

PRG REPORT

NEWSLETTER OF THE PRESIDENCY RESEARCH GROUP
OF THE AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION

Volume XX, Number 2



Fall 1997

RDP
12/15/97

Theory and the Future of Presidential Studies

Terry M. Moe
Stanford University

The presidency is a field in transition. Traditional methods of study - rooted in history, in the uniqueness of presidential personality, in the rich complexity of politics and context - are giving way to methods that put the emphasis on simplicity, abstraction, and quantification, and that have as their aim the development of a logically rigorous body of theory. This has been happening rather slowly over the last two decades, slowly enough so that, even today, the field is not fundamentally different than it was then. But things are changing, and I suspect that before too long - less than another twenty years - the study of the presidency will undergo a dramatic conversion, breaking from the past and emerging as one of political science's most exciting arenas of new theory and research.

Why the transition? In my estimation, the primary force for change has not and will

will not come from within. Presidency scholars have long been urging a greater emphasis on theory and quantitative research, and some of the leading figures in the field - people like George Edwards, John Kessel, Mark Peterson, and Terry Sullivan - have shown us what analytically sophisticated work can look like. But despite widespread agreement that more theory and rigor are good things, all the talk about jump-starting the field along theoretical lines has had only modest effects within the community of presidency scholars more generally. In most presidency research, theory and rigor continue to be the exception rather than the rule.

The field of presidential studies is itself something of an institution. And like all institutions, it does not change so easily from within. There have long been accepted ways of thinking about and researching the presidency, accepted criteria

that define good work and important contributions. And whatever the exhortations about reorienting the field, these deeply rooted traditions continue to influence the kind of research that actually gets carried out. The talk is modern and cutting edge. The action is traditional.

Woven into the warp and woof of the field - institutionalized within it - are notions of what it means to be theoretical. These too are traditional, and not compatible with what is really driving cutting-edge work in other fields and disciplines. In the study of the presidency, a work is considered theoretical if it points to important variables, suggests in even the vaguest terms how they might be related to one another, and offers some sort of perspective on the inevitable mass of facts. The more variables and relationships that are somehow deemed relevant, the more complex and multifaceted the thinking, the more factually grounded and detailed the perspective, the better the theory is thought to be. In the practice of most presidency research, then, there is a fine line between theory and description, or between theory and history. All are about complexity and detail. All are immersed in the facts. All tend to offer an "understanding" that cannot readily be replicated or generalized by others, but that simply reflects the personal judgments and unique thought processes of whoever happens to be doing the writing.

The main impetus for change, and for

INSIDE THIS ISSUE

• TERRY MOE, <i>THEORY AND THE FUTURE OF PRESIDENTIAL STUDIES</i>	1
• BRUCE MIROFF, <i>LET A HUNDRED THEORIES BLOOM</i>	4
• MARY STUCKEY, <i>THE RHETORICAL PRESIDENCY: A NEXUS FOR SCHOLARSHIP</i>	6
• TERRY SULLIVAN, <i>REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT</i>	8
• KAREN HULT, <i>REPORT FROM THE SECRETARY/TREASURER</i>	11
• DAVID ALSOBROOK, <i>THE BUSH PRESIDENTIAL LIBRARY</i>	12
• APSA PRESIDENCY RESEARCH SECTION EXPENSE REPORT.....	13
• BOOKS AND ARTICLES ON THE PRESIDENCY.....	14
• BOOK AND PAPER AWARDS.....	16
• PRIZE AND AWARD COMMITTEES.....	18
• IN MEMORIAM: BILL LAMMERS.....	19

Theory and the Future of Presidential Studies

(continued from page 1)

"Traditional methods of study . . . are giving way to methods that put the emphasis on simplicity, abstraction, and quantification . . ."

reorienting the field around an entirely different methodology, is coming from the outside, not the inside - which only makes sense, institutions being what they are. Three external sources stand out.

1) **Rational Choice Theory.** While its detractors and critics are many, rational choice theory has become the major engine of theoretical progress throughout most of political science. Its success arises from its economic methodology, which argues that the way to build truly powerful theories is *not* to capture the dizzying complexity of the real world, and *not* to pursue the endless proliferation of relevant variables - even though they are indeed relevant - but rather to strip away as much of this as possible in fashioning simple, clear, logically tight models that seem to capture just the essence of what is going on. In practice, not all of these models are useful. Some, in fact, are little more than mathematical toys that have no other redeeming value. Overall, however, rational choice theory offers a powerful set of tools for analyzing politics, and it is being put to creative, productive use throughout the discipline.

The pattern is that modelers colonize and revamp a given field, then see connections in a closely related field and move imperialistically to apply their methods there as well. Right now, the presidency is being visited by rational choice theorists who started with Congress, and who find the president interesting largely because he can veto legislation. So there is already a small literature that offers a variety of models on presidential veto power. That is only

the beginning. There are also early attempts to move beyond the legislative sphere and model presidential appointments, presidential control of the bureaucracy, "going public," and other aspects of presidential behavior. When these efforts come to maturity, the presidency will increasingly be a prime target of interest in its own right, not just as an adjunct to Congress and the legislative process. More and more rational choice theorists will then call themselves presidency scholars, and they will be hard at work creating a coherent body of theory for *their* field.

(2) **The New Institutionalism.** The shift in scholarly attention from behavior to institutions has involved an eclectic assortment of theories and methods, but the most influential work on institutions has been done by rational choice theorists. Thus, as the new institutionalism prompts students of politics to study the presidency as an institution, the same forces I just discussed will be reinforced and further empowered; rational choice theorists and their ways of thinking will increasingly be drawn to the presidency as an institutional target of analysis, and they will increasingly shape the way the presidency is understood and modelled.

But institutionalism has something of its own to contribute quite apart from rational choice theory. Most notably, it encourages us to think of presidents in impersonal terms - to think of them as types of institutional actors whose incentives are structured in particular ways (due to their institutional locations) and who can thus be expected to behave in a characteristic manner - a presidential manner - *regardless of who they are.*

By contrast, the traditional view of

PRG REPORT is published twice annually on behalf of the Presidency Research Section of the American Political Science Association by the Center for Presidential Studies in the George Bush School of Government and Public Service.

Editor:
George C. Edwards III

Associate Editor:
MaryAnne Borrelli

Assistant Editor:
Colleen Hoffman

Center for Presidential Studies
2137 Bush Academic West Building
Texas A&M University
College Station, TX 77843-4349
(409) 845-9764 Phone
(409) 862-7953 Fax
E-mail: gedwards@tamu.edu

Individual subscriptions to the *Report* are provided with membership. Institutional subscriptions are \$10 annually. Make checks payable to the Presidency Research Section, APSA.

Send subscriptions and address changes to American Political Science Association, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. 20036.

The PRG's World Web Site is:
[HTTP://SUNSITE.UNC.EDU/LIA/PRGNET](http://SUNSITE.UNC.EDU/LIA/PRGNET)

Theory and the Future of Presidential Studies (continued from page 2)

the presidency inevitably pursues explanations that involve us in personality, decision styles, personal backgrounds, and other horribly complex tangles of variables that lead us into a descriptive thicket. If we want to build a theory of the presidency, this is perhaps the most important place to begin: by simplifying away the burdensome complexities of the personal presidency. The institutional perspective, by seeing the president in impersonal terms, offers us a coherent way of doing that - and a crucial analytic wedge for moving towards a powerful theory.

(3) **Young Scholars.** Generational differences are going to play a big role in transforming the field. It has long been true, I think, that the study of the presidency has suffered from a selection effect, in which people who like history and anecdote and informal modes of analysis have found the presidency an attractive and comfortable place to pursue their interests, while people more oriented by theory and analytic methods have found it too traditional for their tastes and thus have taken their talents and skills elsewhere. This selection effect thus tended to reinforce and reproduce the long-standing properties of the field, and made change difficult.

In any field or discipline, selection effects of this sort are inevitable. But things are changing for the better with the new generation of young scholars coming out of graduate school over the last ten years or so, and I suspect the situation will improve even more in the years to come. These scholars are trained differently than previous generations were. They are more theoretical and analytical in their approach to research - they think like social scientists. They are quite familiar with rational choice, both as a literature and as a

methodology; and even when they are critical of it, they appreciate what it can contribute when put to good use. They are more willing to engage in simplification and abstraction as means of building powerful theories. And they are better trained in sophisticated statistical methods for testing out their theoretical ideas.

It is still true (and unavoidable) that the presidency field tends to attract a disproportionate number of the more traditional young scholars. But it always has. The difference these days is that the nature of the pool has changed - the average newcomer is better trained, more theoretical, less traditional. And when these newcomers do what newcomers always do - generate lots of new work that builds on the most exciting new developments (as they see them) in the discipline as a whole - they are changing the field rather than reproducing it.

In sum, I think these basic forces for change - rational choice theory, the new institutionalism, and the new generation of young scholars - have put us on the threshold of a new era in the study of the presidency. This is a good thing for the field, and for political science as a whole. For the presidency will not only become a hotbed of new research and theoretical progress, but it will also be much more solidly and productively integrated into the broader discipline, both contributing to progress in other fields and gaining from the ideas and advances that those fields have to offer.

