

Chapter 1 : Project MUSE - The Modern American Presidency (review)

*The Modern American Presidency: Second Edition, Revised and Updated [Lewis L. Gould] on calendrierdelascience.com *FREE* shipping on qualifying offers. When the first edition of this book appeared in , it was chosen as a Main Selection of both the Book-of-the-Month Club and History Book Club and quickly became the standard work on the modern American presidencyâ€”from William McKinley through William.*

Like most late-19th-century commentators, he believed that his country was nearing a watershed in its history. But unless America rallied around a strong leader, the center of world power, which he thought might be about to shift from England to the United States, would shift instead to Russia. In so doing, he became the first modern president. Roosevelt was well suited for this role. Philosophically he was the consummate Progressive, determined to bring efficiency and coordinated intelligence to bear against the trusts, against despoilers of the natural environment, and against international disorder. He was, as one historian put it, "the first great president-reformer of the modern industrial era. Politically he was a committed nationalist. He thus could barely bring himself to speak of Thomas Jefferson, whom he loathed; and as late as the 1860s he was still condemning Jefferson Davis as a traitor. The Confederate cause, since it denied that a large consolidated nation was its own justification, enraged him. Roosevelt brought to the presidential office a thorough and consistent philosophy of the presidency. What a previous president may have done hesitatingly or without fanfare, Theodore Roosevelt made a matter of principle. He deserves credit for innovation, even, paradoxically enough, in cases in which he was exercising an executive prerogative that one of his recent predecessors had in fact pioneered. Presidential scholar Edward Corwin has spoken of the "personalization of the presidency," by which he means that the accident of personality has played a considerable role in shaping the office. And indeed it is hard to think of a stronger personality than that of Theodore Roosevelt who ever served as president. One presidential scholar observed that Roosevelt gave the office "the absorbing drama of a Western movie. Mark Twain, who met with the president twice, declared him "clearly insane. At one point during the 1890s he wrote to a friend that he had been working so hard lately that for the next month he was going to do nothing but relax â€” and write a life of Oliver Cromwell. Roosevelt, more than any other man living within the range of notoriety, showed the singular primitive quality that belongs to ultimate matter â€” the quality that medieval theology assigned to God â€” he was pure act. One presidential historian explained it this way: As no president in memory and probably none up to that time, Theodore Roosevelt became a "personality" â€” a politician whose every action seemed newsworthy and exciting. His family, his friends, his guests, his large teeth, his thick glasses, his big game hunting, and his horseback riding â€” all were sources of media attention and delight. In a way that Washington and Lincoln had not done, and even Jackson avoided, Theodore Roosevelt became a very visible tribune of the people, a popular advocate whose personality seemed immediate, direct, and committed to their personal service. The classic example occurred in 1889 when Theodore Roosevelt assembled athletic personnel from Harvard, Princeton, and Yale at the White House to reform the rules of college football to make the game safer. The season had witnessed several dozen deaths from excessively rough play. This was the kind of energy and vigor that Theodore Roosevelt brought to his office and that he used to promote his distinct philosophy of the presidency. But far from deploring this state of affairs, he went on to say, "I believe in a strong executive; I believe in power. Each member of the executive branch, but especially the president, "was a steward of the people bound actively and affirmatively to do all he could for the people," he maintained. He could, therefore, "do anything that the needs of the nation demanded" unless expressly prohibited in the Constitution. Calhoun had exclaimed in response to the suggestion that the president was "the immediate representative of the American people. But why all this solicitude on the part of the president to place himself near to the people, and to push us off to the greatest distance? Why this solicitude to make himself their sole representative, their only guardian and protector, their only friend and supporter? The object cannot be mistaken. It is preparatory to farther hostilities â€” to an appeal to the people; and is intended to to [sic] prepare the way in order to transmit to them his declaration of war against the Senate, with a view to enlist them as his allies in the war which he contemplates waging against this branch of

