2016. The effects of campaign visits were not significant for other candidates in these years.

Thus Wendland partially succeeds at the daunting task of parsing out the impact of campaign effects in presidential nomination campaigns. Other avenues for this investigation, however, may have produced still more fruitful results. For one, Wendland largely assumes that candidate visits attract media coverage and exposure, but he does not measure how much coverage candidates get for their efforts. This intervening factor would seem to be a likely reason to help explain why personal appearances matter for some candidates but not others. Some candidates, like Trump, gain tremendous exposure for their campaign events, whereas others spend days and weeks campaigning on the ground without drawing much attention beyond the rooms in which they speak. Given the focus on presidential nomination campaigns, it likely would have helped this investigation to have measured the volume of local and national news coverage that candidates generate. Analyzing digital, print, and broadcast media generated by events is a critical intervening step between the act of visiting a state and the effects on voter mobilization and public opinion. Without measuring that intervening factor, the inferential leap between visits and observable effects is larger and more tenuous.

Similarly, Wendland appropriately notes that candidates spend a lot of time fundraising during the invisible primary. It would have been a fruitful line of inquiry to have measured the correlation between visits to a particular state and funds raised in that state during that time frame. Given that campaign financial disclosure records are often imprecise with respect to the timing of donations, assessing the correlation between visits and the geographic bases of donations would have strengthened this part of the analysis. In the aggregate, it appears that candidates visit more often the big, populous states that have more wealthy donors. Analyzing in depth the efficacy of campaign visits for fundraising would have added value to the analysis of this kind of campaign activity.

Overall, Wendland offers an interesting analysis of a little-studied subject for which identifying significant effects is a daunting task. He has gathered an impressive array of data on candidate visits, as well as on other campaign effects, in his effort to isolate and evaluate the effects of campaign visits. He shows that presidential nomination candidates are strategic in the allocation of their time and their campaign efforts. He finds mixed results for the effects of campaign visits on both voter mobilization efforts, particularly of targeted constituency groups, and voter preferences for candidates across three presidential nomination cycles. The study could have done more to measure the visibility gained by candidates for their efforts, which could have helped explain the variations that Wendland finds across candidates and across presidential nominations. There is room for the inquiry to be expanded to demonstrate the efficacy of campaign visits and the geographic distribution of campaign fundraising. Yet overall, *Campaigns That Matter* is a worthwhile read for anyone interested in campaign effects and in presidential nomination campaigns.

The Lost Soul of the American Presidency: The Decline into Demagoguery and the Prospects for Renewal. By Stephen F. Knott. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2019. 312p. $39.95 cloth.

doi:10.1017/S1537592720000237

— Andrew E. Busch, *Claremont McKenna College*
andrew.busch@cmc.edu

In *The Lost Soul of the American Presidency*, Stephen F. Knott tackles a subject on the minds of many Americans: How did we get to where we are? That is, how did we get to our highly polarized country, complete with a highly divisive and arguably demagogic president? Knott offers an answer worth thinking about: our condition is at least partly the logical outgrowth of the transformation of the presidency from a constitutional office to a popular office.

Knott's argument is unabashedly Hamiltonian. He puts forward as the starting point the "constitutional presidency" as understood by Hamilton and Washington. In this original conception of the presidency, the president would be a stout defender of the rule of law and would strive to maintain the dignity of the office. He would serve a unifying function, prioritizing his role as head of state over a diverse and fractious republic. Although elected by the people indirectly, he would be independent from public opinion, and one of his most important tasks would be a willingness to exercise his powers to check legislative excess and defend unpopular minorities. Washington, in particular, would be both personally and politically humble and would think institutionally, understanding that the office was not coterminous with its temporary inhabitant. This model both compelled and allowed for a certain magnanimity from the president.

After establishing this baseline, Knott proceeds to trace key moments in what he calls the "degradation" of the presidency, culminating in our current dyspeptic moment. In stages, Knott argues, pivotal presidents shed the elements of the constitutional presidency.

This process began with the election of Thomas Jefferson in the "revolution of 1800." Although Jefferson curtailed the pomp of the presidency, he loosened the bonds holding the presidency to the Constitution. He prioritized a new presidential role of partisan leader over the role of head of state and pronounced that his foremost task was to facilitate the wishes of the majority. In his partisan role he curtailed civil liberties and treated political opponents as enemies and traitors.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592720000237 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Andrew Jackson adopted Jefferson's foundation while going far beyond Jefferson in degrading the dignity of the office. His efforts on behalf of the "common man" among the majority were offset by his offenses against the minority, whether free blacks or the victims of the Trail of Tears.