I should also emphasize, finally, that these developments should be good for everyone in the field, not just for those who are doing high-tech theoretical work. In any field of social science, progress turns on a productive division of labor. Everyone should not be doing the same thing. We need people who do formal modeling, abstract theory, sophisticated empirical testing. But we also need people who collect and interpret the countless facts that make up the knowledge base of the field. We need informa-

... "rational choice theory, the new institutionalism, and the new generation of young scholars - have put us on the threshold of a new era in the study of the presidency."

tive histories. And we need studies in-between the highly abstract and the highly detailed, studies that explore the links among all sorts of potentially important variables and assess their connection to reality. Theorists cannot do their jobs well unless they know their subject, and thus learn from the more empirically grounded research of others. Historians and other empiricists cannot do their jobs well unless they are able to think theoretically, using the best and most powerful ideas available to organize and interpret the facts. We all need one another, and no job is so important that it crowds out the others. Social science is a collective effort.

The field's lackluster performance to this point is not somehow due to the bankruptcy of traditional lines of research. They are useful and have a role to play. It is due, rather, to the absence of enough scholars who put the emphasis on theory, rigor, and analytics. In the division of labor making up the field, these were sorely lacking in the past, and it took a toll. In the field of the future, traditionalism will not be entirely replaced by a new methodology. It will simply adjust to a more productive division of labor in which theory and its building blocks take on a growing prominence - and everyone has something to contribute.

Let a Hundred Theories Bloom: Theory and Presidency Research

Bruce Miroff

State University of New York, Albany

At the Neustadt Conference at Columbia University last November, Terry Moe made some provocative comments about theory in presidency research. My reflections in this brief, informal essay have been prompted by those comments.

As I recollect Moe's comments (I apologize to him in advance if I have at all remembered them inaccurately), they focused on the failure of presidency research to make significant advances. Moe ascribed this failure to the lack of a proper theory in presidency research. We have a profusion of anecdotes, he complained, and know many specific things about presidents, but we do not share a theory that will foster a cumulative development of knowledge about the presidency as an institution. Moe's most striking argument was that we do not need one hundred variables in the study of the presidency but rather two or three. Granting that abandoning the hundred variables would leave some areas of the presidency understudied, he suggested that the payoff would be a parsimonious and powerful theory that would transform presidency research. The theory that held such promise remained nameless in Moe's comments, but I assumed - as did the others in the audience with whom I later discussed his remarks - that the words "rational choice" might be filled in.

Moe's lament about the anecdotal, unscientific, and atheoretical character of presidency research is, in fact, an old one. I took a graduate seminar on the presidency with Aaron Wildavsky in 1968 and have kept up with overviews and critiques of the field of presidency studies ever since. I have read over and over again that we need to get past the anecdotes and biographical details and turn presidency research into a proper social science subject, as Congress has long been. But I believe that this lament is outdated:

presidency research has come a long way since I took Wildavsky's course. Along with an explosion of empirical work in the last two decades has come a profusion of theoretical approaches. Back in 1968, Richard Neustadt's theoretical work was the only theoretical approach to the presidency that merited serious consideration. Now, in teaching a graduate seminar on the presidency, there is not time to consider all of the theoretical works to which an empirical researcher can turn for guidance. (Some of those whose theoretical writings I have assigned in my seminar in recent years include Rockman, Lowi, Skowronek, Jones, Grover, Barber, and Rogin.)

A profusion of theories can, of course, produce a confusion of theory. What Moe seemed to have in mind was a single Theory (or, at a minimum, several theories that all agreed on the same basic assumptions) that would supply a hegemonic paradigm for presidency research. His comments evoked the vista of a scientific revolution in presidency studies à la Thomas Kuhn.

But in this post-positivist age the prospect for a paradigmatic theory (such as rational choice) seems dubious. One need not embrace some fashionable post-modern lingo to argue that we will have to live with a profusion of theories, with disparate and sometimes incommensurable approaches to the presidency. I think that this is a cause not for lament but for good cheer. In complex - and sometimes frustratingly fragmented - ways, presidency research is advancing in its knowledge of its subject matter. And the 97 or 98 hypothetical variables that Moe urged us to jettison are playing no small part in that advance.

The call for a theory based on two or three variables is a prescription for neglecting many promising lines of research in favor of one preferred line of research. Note how many approaches are marginalized if Moe's agenda is followed: historical/political development (at least in the versions of a Skowronek, Milkis, or

Tulis), constitutional/legal analysis, political psychology, structural political economy (radical or Neomarxist, not rational choice), rhetorical analysis, cultural/symbolic interpretation. I have my own preferences among these, and at times I have been sharply critical of some of the others. Yet I do not believe that the insights of any of these approaches can be ruled out by the imperious fiat of a hegemonic theory.

" . . . in teaching a graduate seminar on the presidency, there is not time to consider all the theoretical works which an empirical researcher can turn for guidance."

But what if one theory is genuinely superior, if it generates cumulative and comprehensive knowledge about the presidency? The problem with this claim, as I see it, is that no two or three variables can explain a phenomenon with as many dimensions as the presidency. Rational choice theory has made some powerful arguments - and shown some profound limitations - in the study of Congress. But the presidency is a different kind of creature: From the individuality of its office holders to its dynamic relationships that ramify throughout the political, economic, and cultural systems, the presidency resists reduction to a parsimonious model. Perhaps the main reason for the decline of Richard Neustadt's hold over the field and the rise of competing perspectives is that his approach, with its focus on the individual actor, left the institutional, structural, and cultural aspects of the presidency largely in the dark. A new "grand theory" of the presidency, rooted in a parsimonious set of variables, will encounter the same kind of limitations.

Theories of the presidency, then, are necessarily partial theories. What we theo-

Let a Hundred Theories Bloom: Theory and Presidency Research

(continued from page 4)

size about the presidency depends on what we want to understand. Different theories ask radically different kinds of questions and lead us to different bodies of empirical data. If we want to understand the incentives that lead presidents to expand their control over bureaucratic agencies, for example, Terry Moe's approach makes an impressive theoretical case. If we try to understand how modern presidents enact spectacles, as I have done, his rational choice assumptions are not very helpful. Examples here could be multiplied, but I do not want to belabor the point: No one set of questions or body of data about a particular dimension of the presidency has a warrant any more to claim privileged standing.

Since I invoked Neustadt's name above, I should add a word about something that doubtless has been lost once his approach to the presidency ceased to dominate the field. Neustadt insisted that what a president did in one area had an impact on every other area of his presidency, that a bungled appointment to the cabinet, for example, might diminish a president's reputation and weaken his position in pushing a top legislative priority. In the profusion of new approaches and specialized studies, this insight can easily be overlooked. Neustadt's holistic view of presidential activity may no longer be possible. Moe's candidate for its replacement, the rational choice approach, gets no closer to it than other approaches. Nonetheless, in pursuing our disparate theoretical and empirical agendas we need to pay attention to how what we study intersects with the work of others to form a larger picture of the presidency.

One place where we can attempt to balance our interest in a particular theoretical niche with consideration for the wider terrain of the presidency is our teaching. In both my undergraduate and graduate presi-

dency courses I spend considerable time on examining alternative theories of the presidency. In the undergraduate version, for example, I devote a couple of lectures to the approaches of Neustadt, Rockman, Skowronek, and Jones. One reason for this is to challenge the overly personalized view of the presidency (represented on a sophisticated level by Neustadt) with which students come into the course.

A second is to show students how the assumptions that are made and the questions that are asked shape how the presidency is understood. By holding a subsequent discussion in which the students compare these alternative theoretical lenses and then apply them to explain the behavior and fate of President Clinton, I hope not only to sensitize them to the importance of particular theoretical perspectives but to broaden their own perspective on the presidency. In playing off different theories against one another, I find my own understanding stretched as well, my own theoretical preferences challenged and revised.

So, let a hundred variables (or at least a significant number of them) be employed in our research. Let a hundred theories bloom. Presidency research will be pluralistic, contentious, lively. And we will learn a great deal more, even if what we learn will sometimes seem disjointed and tentative. The alternative that Moe seemed to have in mind would not, to my way of thinking, be desirable even if it were viable. A field dominated by a hegemonic theory like rational choice would be narrow, arid, and politically detached; it would drain the juices from one of the most fascinating subjects in all of political science. Yes, let us all be more theoretical in our research. But as we expand our theoretical ambitions, let us also appreciate the limits of our own theorizing.