the Government. Roosevelt, as we shall see, convinced he was doing the will of the people and what was best for the country, did not hesitate to disregard the Senate or the Congress as a whole. He remarked privately that in the United States, as in any nation which amounts to anything, those in the end must govern who are willing actually to do the work of governing; and insofar as the Senate becomes a merely obstructionist body it will run the risk of seeing its power pass into other hands. Previous presidents, following both American tradition and the spirit of the Constitution, had not entered office with an extensive legislative program whose passage they vigorously prosecuted. They deferred instead to Congress, the branch which, it was generally understood, was to retain the initiative in such matters. But Roosevelt found a certain virility in bold leadership, and in situations in which decisive action seemed called for he considered deference to Congress or to other legal restraints on executive power as a sign of pusillanimity and decadence. He wrote in his *Autobiography*: In theory the Executive has nothing to do with legislation. In practice as things now are, the Executive is or ought to be peculiarly representative of the people as a whole. As often as not the action of the Executive offers the only means by which the people can get the legislation they demand and ought to have. Therefore a good executive under the present conditions of American political life must take a very active interest in getting the right kind of legislation, in addition to performing his executive duties with an eye single to the public welfare. The *New York World*, a Democratic newspaper, called it "the most amazing program of centralization that any president of the United States has ever recommended. As one scholar put it, these acts, taken together, "might well be considered as marking the birth of the modern regulatory state. One conservative Republican observed that the president was "consciously, or unconsciously â€” trying to concentrate all power in Washington, to practically wipe out state lines, and to govern the people by commissions and bureaus. Historians of the New Left have gone even further, arguing that since big business itself frequently played a role in agitating for and even shaping the emerging regulatory apparatus, the ostensible effort by Roosevelt and his successors to rein in business interests was a sham. New Left scholars have, indeed, added a necessary corrective to the previously existing literature, and their claims certainly hold water in such obvious cases as the Federal Reserve System. That a governmentâ€”business alliance characterized the emerging American regime at the turn of the century is beyond dispute; but New Left historians fail to acknowledge that the state always maintained the upper hand in this partnership. The New Left critique stems partially from the fact that its partisans would have been satisfied with nothing short of nationalizing or dismantling large interests; and from such a perspective Roosevelt can indeed seem the reactionary. The battle over railroad regulation and the Interstate Commerce Commission provides a good example of the shortcomings of this thesis. Roosevelt supported further railroad regulation in addition to that already on the books, and ultimately signed the Hepburn Act of â€” which, while not as radical as what he had sought, he considered satisfactory. The Act increased the number of members of the Interstate Commerce Commission and gave it the authority to set "just and reasonable" rail rates. Whatever rates the Commission decided upon were to take effect immediately. Although the railroads had a right to appeal to the courts, the burden of proof rested on them and not on the Commission. The results were devastating. The railroads needed investment capital following the reorganizations of the s if they were to preserve their capital stock, to rebuild, and to modernize. In other words, they needed to be left alone. Instead they got policies that both increased labor costs and refused the rate increases they needed. The result was that by profits had vanished, and the collapse of the system of private management of the railroads followed soon afterwards. Unlike some Progressives, whom he dubbed "the lunatic fringe," Roosevelt did not consider business concentration a trend to be avoided or reversed. He saw it as an inevitable and even beneficial development of industrial society, albeit one that had to be regulated in the public interest. But at issue here is not so much whether Roosevelt was especially severe in this or that area, or whether he was an outright radical. The question is whether he dealt justly with the private sector, what kind of precedents he set for the future, and how he helped to strengthen the executive beyond what the framers had envisioned. In early , Roosevelt ordered Attorney General Philander Knox to file an antitrust suit against the Northern Securities Company, a holding company that had taken over two railroads that stretched from Seattle to St. Paul, the Northern Pacific and the Great Northern. Roosevelt himself pinpointed its importance: From the standpoint of giving complete control to the National Government over