Woodrow Wilson represented the next leap in the "popular presidency," as he advanced a theory of presidential power overcoming the separation of powers through rhetoric dominated by utopian promises. Franklin Roosevelt built on Wilson's innovations, marshaling mass communications to propound an "us versus them" rhetoric.

To Knott, John F. Kennedy, despite his short tenure, was a crucial figure in this transformation, emphasizing himself as a "man of action"—operating largely outside the strictures of his party, building a personalistic culture of celebrity around his presidency, and using modern television to build a personal connection with voters. Since then, in Knott's telling, it has been mostly downhill, with only a few examples of presidents slowing the trend and then only partially.

Knott appropriately concedes that it is risky to judge presidencies while they are still in office, but he holds that Donald Trump "has hastened the office's descent into a media-saturated, cultish, hyperpartisan, public-opinion pandering enterprise.… Trump is completing the task that was initially undertaken by Jefferson and Jackson, updated for the twentieth century by Wilson, and slightly re-packaged by Franklin Roosevelt and Kennedy, and their successors" (pp. 206–7). He acknowledges that many of these predecessors would likely be appalled by Trump, but the institutional consequences of their presidencies include the creation of a divisive, partisan office that treats opponents as enemies and that fuels public discontent through consistent overpromising.

Overall, Knott offers an extended argument for drastically revising our notions of what constitutes an admirable presidency, and consequently the way we rank particular presidents. In this view, Jefferson, Jackson, Wilson, FDR, and Kennedy would be significantly downgraded. Their diminishment of the constitutional presidency and puffing up of the popular presidency had enormous negative consequences for their own times, as well as our own. Conversely, a set of unsung heroes should be elevated in rank. These are presidents whose fidelity to the rule of law and whose humility and magnanimity were in keeping with the constitutional presidency: John Quincy Adams, William Howard Taft, Calvin Coolidge, Gerald Ford, and George H. W. Bush (at least once the 1988 campaign was over). Knott also points to Abraham Lincoln and Dwight D. Eisenhower, already highly ranked among scholars, as worthy of the praise they receive and perhaps more.

The Lost Soul of the American Presidency is a timely contribution to scholarship on the presidency. As Knott points out, although Donald Trump is unique in some ways, it is a mistake to see him as an aberration. It is important to come to grips with the institutional trends that have made him possible, if not inevitable. The president's supporters will not be satisfied, as Knott's treatment of Trump lacks the even-handedness he applies to most other presidents; it could be argued, for example, that, despite his many faults, Trump has used the presidency to defend the rights of vulnerable minorities such as gun owners, Americans whose conscience does not permit them to genuflect before modern progressive social notions, and even (for pro-life voters) the unborn. Progressive scholars will be equally discomfited, as Knott relentlessly notes the demagoguery, divisiveness, and assaults on civil liberties characteristic of the pantheon of progressive presidential heroes. But we live in a discomfited time, and Knott is challenging all to reconsider. Broadly speaking, his argument is thoughtful and defensible. One can support an energetic presidency without insisting on the popular presidency with its problematic personalism and hubris.

There are some questions that might have received greater attention, however. Knott glides over the presidents of the late nineteenth century while acknowledging that they tended to hew more to the constitutional model. A case study of Grover Cleveland might have been in order. Some greater attention might have been paid to the potentially ameliorative role of presidential rhetoric. And it would have been helpful to think more systematically about how to weigh varying elements. Does Kennedy's gradual embrace of minority rights outweigh the negative consequences of facilitating the celebrity status and communications dominance of the popular presidency? It is not quite clear.

Perhaps the biggest question—at most only partially answered—is how we *should* think about consent of the governed and majority rule relative to the presidency or, more broadly, how to restore a presidency of humility and self-control within a society increasingly defined by narcissism and instant gratification. As Knott admits, "Trump is a representative man of his era" (p. 208).

In the end, Knott expresses pessimism that the degrading of the presidency can be reversed. His study provides much evidence that the task will be quite difficult, not least because Americans seem to like the popular presidency, even if they do not like its consequences. Most of the unsung heroes Knott extols were defeated when they attempted to hold onto the White House. Yet Knott provides two politically successful examples—Lincoln and Eisenhower—as well as partial examples, like Reagan, who embraced elements of the popular presidency but also revived elements of the constitutional presidency.