PRG OFFICERS

President

Terry Sullivan, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

Vice President

Karen Hult, Virginia Polytechnic Institute

Secretary/Treasurer

Robert J. Spitzer, SUNY Cortland

Governing Council

David Gary Adler, Idaho State University (95-98)

Ryan Barilleaux, Miami University of Ohio (95-98)

MaryAnne Borrelli, Connecticut College (97-00)

George C. Edwards, III, Texas A&M University (95-98)

Michael Genovese, Loyola Marymount University (95-98)

Nancy Kassop, SUNY New Paltz (97-00)

Janet M. Martin, Bowdoin College (97-00)

Lyn Ragsdale, University of Arizona (96-99)

Robert Shapiro, Columbia University (97-00)

Renee Smith, University of Rochester (96-99)

Raymond Tatalovich, Loyola University of Chicago (96-99)

Kathryn Dunn Tenpas, University of South Florida (97-00)

Shirley Anne Warshaw, Gettysburg College (95-98)

Stephen J. Wayne, Georgetown University (96-99)

M. Stephen Weatherford, University of California - Santa Barbara (96-99)

Graduate Student Board

Member

Michael Link, University of South Carolina

1997 Program Section Chair

Shirley Anne Warshaw, Gettysburg College

The Rhetorical Presidency: A Nexus for Scholarship*

Mary Stuckey
University of Mississippi

There is an increasing amount of scholarship appearing at our professional conferences and in our professional journals dedicated to the president's relationship with the American mass public. This scholarship increasingly reflects both qualitative and quantitative methods, and often yields impressive results. Many scholars, however, tend to remain bound by the traditions of their specific subfields or areas of emphasis. Presidential scholars, for instance, too seldom read the public opinion literature; those who focus on public opinion too rarely look beyond that subfield to the broader implications of their work for the study of the presidency as a whole. The best research in presidential scholarship - and certainly in the rhetorical presidency - originates from those scholars who read widely, and who join a variety of theoretical and methodological traditions, understanding presidential communication as having important instrumental consequences as well as significant constitutive effects.

The rhetorical presidency has the capacity to contain elements of interest for all scholars of the presidency. It provides a theoretical framework that enables us to elide the pre-modern/modern/post-modern distinctions often criticized as analytically limiting. Because its theoretical focus is on the changes in the institution, it relies heavily on the standard institutional analyses of staffing, congressional relations, and the executive branch as a whole. In its emphasis on the president's relationship with the public, it allows for the inclusion of the public opinion literature. With its focus on the media, it encompasses research on agenda-setting, image making, and news routines from media and political commu-

nication studies. Finally, its accent on the "permanent campaign" brings with it a steadfast interest in the processes of campaigning and governing and the relationships between the two. In short, there is little of interest to scholars of the presidency that is not somehow included in studies of the rhetorical presidency. More importantly, the rhetorical presidency as a theoretical construct has the capacity to bring together scholars from widely divergent areas of presidential research, and to encourage them to read more widely within the subfield and the discipline as a whole, an enterprise that will benefit our students as well as our research.

The rhetorical presidency as an analytic construct can be traced back to the publication of Richard Neustadt's landmark work, *Presidential Power*. Neustadt began the shift away from strictly legal and institutional studies of the presidency, and brought to political science a new understanding of the roles bargaining and persuasion play in the practice of the presidency. As generally understood by political scientists following the work of James Ceaser and his colleagues, the rhetorical presidency marked a change from the Framers' conception of the institution as a deliberative, largely administrative entity, and toward a more epideictic, publicly responsive institution. There is substantial agreement throughout the literature that the constitutional system as a whole has been weakened by presidential attempts to build a direct relationship between themselves and the American people and through presidential de-

pendence upon the mass public rather than the political parties to maintain their status as national leaders. These attempts have changed both the presidency and the system in which it is embedded, including an increase in presidential speech, a change in the nature and meaning of that speech, an erosion of the traditional means of governance, and an increase in the president's ceremonial rather than substantive role.

"... the rhetorical presidency as a construct has the capacity to bring together scholars from widely divergent areas of presidency research . . ."

These changes in the institution of the presidency took place under the influence of three dramatic developments: (a) the decline of the power and standing of political parties, (b) the growing political and cultural influence of the autonomous institutions of the mass communication, and (c) the increasing personalization of politics. Thus, elements of the literature on political parties, media, and other institutions, as well as the various literatures on political processes, are all relevant to the study of the rhetorical presidency, which in turn provides a broader view of the system than much of the research in these disparate subfields often applies. Yet neither scholars of the rhetorical presidency nor those in other relevant subfields have made substantial use of these opportunities.

Instead, examinations of the myriad relationships between the president and the people, especially those that originate in political science, understand communication as purely instrumental - rhetorical acts are interesting to these researchers as variables that potentially affect presidential standing in the polls. Little regard is

* M. Stuckey & F. Antczak. "The Rhetorical Presidency: Deepening Vision, Widening Exchange." *Communication Yearbook* (in press). Although space precludes a detailed listing of appropriate citations, a sampling of the best work in the field is appended. Copies of the larger study can be obtained by mailing a disk to Mary E. Stuckey, Political Science, University of Mississippi, University, MS 38677.

The Rhetorical Presidency: A Nexus for Scholarship

(continued from page 6)

given to the idea that constituting the "public" as respondents is itself a rhetorical move that has potentially important political consequences for the democratic polity. In this area, political scientists could learn much from scholars in other disciplines, even as those who are interested in the constitutive effects of presidential rhetoric have much to learn about the political contexts that constrain that rhetoric.

If scholarship on the rhetorical presidency can be envisioned more as a continuous conversation than as a set of discrete inquiries, promising areas of research emerge. The most important of these is the question of whether the rhetorical presidency as a theoretical construct accurately reflects significant changes in the practice of the American presidency. Scholars have been far better at applying and extrapolating the insights of the early work on the rhetorical presidency than at deriving empirical tests of it, whether using qualitative or quantitative methods. While it seems beyond dispute that contemporary presi-

dents both speak more often and construct different sorts of rhetorics than previous presidents, it is considerably less clear that these practices necessarily imply significant changes in the presidency as a policy making institution. This argument needs to be analyzed rather than asserted and assumed, as we too often do presently.

Scholars may also need to examine further the question of how presidents are making appeals to mass audiences. With the American polity increasingly fragmented into a variety of publics, and with the mass media fragmenting as well, scholars interested in the relationship between national institutions and the practice of democracy would do well to examine which of these publics, if any, are granted differential degrees of presidential attention, and assess the implications for the policy that is then produced by the national government. Indeed, the very assertion that presidential communication has specific effects on specific audiences however defined, is one that needs both theoretical and empirical refinement.

Finally, there is the issue of designing theories and methods appropriate for analyzing the

new technologies of communication as they extend and alter the rhetorical possibilities of the presidency. Foremost among these technologies are those involving computer networking. As yet, discussion of the implications of the "Information Super Highway" are considerably more prevalent in the popular media than in the academic literature. Whatever the consequences computer technologies may have for democracy, scholars need to develop theories and methods for testing those theories if we are going to understand the presidency in an increasingly electronic age.

Beyond the vast body of research generated by scholars from various disciplines lies an even broader expanse of emendations, clarifications, and unanswered questions. If researchers from all these disciplines and approaches can welcome what they do not know, the wider possibilities of exchange will broaden scholarly fields of vision and deepen our collective understanding of the presidency and its place in the polity as a whole. □

Selected Bibliography

- Abramson, J., F. Arterton, & G. Orren. (1988). *The electronic commonwealth: The impact of new media technologies on democratic politics*. New York: Basic Books.
- Blumenthal, S. (1990). *Pledging allegiance: The last campaign of the cold war*. New York: Harper/Collins.
- Bostdorff, D. (1994). *The presidency and the rhetoric of foreign crisis*. University of South Carolina Press.
- Brace, P. & B. Hinckley. (1992). *Follow the leader: Opinion polls and the modern presidents*. New York: Basic Books.
- Campbell, K., & K. Jamieson. (1990). *Deeds done in words: Presidential rhetoric and the genres of governance*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Ceaser, J., G. Thurow, J. Tulis & J. Bessette. (1981). The rise of the rhetorical presidency. *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 11, 158-171.
- Edwards, G. (1989). *At the margins: Presidential leadership of Congress*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Fisher, W. (1980). Rhetorical fiction and the presidency. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 66, 119-126.
- Friedenberg, R. (1994). *Rhetorical studies of national political debates, 1960-1992* (2nd ed.). Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Hacker, K. (1995). *Candidate images in presidential elections*. New York: Praeger.
- Hart, R. (1984). *Verbal style and the presidency: a computer-based analysis*. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Hart, R. (1987). *The sound of leadership: Presidential communication in the modern age*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hinds, L., & T. Windt. (1991). *The cold war as rhetoric; The beginnings, 1945-1950*. New York: Praeger.
- Hinckley, B. (1990). *The symbolic presidency: How presidents portray themselves*. New York: Routledge.