big corporations engaged in interstate business, it would be impossible to overestimate the importance of the Northern Securities decision and of the decisions afterward rendered in line with it in connection with the other trusts whose dissolution was ordered. The success of the Northern Securities case definitely established the power of the government to deal with all great corporations. Knight case of , which had severely limited the scope of the Sherman Act. In that case, the Supreme Court had ruled that, although the American Sugar Refining Company held about 95 percent of the American sugar market after buying the E. Knight Company, they had committed no actionable offense since they had done nothing, strictly speaking, to restrain trade. Before advising Philander Knox to initiate the case, Roosevelt neglected to ask himself some fairly obvious questions. For one thing, did the new holding company in fact substitute a monopolistic arrangement for a previously existing state of competition? In fact, it did not. The Great Northern and the Northern Pacific may have appeared to be two alternative lines between St. Paul and Seattle, but in fact, as Balthasar Henry Meyer points out, price wars between the two lines were a thing of the past, and for twenty years the railroads had lived in "comparative peace. The idea for the holding company originated partly from a desire to put the arrangement on a more stable footing and partly from concerns surrounding the designs of E. Harriman, who in early had tried to get a controlling interest in the Northern Pacific. The holding company would put both rails beyond the reach of Harriman, and, thus prevent him from undermining the economic advantages that obtained from the close relationship that existed between the two lines. Naturally, these advantages paid dividends to the consumer: There had been a chance, following Knight, that the arbitrariness of the antitrust laws might to some degree be mitigated; Roosevelt helped ensure that they would continue to be leveled against corporations that simplistic, static models deemed monopolistic but which nearly always brought benefits to the consumer. In domestic affairs, then, Roosevelt greatly accelerated the process by which the executive became the de facto originator of legislation, and in other ways, such as his increasing use of executive commissions, set in motion a trend toward presidential supremacy. Theodore Roosevelt made even more significant contributions to the modern presidency in the area of foreign affairs. In domestic affairs, Roosevelt explained, Congress could generally be trusted to come around to the correct position. But in the conduct of foreign policy, senators, who were, as he put it, "wholly indifferent to national honor or national welfare" and "primarily concerned in getting a little cheap reputation among ignorant people," could interfere with the conduct of an honorable course abroad. He had privately called public opinion "the voice of the devil, or what is still worse, the voice of a fool," and in a calmer moment, speaking in particular of foreign affairs, he observed that "[o]ur prime necessity is that public opinion should be properly educated. A college friend wrote in , "He would like above all things to go to war with some oneâ€. He wants to be killing something all the time. The burning of New York and a few other sea coast cities would be a good object lesson in the need of an adequate system of coast defenses, and I think it would have a good effect on our large German population to force them to an ostentatiously patriotic display of anger against Germany. One foe is as good as another, for aught he tells us. He became an advocate of "universal obligatory military training" and, in a comment that unwittingly reveals the rarely acknowledged link between universal suffrage and universal conscription, Roosevelt declared: Army camps as the standard to be imitated. I believe that for every young man â€ to have six months in such a camp â€ [with] some field service, would be of incalculable benefit to him, and â€ to the nationâ€. Nearly every historian of Roosevelt since the late s, with the smug self-satisfaction that comes from seeming to overturn the conventional wisdom, has argued that notwithstanding his reputation and his personal bellicosity, Theodore Roosevelt was actually much more restrained in foreign policy matters while in office than might have been expected. This is in fact what most of these historians, to their everlasting shame, have done. The United States obtained the Philippines during the Spanish-American War in , when Commodore George Dewey, under instructions from Theodore Roosevelt himself then assistant secretary of the Navy , attacked the islands a few days after the opening of hostilities in Cuba. The size of the American effort to suppress the Filipino nationalists has rarely been fully appreciated: Our men have been relentless; have killed to exterminate men, women, children, prisoners and captives, active insurgents and suspected people, from lads of ten and up, an idea prevailing that the Filipino, as such, was little better than a dog, a noisome reptile in some instances, whose best disposition was the rubbish heap.

Chapter 2 : The Modern Presidency: Tools of Power, Topic Overview

This analysis and critique of the modern American presidency aims to lay bare the current strengths and weaknesses of the office and remind the reader that the presidency remains a work in progress. It surveys the transformation of the White House over the 20th Century. To ask other readers.