Perhaps a first step would be simply to find a president who will reemphasize his role as head of state and be

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592720000237 Published online by Cambridge University Press

capable of conducting himself with magnanimity and a modicum of both personal and political humility. Perhaps that is not asking too much.

Power, Participation, and Protest in Flint, Michigan: Unpacking the Policy Paradox of Municipal Takeovers. By Ashley E. Nickels. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2019. 272p. $94.50 cloth, $32.95 paper.

doi:10.1017/S1537592720000742

— Helen M. Ingram, *University of California Irvine*
hingram@uci.edu

In making water resource decisions, water agency officials respond to three core values— availability, quality, and cost—in that order, with cost rated a distant third (e.g., see Steve Rayner, Denise Lach, and Helen Ingram, "Weather Forecasts Are for Wimps: Why Water Resource Managers Do Not Use Climate Forecasts," *Climatic Change* 69 [2], 2005). However, cost to the Flint, Michigan city budget was the overarching concern when the state-appointed Emergency Manager (EM) made the decision to switch to cheaper sources of water and not to apply anticorrosive treatment to new water supplies from the Flint River, instead of its previous source, Lake Huron. The taste, smell, discoloration, and high levels of lead in the new water supply were noticed immediately, and people took to the streets in protest. The EM who made the decision to change the water source adopted the cover-up that came after, armed with municipal takeover laws that gave him sweeping authority. He shuttered city offices, laid off employees, restructured collective bargaining agreements, sold city assets, and raised water rates. The EM and his cadre of advisors were freed from internal restraints such as voting or public participation, enabling them to introduce and pursue their draconian agenda. According to Ashley Nickels, such municipal takeovers, when implemented at the local level, have both material and symbolic effects. She concludes that state laws intended to get the local government's fiscal house in order led to the restructuring of power, helped determine who participates and who protests, and in the case of the people of Flint, caused lower levels of service, higher costs, and a less attractive community for residents and new businesses.

Nickels draws on standard public policy theories from writers such as Deborah Stone, Paul Pierson, Anne Schneider, Helen Ingram, Suzanne Mettler, and others to argue that the feedback effects of policies create winners and losers, encourage the participation of some while marginalizing others, and modify institutional structures and processes. Municipal takeovers are intended to remove politics from the equation but are inherently political and have lasting political impacts. Putative benefits to urban finances fade quickly while policy-making processes are more permanently changed to further disadvantage the already disadvantaged, such as the poor and people of color. Narrative and causal story analyses are employed to reveal the dominance of a development regime that Nickels associates with the rationality project: this perspective assumes that the root causes of financial failings are lack of leadership and management skills to resist irrational and self-serving interests. Nickels's recommendations are that politics needs to be restored and strengthened by removing state-appointed managers, rebuilding and strengthening democratic access and participation, and designing policies that foster democracy.

The book delves into the history of state interventions into local fiscal matters and court decisions that grant states broad powers to intervene. At least 19 states have formal laws allowing interventions, but such actions have happened most frequently in Michigan, where laws are particularly aggressive. More municipalities are likely to get into fiscal trouble as devolution of responsibility to local levels continues at the same time that climate change, the frequency of extreme weather events, and the high cost of infrastructure overwhelm local resources.

According to Nickels, the diffusion of takeover laws and more applications of such laws to troubled cities will harm democracy. Takeover laws advance elite interests that are favored by developmental agendas and narratives portraying local governments as inept and unable to deliver balanced budgets or economic progress. Although some nongovernmental organizations are considered as potential actors that challenge decisions harming the environment and discriminating against the poor, this book comes to a different kind of conclusion about some nonstate actors in Flint. It notes that the C. S. Mott Foundation is a powerful participant in Flint politics that promotes economic development at the expense of other values.

The book is worthwhile reading and will serve undergraduate and graduate public policy classes well, as illustrative readings showing how prominent policy theories can be applied. Nickels adds importantly to the small literature examining how policy feedback affects democracy and participation. Urban water policy serves as a focal point for elucidating how political forces shape policy and how policy reshape the exercise of political rights. Although pursuing balanced budgets may yield short-term benefits to the city, the long-term impact of such policies erodes democracy. While EMs are in control, structural changes are made that strengthen elites and undercut public participation. By decreasing access to local decision makers, such policies increase distrust among residents and lower their likelihood of involvement in local affairs. Democratic accountability is lessened considerably.

The book is not without problems. There are issues of how bureaucracy can serve democracy that Nickels does not sufficiently consider. She views water agency decisions, to which she gives little or no attention, as part of the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592720000237 Published online by Cambridge University Press