The Rhetorical Presidency: A Nexus for Scholarship

(continued from page 7)

Selected Bibliography (continued)

- Ivie, R. (1974). Presidential motives for war. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 60, 337-345.
- Jamieson, K. (1988). *Eloquence in an electronic age: The transformation of American political speechmaking*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Jamieson, K. (1992). *Packaging the presidency: A history and criticism of presidential campaign advertising* (2nd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Jones, S. (Ed.). (1995). *CyberSociety: Computer mediated communication and community*. New York: Basic Books.
- Just, M., A. Crigler, D. Alger, T. Cook, M. Kern, & D. West. (1996). *Crosstalk: Citizens, candidates, and media in a presidential campaign*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kernell, S. (1993). *Going public: New strategies of presidential leadership* (2nd ed.). Washington, DC: CQ Press.
- Kiewe, A. (Ed.). (1994). *The modern presidency and crisis rhetoric*. New York: Praeger.
- Lowi, T. (1985). *The personal president: Power invested, promise unfulfilled*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Maltese, J. (1994). *Spin control: The White House Office of Communications and the management of presidential news* (2nd ed.). Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- Manheim, J. (1991). *All of the people all of the time: Strategic communication and American politics*. Armonk, NY: ME Sharpe.
- Medhurst, M. (Ed.). (1996). *Beyond the rhetorical presidency*. College Station, TX: Texas A&M Press.
- Patterson, T. E. (1993). *Out of order*. New York: A. Knopf.
- Stuckey, M. (1997). *Strategic failures in the modern presidency*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Swanson, D., & D. Nimmo. (Eds.). (1990). *New directions in political communication: A resource book*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Trent, J. & Friedenber, R. (1991). *Political campaign communication: Principles and practices* (2nd ed.). New York: Praeger.
- Tulis, J. (1987). *The rhetorical presidency*. Princeton: NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Wander, P. (1984). The rhetoric of American foreign policy. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 70, 339-361.
- Windt, T. (1986). Presidential rhetoric: Definition of a field of study. *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 16, 102-116.
- Zarefsky, D. (1986). *President Johnson's War on Poverty: Rhetoric and history*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.

Report from the President

Terry Sullivan

University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

I have told a number of you that in assuming the duties of leading this organization, Earl Weaver's comment comes to mind that a team's momentum is defined by the quality of the next day's pitcher. I feel the burden of that observation quite squarely at this time. In the past few years, the Presidency Research Group (PRG) has undergone a substantial transformation. Now more than ever, it has assumed responsibility for developing the profession. Thanks most especially to the indefatigable efforts of Martha Kumar, the PRG has begun a major program of affecting professional scholarship in

our subfield. But the interesting thing about our recent revival is that it has not simply been one person or a few people carrying the load. Instead, everyone has contributed to this effort. The PRG Board has worked hard considering the future, planning, programming, budgeting, and committing. Although most social science associations leave their entire decision-making to their executive councils, the PRG leadership (its officers and boards) have gone to the membership with every major issue, and it has responded.

As a result, the PRG has launched an

impressive program of internal development: improving its publications, searching for funding, analyzing patterns of publication, and expanding its recognition of scholarly excellence. In addition, the PRG has played an important role in shaping the consideration of public policy issues affecting our discipline. It has participated in an important way in the management of the National Archives, in shaping the government settlement of the Nixon papers question, in rescuing the Wilson Center from oblivion, and in shaping the way in which government secrets become open.

Report from the President (continued from page 8)

In this report to you, I want to cover two broad areas: our ongoing agenda of business and our developing agenda of activities. Some of you have already read this report on our list service (*PRGNews*). I encourage those of you not registered with *PRGNews* to sign up. It is a free and easy way to connect the entire sub-field, worldwide and all the time. It allows us to exchange information and opinion, quickly. It allows us to participate in the shaping of issues important to our professional lives. To sign up, you need to get an e-mail account at your home institution or through an internet service provider in your area (like AOL or Mindspring). Then, with your e-mail account you send a message to our overarching e-mail address (PRGNet@unc.edu), and we will do the rest. Or you can look at the PRG's newly updated website and send e-mail from there with your web browser. The address for the PRGNet website is <http://sun-site.unc.edu/lia/prgnet>.

Convention Program. Thanks to the organizing efforts of Stephen Weatherford, the convention panels and poster sessions went very smoothly. A particular highlight of that program - a panel on White House press relations - drew a very large crowd and resulted in a very informative exchange involving three White House reporters (Helen Thomas of UPI, John Harris of the *Post* and Alexis Simendinger of the *National Journal*), former White House strategist David Gergen, and current White House Press Secretary Mike McCurry. The panel also garnered C-SPAN coverage. Following the panel, the PRG hosted a reception for the panelists, allowing PRGsters an opportunity to meet and discuss topics with the panelists. Each of the panelists stayed for a long time, seeming to

enjoy the opportunity to discuss issues with members.

Similar special efforts with journal editors also seemed successful. Thanks to George Edwards (chair) and the publications committee for organizing the panel, building on last year's panel with book editors.

Committee Activities. The convention also offered PRG committees an opportunity to accomplish a number of their goals and issue their reports. The White House Interview Program (WHIP), chaired by Martha Kumar, continued its work laying a foundation for seeking grants to underwrite the program. The committee has a number of reasons for optimism. This past summer, Pew awarded Martha Kumar money to investigate the feasibility of this project and to do some pilot interviews. The WHIP advisory board contributed to the effort with sage advice on interviewing and The Academy of Leadership at the University of Maryland (where Martha is a senior fellow) contributed a great deal of effort in infrastructure planning and support.

The Research and Funding Committee, chaired by Janet M. Martin, produced an outstanding report on funding sources and publication patterns. In addition, through Janet's work and the goodwill and dedication of Paul Light at the Pew Charitable Trusts, the PRG will sponsor a Wednesday Workshop at the 1998 convention on development and foundation relations (how to get grants!). Paul outlined a very impressive program that he thought he and Janet could put together for the Boston meetings. Of course, this short course will carry an admission fee and any member of APSA can attend. Shortly we will have some more information about the short course.

In addition, Janet identified a development possibility for support from the National Endowment for the Humanities. NEH staff encouraged the committee to improve its involve-

ment in NEH grant getting, especially through participating on the NEH review panels. Janet obtained applications for panel participants and PRG promised to assist NEH in developing an on-line application process to make it easier for PRG registration.

The Publications Committee, chaired by George Edwards, announced a cooperative relationship with the Center for the Study of the Presidency to publish and improve the *PRG Report*, of which you are reading the initial effort. Housed at the George Bush Presidential Library Center on the campus of Texas A&M University, the Center will provide a permanent operation for the newsletter. George Edwards generously volunteered to act as the "transition editor" while we work out the kinks in this new system. He also proposed and the Board encouraged a new emphasis patterned after the "Extensions" insert in the Legislative Studies Group's newsletter. This will concentrate on providing an opportunity for PRG members to share methodology and theory. Over the next two years, the committee will identify a member (or team of members) to take over editorship from George. The Center will continue to publish the newsletter, though, which will catapult George into the ranks of media moguls. The committee also announced plans for a short course on quantitative and qualitative methods. Contact Renee Smith, George Edwards, or Mary Stuckey about the short course.

Through the auspices of Martha Kumar, the Presidential Libraries Committee, WHIP, and the PRG Board sponsored a breakfast meeting with US Archivist John Carlin. PRG has kept involved in the Archives developments through Martha Kumar's untiring efforts in Washington.

Report from the President (continued from page 9)

The breakfast, opened to all PRG members, discussed the still developing "Nixon settlement," concluding the Nixon family's successful lawsuit to structure Archives dispensation of the Nixon private and personal papers. This settlement will eventually clear the way for moving the Nixon presidential papers to the California library site. Resolving the issues over the private papers also seems to have opened the Nixon family to a more cooperative strategy with regards to releasing (wholesale) presidential paper collections. Carlin seemed hopeful that this new cooperation would speed up processing. Carlin also discussed his views on library system management and the general position of the Archives with respect to its congressional committees. In particular, Carlin announced a number of personnel adjustments at libraries, intended to improve responsiveness to researchers, especially at the beleaguered Reagan and Bush Libraries, where the burdens of Presidential Records Act fall heaviest.

Board Activities. In addition to receiving all of the above committee reports, the Board discussed a number of issues associated with PRG structure and activities. The Board thanked out-going board members: Russell Renka, Mary Stuckey, and Larry Jacobs.

The Board also recommended and the business meeting accepted an increase in dues from \$7.00 to \$10.00. The increase brings our dues into line with those of other sections and will also cover expenditures expected for improvements in the PRG *Report*. At the general business meeting, I noted the strategy of passing a tax increase my first day in office.

Out-going Secretary/Treasurer Karen Hult reported on our financial and membership positions. Each is sound and steady,

although APSA continues to produce confusing membership numbers. This membership blip is a recurring problem, especially for APSA lifetime members who need not reregister with APSA but must register with sections.

The Board encourages all members to check their membership status in PRG to assure that they have re-registered.

Next Week's Pitching Schedule. I want to leave you with an idea of the year's agenda for PRG. I do not foresee an activist agenda for the organization. With all of the trepidation of an articulator who *has* read Stephen's book, I foresee merely continuing to realize the PRG's current agenda. In my opinion, we cannot encompass much beyond what we have before us now. More on that later.

This agenda includes three kinds of things. First we have a number of ongoing projects (short courses, funding opportunities, publishing, awards) which constitute the regular business of the organization. The Board and its standing committees have begun this work already, and over the year you will hear about their activities through *PRGNews*. Be there or be uninformed.