In lieu of an abstract, here is a brief excerpt of the content: Spitzer The Modern American Presidency. Arguably the greatest and most protracted intellectual struggle in the study of the American presidency arises from two opposing views of the institution. One view explains the institution largely in terms of the way it has been shaped by the individuals occupying the office. It emphasizes the impact of leadership surely still the largest and most prolific school of presidency analysis, personality, and unique historical events, among other factors, to explain the institution. In this view, the presidency is composed of the 43 distinct events or cases defined by the individuals who have occupied the Oval Office, even when analysts seek common traits found across administrations. The alternate view is the institutionalist perspective. While this term encompasses an eclectic array of methodologies, they share in common some sense that fundamental institutional traits generally transcend the idiosyncrasies of individual presidents; that the presidential experience is more common than different; that key factors explain fundamental behaviors and outcomes. His analytical focus is decidedly institutional. There is a modern presidency, of course, as distinct from the premodern institution, although traits of the latter are inextricably intertwined with the former. But each president played an identifiable role in advancing the modern institution. Generally considered the last of the premoderns, Gould demonstrates the reverse. In part through the pivotal role of the little-known presidential secretary George B. Cortelyou—think of an Edwardian Karl Rove—McKinley was not, in fact, quite the back porch campaigner and president too often depicted. Yes, McKinley did follow the custom and refrain from personal political campaigning in and But just prior to the midterm elections, he "campaigning" vigorously around the country to defend his post-Spanish-American War plan to retain lands abroad. Thumping vigorously on policy near election time had the desired effect: In short, he materially expanded and diversified the presidential institution and mission in ways identified with later presidents. Further, Gould is not out to deify the institution, to somehow resurrect "failed" presidents or to vilify "great" ones. He makes clear from the outset that "[t]o treat the modern presidency as a success story is to falsify the historical record" xiv. Instead, this book is a highly readable, engagingly written, and nearly engrossing tale of the institutionalization of the twentieth-century presidency, although that analytic approach flags in the treatment of more recent presidents. Two conclusions that emerge from this account are that an institutional analysis underscores evolutionary continuity and that a square reading of that evolution deflates presidential myths and stereotypes, especially those that arise from the usual breezy and dreadful presidential rankings. Each of the three presidencies of the s did contribute, if incrementally You are not currently authenticated. View freely available titles:

Chapter 3 : The Modern American Presidency by Lewis L. Gould

The Modern American Presidency: Second Edition, Revised and Updated by Lewis L. Gould When the first edition of this book appeared in , it was chosen as a Main Selection of both the Book-of-the-Month Club and History Book Club and quickly became the standard work on the modern American presidencyâ€”from William McKinley through William.

Tools of Power Learning Objectives After completing this session, you will be able to: Summarize the growth in presidential power since the ratification of the Constitution. Explain the major elements that effect presidential influence with Congress. Analyze the role of the cabinet and cabinet secretaries in the policymaking process. The growing expectations that the public has of presidents creates a gap between expectations and formal powers. This unit discusses the ways in which presidents seek to bridge this gap, by using personal attributes and cultivating strong public support. The unit also illustrates how presidents have increasingly centralized, at the expense of many of the cabinet officials, policy-making authority as a means of maximizing their own power to control the political environment. The American Presidency has changed dramatically over American history. Article II of the Constitution lists potent but limited formal powers for the president. The president can negotiate treaties, also subject to Senate approval, and can recognize ambassadors from other countries. Presidents can veto bills passed by Congress, but such vetoes can be overridden by a two-thirds vote in both houses of Congress. As commander-in-chief, the president is the top civilian commander of all U. Beginning with our first president, George Washington, many presidents have used their implied and informal presidential powers to enhanced their personal influence, and often the power and potential influence of later presidents. And in his bold Louisiana Purchase, Jefferson showed that a president who acts decisively might successfully compel others to follow his lead after the fact. Some presidents, such as Lincoln, Wilson, Theodore Roosevelt, and Franklin Roosevelt, drew upon their informal powers during times of national crisis to increase their influence over others in Congress and the executive branch. Other presidents, including Lyndon Johnson, drew upon their personal skills and intimate knowledge of legislative processes to pass bold national initiatives such as the Civil and Voting Rights Acts. During the twentieth century, the presidency itself was transformed. As they presided over two world wars, a major depression, and a cold war, several twentieth century presidents increased their powers and influence at the cost of Congress and other government institutions. Presidents Nixon, Reagan, and Clinton, for example, conducted specific foreign policy initiatives almost wholly from within the White House, sometimes at the cost of a consistent and unified U. The institutional presidency has also grown during the twentieth century. These offices surround modern presidents in layers of bureaucracy that they can use to enhance their power and influence. However, some presidents have found that the White House bureaucracy can actually make them feel isolated and out-of-touch. A key position is White House chief of staff. Some vice presidents have exercised important influence in their presidential administration. The development of electronic mass media facilitated the transformation to the modern presidency. Through the adept use of television, modern presidential candidates can get elected as national personalities who enjoy broad personal popularity. While in office, a president can choose to "go public" through direct television appeals to the American people that are designed to circumvent party leaders, Congress, and other government officials. President Reagan, for example, used his first televised speech after an assassination attempt to successfully sell his signature tax cut directly to the American people. Although the presidency offers a range of formal, implied, and potential informal powers, modern presidents grapple with the inherent limitations of the office and often have difficulty coping with conflicting public expectations. For example, most Americans want their president to be a "regular person" who understands them and their daily struggles. Yet, many Americans also expect their presidents to rise above commonality and command the international stage. Similarly, Americans usually prefer pragmatic approaches to governing and executive leadership, but also expect presidents to lead with visionary policy initiatives.

