishing his own distinct foreign policy doctrine. In addressing these questions, the chapters explore continuity and change from a range of perspectives in International Relations and Foreign Policy Analysis, which are broadly representative of a spectrum of theoretical positions.

With contributions from a range of US foreign policy experts, this book will be of great interest to students and scholars of US foreign policy, Foreign Policy Analysis and American politics.
HANES WALTON JR. (University of Michigan), PEARL K. FORD DOWE (University of Arkansas), and JOSEPHINE A. V. ALLEN (Binghamton University)

Remaking the Democratic Party: Lyndon B. Johnson as a Native-Son Presidential Candidate
(University of Michigan Press)

A continuation of Hanes Walton Jr.’s work on Southern Democratic presidents, Remaking the Democratic Party analyzes the congressional and presidential elections of Lyndon Baines Johnson. This study builds upon the general theory of the native-son phenomenon to demonstrate that a Southern native-son can win the presidency without the localism evident in the elections of Bill Clinton and Jimmy Carter.

Although ridiculed by contemporaries for his apparent lack of control over formal party politics and the national committee, Johnson excelled at leading the Democratic Party’s policy agenda. While a senator and as president, Johnson advocated for—and secured—liberal social welfare and civil rights legislation, forcing the party to break with its Southern tradition of elitism, conservatism, and white supremacy. In a way, Johnson set the terms for the continuing partisan battle because, by countering the Democrats’ new ideology, the Republican Party also underwent a transformation.

We welcome and strongly encourage suggestions for future issues. Please contact us at PEPReportAPSA@gmail.com