Second, the horizon continues to suggest a number of public issues with which the PRG will likely engage. We have already participated in the saving of Woodrow Wilson Center. While most of the social science organizations focused their attention on the National Endowment for the Humanities, the House of Representatives crippled the Wilson Center's funding. The PRG, through the attention of Martha, jumped into the fray with our support. The Senate, thanks in part to that participation restored last year's funding levels to the Center and as of this writing, it looks as though we have rallied enough support to preserve the Center this year. Obviously, we

will play a part in the restructuring of the Wilson Center's activities and its support base so that this will not happen again.

The Nixon settlement will probably finalize sometime this fall, and we need to involve ourselves in that. The PRG's position on this settlement has emphasized full disclosure and increased access to these valuable papers. We have made a number of recommendations to the Archivist in resolving this dispute with the Nixon family. At present, though, most of the negotiations now involve the Departments of Justice and the Nixon attorneys. We have proposed that in addition to speeding the processing of materials, the Archives and the Nixon Library itself should consider the value of an advisory panel whose responsibilities would include advising the Nixon Library director on opening materials. Such an advisory committee would assure the scholarly community that the Archives could process materials without interference or undue influence from the Nixons.

Third, I believe that as an organization, we have reached a point in our development that we need to pay attention to the organization itself. We want to encourage more participation in the life of the PRG and we want to leave the organization with a leadership whose positions represent challenges for a group like ours dependent entirely on volunteerism and good offices. I will continue to keep the challenge in my work this year, as I know your Board and its leadership will.

Report from the Secretary/Treasurer

Karen Hult
Virginia Tech

The PRG continues to operate on a solid financial foundation with a relatively steady membership base. Meanwhile, its activities during 1996-97 included ongoing work on designing and seeking funding for the White House Interview Program, co-sponsoring the November 1996 Conference on *Presidential Power*, participating in ongoing discussions with officials of the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) on issues related to the presidential libraries system, submitting a public comment to NARA's National Historical Publications and Records Commission on the NHPRC's revised strategic plan, and working to save the Wilson Center from congressional budget cuts.

Secretary's Report

Membership in PRG has declined somewhat, with individual memberships numbering 385 (compared with 416 in 1995-96 and 421 in 1994-95). In addition, there are roughly 25 institutional members, mostly libraries. The need persists to urge members to keep their memberships current and to try to attract new members, especially junior faculty and graduate students.

The on-line information services of the PRG continue to be used. Their ongoing maintenance and refinement owe much to Terry Sullivan's oversight. PRGNet (and PRGBoard for board members) have helped keep section members informed and have facilitated their participation in ongoing PRG activities. Meanwhile, PRESIDENT continues to attract a diverse array of requests for information on and about U.S. Presidents.

Treasurer's Report

What follows summarizes PRG bud-

getary matters from 1 July 1996 through 30 June 1997. Similar, more detailed information is provided to the APSA every July as part of the Association's monitoring of organized sections.

PRG's revenues exceeded expenditures for FY1997 by \$611.42. At the beginning of FY1998, almost \$3,800 remained in the PRG account. It should be noted, however, that members contributed \$690 for the Neustadt Conference, and the PRG spent only \$351 of those funds on a gift for Professor Neustadt. (Columbia University and others picked up many of the other conference expenses, including travel for several junior scholars).

PRG's revenues exceeded expenditures for FY1997 by \$611.42. At the beginning of FY1998, almost \$3,800 remained in the PRG account. It should be noted, however, that members contributed \$690 for the Neustadt Conference, and the PRG spent only \$351 of those funds on a gift for Professor Neustadt. (Columbia University and others picked up many of the other conference expenses, including travel for several junior scholars).

As in recent years, over half of the expenditures were devoted to preparation (copying and bibliographic consulting) and mailing of the PRG newsletter (total of \$1,373.44). Additional expenses included the various awards and other costs associated with the annual meeting (two breakfasts and a reception).

As of September 30th, with all of the bills from the August APSA paid, PRG's balance is \$1,789.20.

Minutes of the Annual Meeting

The business meeting of the PRG was called to order at 12:30 p.m. on August 29, 1997 at the Washington, D.C. Sheraton by Professor Martha Joynt Kumar, the outgoing PRG President. Professor Kumar turned the chair over to the incoming President, Professor Terry Sullivan, who

presided over the meeting.

Professor Sullivan immediately recognized Professor Stephen Wayne who moved that Martha Kumar be presented with a special Neustadt award in recognition of her many contributions to the PRG. Professor George Edwards seconded the motion, which was passed by acclamation. After Professor Wayne read a tribute to Professor Kumar, she was presented with a plaque and a crystal vase as tokens of the members' appreciation.

Old Business

Recommendations from the PRG Board of candidates to fill open board and officer positions were presented to the full membership for discussion and vote. First, Professor Sullivan reported the nominations of five new board members to replace those whose three-year terms expire in 1997: Nancy Kassop, Janet M. Martin, Robert Shapiro, Alexis Simendinger, Kathryn Dunn Tenpas. After little discussion and no nominations from the floor, these nominees were approved. [Since this meeting, Alexis Simendinger has learned that her employer, *National Journal*, does not permit such activity, and she has withdrawn from the Board. She has been replaced by MaryAnne Borrelli.] The Board's nominations for secretary-treasurer and vice-president were then presented: for secretary-treasurer, Robert Spitzer; for vice-president, Karen Hult. Once more, following little discussion and no nominations from the floor, these nominations were approved.

Secretary-Treasurer Karen Hult then reported briefly on the PRG's membership and financial situation. She noted that

Report from the Secretary/Treasurer (continued from page 11)

sented the award to Professor Stanley A. Renshon for his book: *High Hopes: The Clinton Presidency and the Politics of Ambition* (New York University Press).

Professor Charles Walcott reported on the Founder's Award for the best graduate student paper on the presidency presented at the 1996 APSA or the regional political science meetings in 1996-97. This year, the award was in honor of PRG founder Peri Arnold. On behalf of committee members MaryAnne Borrelli, Patricia Conley, and Michael Link, Professor Walcott presented the award to Richard J. Powell for his paper, "Taking the Show on the Road: The Politics of Presidential Travel in the Modern Era."

No Founder's Award was given this year for the best paper on the presidency presented at the 1996 APSA. Professor Sullivan urged PRG members to nominate papers for next year's award.

New Business

Following presentation of the awards, Professor Sullivan introduced the subject of a possible new award, to be given approximately every year to an outstanding reference work on the presidency. The

Board had approved the 1996-97 Neustadt committee's recommendation of such an award and brought it to the full membership for discussion. After some discussion from the floor, a motion to establish the new award was passed, and the outgoing Neustadt committee was asked to draft a proposal that suggested the name of the award and language for the by-laws on the criteria to be used in granting such an award.

Terry Sullivan then addressed the group to outline his plans as PRG president. He stressed the need to continue to advance the PRG's development as an organization, including both expanding its base of active members and encouraging more participation on PRGNet. Professor Sullivan underscored the importance of two overall objectives: working to advance members' common interests as scholars, and seeking to sustain the PRG's external presence. Pursuing the first goal will include the ongoing efforts of the Funding Committee (chaired by Janet M. Martin) and of those working on WHIP. Significant as well will be seeking to further improve the newsletter and to sponsor activities that will enhance members' skill acquisition (e.g., through a "short course" on updating data analysis skills being planned by George Edwards, Renee Smith, and Mary

Stuckey). In addition, the second goal of maintaining PRG's presence eternally will include continued liaison with NARA and ongoing efforts to lead the APSA into more policy-related activities.

The next order of business was a motion from the PRG Board to increase section fees to \$10. After some discussion, the motion passed.

Professor George Edwards then updated the group on the Bush Presidential library, noting that it would be open to scholars on 20 January 1998. Professor Kumar discussed the current status of the White House Interview Program.

Professor Michael Genovese moved, and several seconded, that Professor Stephen Weatherford be thanked for his work in chairing the Presidency section for the 1997 APSA. Professor Sullivan commented briefly on the reduced number of panels on U.S. politics for the 1998 APSA.

The meeting adjourned at 1:15 p.m.

Research Opportunities at the George Bush Presidential Library

David Alsobrook

The George Bush Presidential Library

Now that the Bush Library and Museum has been dedicated and opened to the public, the next important date on the Library's calendar is the research room's official opening on January 20, 1998. The Bush Library's archival collections include approximately 400,000,000 pages of officials records and personal papers, 1,000,000 photographs, and thousands of sound

and video recordings documenting the life and career of George Bush.

All of the official records are administered in accordance with the terms of the Presidential Records Act of 1978 (44 USC, Chapter 22.) Materials not subject to any restrictions of the Presidential Records Act are available for research five years after the

Archivist of the United States assumes custody of such records or upon completion of the archival processing. On January 20, 1998, scholars may visit the Bush Library's research room. On that date, they can file Freedom of Information Act requests for access to Bush Presidential Records and Quayle Vice-Presidential Records (Bush Vice-Presidential

**Research Opportunities at
the Bush Presidential
Library
(continued from page 12)**

Records have been available for FOIA requests since January 1994). Before filing their FOIA requests, scholars are encouraged to examine the official records that the Bush Library archivists have systematically processed over the past four years. These records include: The White House Office of Records Management (WHORM) Subject File, The White House Scheduling Office's Presidential Daily Diary, the Speechwriters Files, and selected portions of White House Press Office files.