Chapter 4 : The Modern American Presidency: Second Edition, Revised and Updated by Gould,â€¦ | eBay

"One of the most effective and readable books on the American presidency to date a case study on how an intellectual historian can tackle a seemingly impossible project and turn out serious important scholarship.

George Washington who founded the country; Abraham Lincoln, who preserved it; and Franklin Delano Roosevelt, who rescued it from economic collapse and then led it to victory in the greatest war of all time. Elected for an unprecedented four terms, Roosevelt proved the most gifted American statesman of the twentieth century. Roosevelt revolutionized the art of political campaigning, revitalized the Democratic Party, and created a new national majority from those previously excluded from the political process. His fireside chats brought the presidency into every living room in the nation. And what may be more remarkable, he did this while paralyzed from the waist down. For the last twenty-three years of his life, Franklin Roosevelt could not walk unassisted. Grant, a Pulitzer Prize finalist. A graduate of Princeton University and Columbia, he taught at the University of Toronto for thirty-five years before joining the faculty at Marshall in He is presently at work on a biography of Dwight D. The New Deal Focus: What was the nature of the crisis that faced the United States in March ? What were the conditions in banking, agriculture, business employment, investment, and foreign trade? What steps did FDR take? What were the Hundred Days? Was the New Deal successful in meeting the crisis? What role did Eleanor Roosevelt play? What were the results of the election? Why did Roosevelt seek to pack the Supreme Court? Did he err entering Democratic primaries in ? What caused the Roosevelt recession of ? Was FDR a shoo-in for renomination in ? Who was Wendell Wilkie? Why did FDR win the election? Random House, , chapters Roosevelt, , Samuel I. What steps did FDR take to prepare the country for war? Should the United States have provided aid to the Soviet Union? Was war with Japan inevitable? Why was the United States unprepared for Pearl Harbor? How did FDR handle the armed forces? Why was he more successful than Lincoln in selecting military leaders? What was achieved at Teheran? What effect did the war have on the homefront? What was the G.

Chapter 5 : The modern American presidency - Lewis L. Gould - Google Books

The Rise of the Modern American Presidency As this paper began, an anecdote was presented that in fact applies to every generation of presidential leadership in America. The existence of such power begs the first question of when this power first began to emerge.

Chapter 6 : The Modern American Presidency

Book Description: When the first edition of this book appeared in , it was chosen as a Main Selection of both the Book-of-the-Month Club and History Book Club and quickly became the standard work on the modern American presidency-from William McKinley through William Jefferson Clinton.

Chapter 7 : The Rise of the Modern American Presidency | Free Essays - calendrierdelascience.com

"Anyone interested in the presidency will want to read Lewis Gould's The Modern American Presidency. It is a compelling analysis and critique that lays bare the current strengths and weaknesses of the office and reminds us that the presidency remains a work in progress."

Chapter 8 : FDR and the Birth of the Modern Presidency | Teaching American History

"The Modern American Presidency" is a lively, interpretive synthesis of 20th century leaders, filled with intriguing insights into how the presidency has evolved as America rose to prominence on the world stage.

*Lewis Gould discussed the problems and triumphs of twentieth-century presidents in his book *The Modern American Presidency*, published by University Press of calendrierdelascience.com author analyzed the.*