Personal papers relating to George Bush's many years in public service also are among the Library's archival holdings. These personal papers deal with Mr. Bush's service as congressman, US Ambassador to the UN, RNC Chairman, Chief of the US Liaison Office in China, and CIA Director. (Processing is underway on these collections of personal papers, which will be made available in the future for researchers in accordance with the terms of President Bush's deed of gift.)

All researchers are strongly encouraged to contact the Bush Library before planning a trip to College Station. Researchers who have questions about FOIA filing procedures, archival holdings, hotel accommodations, and research grants should contact:

Warren Finch
Supervisory Archivist
George Bush Library
P.O. Box 10410
College Station, TX 77842-0410

Tel. (409) 260-9552

American Political Science Association

Presidency Research Section Expense Report

FUNDS AT BEGINNING OF PERIOD		\$3,182.20
REVENUE FOR PERIOD		
APSA SECTION DUES PAYMENTS	\$1,592.00	
PUBLICATION SALES	60.00	
INTEREST INCOME	—	
OTHER REVENUE:		
Mailing Labels	215.47	
Neustadt Conference Contributions	690.00	
TOTAL REVENUE	\$2,557.47	
EXPENDITURES FOR PERIOD		
COPYING AND PRINTING	207.00	
POSTAGE	336.87	
TELEPHONE	—	
TRAVEL	—	
STAFF	400.00	
BANK SERVICE FEES	421.26	
BUSINESS MTG. & RECEPTIONS		
OTHER:		
Office Supplies	12.75	
Neustadt Gift	351.00	
Book/Paper Awards	193.17	
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$1,946.05	
NET ACTIVITY FOR THE PERIOD	\$ 611.42	
FUNDS AT END OF PERIOD	\$3,793.62	

.....

LOCATION & BALANCES OF ACCOUNTS AT END OF PERIOD	\$3,793.62
CHECKING ACCOUNTS:	
NATIONSBANK: Account #004409728	

* 12/17/97
Kullig's ut...

Books and Articles on the Presidency

MaryAnne Borrelli
Connecticut College

Books on the Presidency

A note to the reader: The following lists includes text and collections, in addition to scholarly works, in the belief that such information is useful in planning courses and designing syllabi. Whenever possible, entries include price and ISBN information.

- Bill, James A. 1997. *George Ball: Behind the Scenes in U.S. Foreign Policy*. New Haven: Yale University Press. 288 pages. \$30.00 cloth. ISBN 0300069693
- Borrelli, MaryAnne and Janet M. Martin (ed.) 1997. *The Other Elites: Women, Politics, and Power in the Executive Branch*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc. 265 pages. \$55.00 cloth. ISBN 1-55587-658-7
- Cabinets and Counsellors: *The President and the Executive Branch*. 1997. Washington, D.C.: CQ Press. 205 pages. \$25.95 paper. ISBN 1-56802-309-x
- Campbell, Collin. 1997. *The U.S. Presidency in Crisis, A Comparative Perspective*. New York: Oxford University Press. 272 pages. \$18.95 paper. ISBN 0-19-509144-2
- Cannon, James M. 1997. *Time and Chance: Gerald Ford's Appointment with History*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press. 496 pages. \$19.95 paper. ISBN 0472084828
- * Cohen, Jeffrey E. 1997. *Presidential Responsiveness and Public Policy Making: The Publics and the Policies that Presidents Choose*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press. 284 pages. \$47.50 cloth. ISBN 0-472-10812-3
- * Collier, Kenneth. 1997. *Between the Branches. The White House Office of Legislative Affairs*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press. 330 pages. \$50.00 cloth, \$22.95 paper. ISBN 0822939789 cloth, ISBN 0822956292 paper.
- Crotin, Thomas and Michael A. Genovese. 1997. *The Paradoxes of the American Presidency*. New York: Oxford University Press. 448 pages. \$29.95 paper. ISBN 0-19-511693-3
- Daynes, Byron W., Raymond Tatalevich, and Dennis Soden. 1998. *To Govern A Nation, Presidential Power and Politics*. New York: St. Martin's Press. 400 pages. \$25.00 paper. ISBN 0-312-15413-5
- Diller, Daniel C. and Stephen L. Robertson. 1997. *The Presidents, First Ladies, and Vice Presidents; White House Biographies, 1789-1997*. Washington, D.C.: CQ Press. 180 pages. \$24.95 paper. ISBN1-56802-311-1
- Edwards, George C., III and Stephen J. Wayne. 1997. *Presidential Leadership, Politics and Policy Making*, 4th ed. New York: St. Martin's Press. 512 pages. \$31.99 paper. ISBN 0-312-14498-9
- Hoopes, Townsend and Douglas Brinkley. 1997. *FDR and the Creation of the U.N.* New Haven: Yale University Press. 288 pages. \$30.00 cloth. ISBN 0300069308
- Kernell, Samuel. 1997. *Going Public, New Strategies of Presidential Leadership*, 3rd ed. Washington, D.C.: CQ Press. 276 pages. \$24.95 paper. ISBN 1 56802-218-2
- Nelson, Michael (ed.). 1997. *The Presidency and the Political System*, 5th ed. Washington, D.C.: CQ Press. 600 pages. \$30.95 paper. ISBN1-56802-304-9
- Pfiffner, James P. 1998. *The Modern Presidency*, 2nd ed. New York: St. Martin's Press. 256 pages. \$18.66 paper. ISBN 0-312-17804-2
- Pfiffner, James P. and Roger H. Davidson (ed.) 1997. *Understanding the Presidency*. New York: Longman. 454 pages. \$32.23 paper. ISBN0-673-99899-1
- [The] Powers of the Presidency, 2nd ed. 1997. Washington, D.C.: CQ Press. 294 pages. \$24.95 paper. ISBN 1-56802-310-3
- [The] President, the Public, and the Parties, 2nd ed. 1997. Washington, D.C.: CQ Press. 184 pages. 24.95 paper. ISBN 1-56802-313-8
- Selecting the President from 1789 to 1996. 1997. Washington, D.C.: CQ Press. 240 pages. 24.95 paper. ISBN 1-56802-312-x
- Shull, Steven A. 1997. *Presidential-Congressional Relations: Policy and Time Approaches*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press. 156 pages. \$39.50 cloth. ISBN 0-472-10832-8
- Thomas, Norman C. and Joseph A. Pika. 1997. *The Politics of the Presidency*, revised 4th ed. Washington, D.C.: CQ Press. 525 pages. \$32.95 paper. ISBN 1-56802-316-2

Articles on the Presidency

A note to the reader: Because every article in the Presidential Studies Quarterly relates to this column, and because limited space argues against replicating its tables of contents, only the themes which define each issue of the journal are listed.

- Borrelli, MaryAnne. 1997. "Gender, Credibility, and Politics: The Senate Nomination Hearings of Cabinet Secretaries-Designate, 1975 to 1993." *Political Research Quarterly* 50.1: 171-197. Examines the relevance of career and gender issues for the credibility of cabinet secretaries-designate.

Articles on the Presidency (continued from page 14)

- Brzezinski, Zbigniew, Brent Scowcroft, and Richard Murphy. 1997. "Differentiated Containment." *Foreign Affairs* 76.3: 20-30. Examines the containment philosophies which have guided the Clinton policy in the Persian Gulf.
- Campbell, James E. 1997. "The Presidential Pulse and the 1994 Midterm Congressional Election." *Journal of Politics* 59.3: 830-837. Revises the accepted theory of surge-and-decline in midterm elections and provides support for the Republican realignment hypothesis.
- Cohen, David B. 1997. "George Bush's Vicar of the West Wing: John Sununu as White House Chief of Staff." *Congress & the Presidency* 24.1: 37-59. Examines the roles and functions assumed by George Bush's first White House Chief of Staff.
- Damore, Damon F. 1997. "A Dynamic Model of Candidate Fundraising: The Case of Presidential Nomination Campaigns." *Political Research Quarterly* 50.2: 343-364. Identifies and compares the factors influencing fundraising success for long-shot and established candidates.
- Doherty, Kathryn M. and James G. Gimpel. 1997. "Candidate Character vs. the Economy in the 1992 Election." *Political Behavior* 19.3: 177-196. Evaluates the effect of economic evaluations along with character attacks on candidate support in the 1992 presidential contest.
- Edwards, George C. III, Andrew Barrett, and Jeffrey Peake. 1997. "The Legislative Impact of Divided Government." *American Journal of Political Science* 41.2: 545-563. Examines the effects of divided government on presidential-legislative relations, conducting a regression analysis of legislative failure and passage from 1947 to 1992.
- Edwards, George C. III, and Tami Swenson. 1997. "Who Rallies? The Anatomy of a Rally Event, A Research Note." *Journal of Politics* 59.1: 200-212. Argues that those who rally to the president's support in crises are not merely evidencing patriotic fervor, but were predisposed to support the president.
- Gimpel, James G. and Diane Hollern Harvey. 1997. "Forecasts and Preferences in the 1992 General Election." *Political Behavior* 19.2: 157-175. Examines the linkage between voter forecasts about the likely winner of a general election and voter preferences for that election.
- Goren, Paul. 1997. "Gut-Level Emotions and the Presidential Vote." *American Politics Quarterly* 25.2: 203-229. Uses social psychology to consider the roots of emotional responses to presidents, and their association with or independence of political cognition.
- Goren, Paul. 1997. "Political Expertise and Issue Voting in Presidential Elections." *Political Research Quarterly* 50.2: 387-412. Uses social and political psychology to demonstrate that the accessibility of policy attitudes from memory is dependent upon the citizen's political expertise.
- Haass, Richard N. 1997. "Fatal Distraction: Bill Clinton's Foreign Policy." *Foreign Policy* No. 108: 112-123. Weighs Clinton's current foreign policy priorities in light of his anticipated historical reputation.
- Haynes, Audrey A., Paul-Henri Gurian, and Stephen N. Nichols. 1997. "The Role of Candidate Spending in Presidential Nomination Campaigns." *Journal of Politics* 59.1: 213-225. Uses a multivariate model of nomination outcomes to determine the effect of spending on votes in presidential primaries and caucuses.
- Joyce, Philip G. and Robert D. Reischauer. 1997. "The Federal Line-Item Veto: What Is It and What Will It Do?" *Public Administration Review* 57.2: 95-104. Weighs the likely effects of the Line-Item Veto Act upon legislative-executive relations.
- Kennan, George F. 1997. "Diplomacy Without Diplomats?" *Foreign Affairs* 76.5: 198-212. Considers the consequences of a politicized foreign service for foreign policy-making.
- Krause, George A. and David B. Cohen. 1997. "Presidential Use of Executive Orders, 1953-1994." *American Politics Quarterly* 25.4: 458-481. Develops a probabilistic-based empirical model that identifies causal factors influencing presidential use of executive orders.
- Lewis, David. 1997. "The Two Rhetorical Presidencies: An Analysis of Televised Presidential Speeches, 1947-1991." *American Politics Quarterly* 25.3: 380-395. Argues that there are two rhetorical presidencies, one for foreign policy and one for economic policy.
- Leogrande, William M. and Alana S. Jeydel. 1997. "Using Presidential Election Returns to Measure Constituency Ideology, A Research Note." *American Politics Quarterly* 25.1: 3-18. Tests the reliability and validity of presidential election returns at the state and district level, as a proxy for constituency influence on congressional voting behavior.
- McCann, James A. 1997. "Electoral Choices and Core Value Change: The 1992 Presidential Campaign." *American Journal of Political Science* 41.2: 564-583. Referencing studies in social psychology, the article demonstrates that support for Bush or Clinton in 1992 led to changes in citizens' core values.
- Presidential Studies Quarterly*. 1997. 27.1, Bill Clinton and Al Gore: Retrospect [First Term Evaluations] and Prospect [Second Term Speculations].
- Presidential Studies Quarterly*. 1997. 27.2, Presidential Leadership.
- Ragdale, Lyn and John J. Theis. 1997. "The Institutionalization of the American Presidency, 1924-92." *American Journal of Political Science* 41.4: 1280-1318. Considers the impact of

Articles on the Presidency (continued from page 15)

- actors, activities, and events upon the institutionalization of the presidency.
- Royed, Terry J. and Stephen A. Borrelli. 1997. "Political Parties and Public Policy: Social Welfare Policy from Carter to Bush." *Polity* 29.4: 539-563. Examines the success of the two major parties in fulfilling platform pledges on social welfare policy, from 1977 to 1992.
- Schlesinger, Arthur M., Jr. 1997. "Rating the Presidents: Washington to Clinton." *Political Science Quarterly* 112.2: 179-190. Details the results of the 1996 *New York Times Magazine* poll assessing presidential performance.
- Scott, James M. 1997. "Interbranch Rivalry and the Reagan Doctrine in Nicaragua." *Political Science Quarterly* 112.2: 237-260. Uses a case study approach to understanding the application of the Reagan Doctrine to Nicaragua, and advances a framework for policy-making studies.
- Shields, Todd and Chi Huang. 1997. "Executive Vetoes: Testing Presidency-versus President-Centered Perspectives of Presidential Behavior." *American Politics Quarterly* 25.4: 431-457. Argues that presidential vetoes are largely the product of institutional arrangements and cycles that are beyond the control of individual administrations.
- Sigelman, Lee, Paul J. Wahlbeck, and Emmett H. Buell, Jr. 1997. "Vote Choice and the Preference for Divided Government: Lessons of 1992." *American Journal of Political Science* 41.3: 879-894. Considers the effect of a preference for divided government on voter choice and ticket-splitting in 1992.
- Spitzer, Robert J. 1997. "The Constitutionality of the Presidential Line-Item Veto." *Political Science Quarterly* 112.2: 261-283. Reviews various constitutional debates surrounding the line-item veto, concluding that many of the arguments cannot withstand critical review.
- Steger, Wayne. 1997. "Presidential Policy Initiation and the Politics of Agenda Control." *Congress & the Presidency* 24.1: 17-36. Examines whether and why presidents have greater success on legislation initiated by their administrations compared with that proposed by others in government.
- Stehr, Steven D. 1997. "Top Bureaucrats and the Distribution Influence in Reagan's Executive Branch." *Public Administration Review* 57.1: 75-82. Surveys career members of the senior executive service regarding the distribution of influence among Reagan's political appointees.
- Tenpas, Kathryn Dunn and Matthew J. Dickson. 1997. "Governing, Campaigning, and Organizing the Presidency: An Electoral Connection?" *Political Science Quarterly* 112.1: 51-66. Reveals the relationship between the two transitions experienced by presidents and their staffs, the one from campaigning to governing and the other from governing to campaigning for re-election.
- Wisendale, Steven K. 1997. "The White House and Congress on Child Care and Family Leave Policy: From Carter to Clinton." *Policy Studies Journal* 25.1: 75-86. Surveys family policy initiatives of the past four presidential administrations, focusing upon the Child Care and Development Block Grant of 1990 and the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993.

Book and Paper Awards

Richard E. Neustadt Award
(For the best book on the presidency published in 1996.)

In *High Hopes: The Clinton Presidency and the Politics of Ambition*, Stanley A. Renshon not only sketches a provocative portrait of Bill Clinton but also presents an innovative approach for analyzing other presidents. Professor Renshon draws upon diverse scholarly work in psychoanalytic theory, presidential leadership and performance, and public psychology.

Despite the undeniable influence of institutional constraints and public expectations, Renshon makes a strong case that the personality and character of individual presidents remain important determinants of presidential performance. Few presidential actions are formally mandated, and many demands that presidents confront either cannot be anticipated or have few obvious responses. Meanwhile, most administrations unfold "in the midst of complex and uncharted shifts in domestic and international

circumstances" (p. 5), volatility only heightened by the end of the Cold War.

Renshon's psychological approach is explicitly grounded in comparative psychoanalytic theory. *High Hopes* is notable for its clear and systematic explanation of the theoretical underpinnings of its notions of character and personality and the application of these concepts to Bill Clinton. Careful citations, thorough research, and the inclusion of a thoughtful methodological appendix enhance the credibility of the analysis.

Book and Paper Awards (continued from page 16)

In addition, *High Hopes* moves beyond psychological classification to consider the effects of presidential psychology on presidential performance. Renshon proposes two useful standards for judging performance that he ties to a president's character: judgment (when making political and policy decisions) and leadership (i.e. a president's skill at mobilizing, orchestrating, and coordinating public support for policy decisions).

The provocative features of Renshon's work - in addition to the uniqueness of his approach, the numerous insights it generates, and the promise it holds for further work - are among the contributions of *High Hopes* to presidency scholarship.

Award Committee:

Karen M. Hult, Chair (Virginia Tech)
David Gray Adler (Idaho State)
Richard Ellis (Willamette)
Bartholomew Sparrow (Texas)

The Founder's Award (in honor of Peri Arnold)

(For the best paper by a graduate student in the 1996-97 academic year.)

"Taking the Show On The Road: The Politics of Presidential Travel in the Modern Era," Richard J. Powell.

Powell's paper provides a creative and methodologically sophisticated investigation of the determinants of presidential travel. In the process, he has created an extremely rich data set, consisting of nearly 4000 non-D.C. domestic speeches, coded along 20 dimensions. Substantively, his paper provides a useful operationalization of determinants of presidential travel, including elements of Kernell's *Going Public* model, and subjects them to rigorous statistical testing. His findings provide important insights into how and why presidents reach out to the public through travel and speaking. At the same time, they reveal little support for Kernell's model, thus raising an important challenge to the conventional wisdom in this area.

The paper is well-written, well-argued, sound in its approach and provocative in its

findings. We are pleased to confer this award on a paper of such quality.

Award Committee:

Charles E. Walcott, Chair (Virginia Tech)
MaryAnne Borrelli (Connecticut College)
Patricia Conley (Northwestern)
Michael Link (University of South Carolina)

The Founder's Award

The Founder's Award Committee for best convention paper announced no winner and the subsequent postponement of awarding a prize in the name of founder Dom Bonafede until next convention.

Award Committee:

Don Robinson (Smith)
Joe Pika (Delaware)
Marissa Golden (Pennsylvania)
Ken Mayer (Wisconsin-Madison)

Dissertation on the Presidency Prize

The Center for Presidential Studies in the George Bush School of Government and Public Service announces the second annual national competition for the best dissertation on the American presidency. The competition is open to scholars in any field, and dissertations may focus on any aspect of the presidency. Nominations may be made by chairs of dissertation committees or other faculty members.

The winners will receive a \$1,000 award and expenses to present their work at Texas A&M University. The prize also carries with it the opportunity for publication in the Presidency and Leadership Studies series of Texas A&M University Press.

Nominations for the prize should include three copies of the dissertation and a cover letter. They should be sent to George C. Edwards, III, Director, The Center for Presidential Studies, George Bush School of Government and Public Service, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX, 77843. Dissertations accepted for degree completion in 1997 are eligible. For additional information, see our website at <http://www.bushschool.tamu.edu>. **Deadline February 15, 1998.**

Prize and Award Committees, 1997-1998

Neustadt Prize for the Best Book on the Presidency

Chair: Russell Renka
rdrenka@semovm.semo.edu
mail Stop 2920
Department of Political Science
Southeast Missouri State University
Cape Girardeau, MO 63701-4799
(573) 651-2692

Richard J. Powell
rjpowell@fau.edu
Department of Political Science
Florida Atlantic University
2912 College Avenue
Davie, FL 33314
(954) 236-1182

Meenekshi Bose
pscmzb@hofstra.edu
Department of Political Science
Hofstra University
Hempstead, NY 11550
(609) 258-4771

Lydia Andrade
Andrade@facstaff.cas.unt.edu
Department of Political Science
University of North Texas
P.O. Box 305340
Denton, TX 76203-5340
(904) 565-2317

Charles Cameron
cmcl@columbia.edu
Department of Political Science
Columbia University
420 West 118th Street, Room 726
New York, NY 10027
(212) 854-4302

Founder's Award for Best Paper by a Graduate Student

Chair: Victoria Farrar-Myers
myers@sage.edu
25 A-1 Pine Lane
Albany, NY 12203
(518) 452-3837
After November 1:
Highland House, Apartment 908
5480 Wisconsin Avenue
Chevy Chase, MD 20815

Michael Towle
towle@msmary.edu
Department of Government
Mount St. Mary's College
Emmitsburg, MD 21727
(301) 447-5374

Steven Shull
saspo@jazz.ucc.uno.edu
Department of Political Science
University of New Orleans
New Orleans, LA 70148
(504) 286-6383

Founder's Award for Best Convention Paper

Chair: Joel Aberbach
aberbach@polisci.sscnet.ucla.edu
Department of Political Science
University of California
4289 Bunche Hall
Los Angeles, CA 90024-148
(310) 206-5720
(301) 206-7110 (fax)

Marcia Walker
whicker@andromeda.rutgers.edu
Graduate Department of Public Administration
Rutgers University - Newark
701 Hill Hall
Newark, NJ 07102
(201) 648-5505

Richard Forshee
forshee@gunet.georgetown.edu
Georgetown Public Policy Institute
3600 N St., NW #200
Washington, DC 20007
(202) 687-7071

Please send your book or paper directly to each relevant committee member.

Does your library subscribe to the PRG *REPORT*? If not, fill out the coupon below and send it to your library.

To: Acquisitions, the Library

From: _____

Re: Library Subscription to PRG *REPORT*

I urge you to pick up a subscription to the PRG *REPORT*, the professional publication of the Presidency Research Section of the American Political Science Association. Published twice a year, the *REPORT* is read by over 400 of the nation's pre-eminent students of the presidency, and contains information on the latest developments in the study of the presidency. **The subscription fee is only \$10.00.** Send a check for \$10 made out to the "American Political Science Association" and indicate that you wish to receive the PRG *REPORT* of the APSA's Presidency Research Section. Mail it to: APSA, 1527 New Hampshire Ave., NW, Washington, D.C. 20036.

In Memoriam: Bill Lammers

Editor's Note: On October 7, 1997, Bill Lammers passed away. This eulogy was delivered at Bill's funeral.

Herbert Alexander
University of Southern California

Mary, Linda, Caroline, Bill's parents, Mr. and Mrs. Lammers, his sisters and other family members, it is with heavy heart that I appear before you. Bill was a friend, a colleague, an inspiration, widely respected in the Department of Political Science and at USC, and we all miss him. He was on the faculty for thirty-two years. He served the university well, in all ranks, progressing from Instructor to Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Full Professor. USC was his job but also his life's work and his focus through the years. He became a Californian by adoption but never forgot his roots in the Middle West. He came out of the Minnesota "good government" tradition, and he was not shy in letting people know where he stood.

Bill served twice as Acting Chair of the Department, once for a two-year stint. Having observed the workings of the Department of Political Science myself, it takes a leader, a conciliator, a compromiser, a strong person, to head a diverse group of independent-minded academics - these are qualities that Bill had in abundance, along with an integrity and genuineness that shone through his persona.

Bill was always reliable. I sat on a number of university committees with him. He always came well prepared with notes, and did not "wing-it" as I and some of our colleagues have done. He was especially helpful on two search committees for a successor to me when I retire. Bill's interests in political science were wide ranging, as indicated by courses he taught in presidential studies, comparative executive behavior, federalism, state politics, policy analysis, politics and aging and politics and health policy. He received major grants from the National Institute on Aging, from the Haynes Foundation, and oth-

ers. Bill took an institutional approach to government. He particularly liked to study the presidency, not that he liked all the occupants of the White House, not that he thought all were worthy of that exalted position. He steered many students to the annual conferences of the Presidential Studies Association, and arranged for financing their trips. Bill developed a data bank on presidential activities in the U.S. and across the world, which facilitated his research on executive behavior and policy formation. Bill's approach to state government was marked by his being for a number of years on the selection committee for state legislative internships. He helped a number of students, not only at USC, to serve as interns in Sacramento.

For an academic such as Bill, death is not final closure, for his works live on. He spent his last years working on a final book, *Comparing Presidents: Leadership Styles and Domestic Policy* (CQ Press). The manuscript was sent to the publisher just last month. It will be published post-humously and will be a lasting monument to his memory. Preparing the manuscript kept his mind off his health, and kept him busy in his declining months. There are also two articles forthcoming, to be included as chapters in edited books, and one book review to be published in the *American Political Science Review*. These are a tribute to his determination to be in print, up to the last. These are typical of his productivity through the years - in all, five books, ranging from *Presidential Politics to Public Policy and the Aging*, and scores of articles and papers published in edited collections as well as in peer-reviewed journals.

Lest I dwell too much on research and publications, Bill had an affinity for teaching. His focus was on students, both undergraduate and graduate. He cared about students and spent much time with them. I think it fair to say that

he supervised more dissertations in the American field than anyone else on our faculty. Just a few months ago, in late July this year, Bill chaired a dissertation defense committee on which I also sat. He had read every word and was his usual insightful self. As usual, he encouraged the student at every turn. He was also, by the way, cheerful and hopeful about his condition.

In later years, Bill also encouraged junior faculty. He was quick to agree to serve on faculty review committees, and he helped a number of younger faculty persons to achieve promotion and tenure. Just a few weeks ago, we talked about another graduate student, who had asked Bill to sit in as a member of his dissertation committee. Bill reluctantly told the student he could not do it. That was our last conversation. He ended by saying to me that I have been a "good colleague." What better way is there than to return the compliment. He was a good colleague, and a good human being.

A quotation in Bill's obituary in the *Los Angeles Times* bears repeating: He never forgot the elderly. On the publication of his book, *Public Policy and the Aging*, Bill was quoted as saying: "All of us should remind ourselves of the importance of ordinary acts of kindness, like offering to drive an elderly neighbor to a physician or just calling up your eighty-year-old grandmother to ask how she's doing." That typifies the kind of person Bill was - caring, kind and concerned.

In Hebrew, there is a saying about the departed, Olaf Sholom, meaning of blessed memory. I end with that thought. □

TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY

THE CENTER FOR PRESIDENTIAL STUDIES
THE GEORGE BUSH SCHOOL OF GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC SERVICE
TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE STATION, TX 77843-4349
(409) 845-9764

Non-Profit Organization
U.S. Postage Paid
College Station, TX
77842
Permit Number 215

Dr. Russell D. Renka
Dept of Political Science
Southeast Missouri State Univ
Mail Stop 2920
Cape Girardeau, MO 63701-4799