FOREWORD

It has been fifteen years since Law and Contemporary Problems published its initial symposium on the presidential office.1 During that interval, President Eisenhower completed his term of office, two Democratic Presidents have come and gone, and now Eisenhower’s former Vice President is over half through his first term. Although the office still basically resembles the institution that existed at mid-century, each of the four most recent Presidents has left his mark on it in several important respects. Changes have also occurred in the office that are the product of exogenous events and conditions. Since the Eisenhower years the nation has passed through a series of profound social, economic, and political crises and transformations that have sharply altered presidential roles and the expectations held for the presidency. The office itself has expanded in both structure and functions. Yet, with the exception of the Twenty-fifth Amendment relating to presidential succession and disability, there have been few alterations in the legal or constitutional position of the presidency. An objective foreign observer might be prompted to remark, “plus la difference, plus la meme chose,” and he would not be wholly in error. Nevertheless, the changes have been substantial, and they are reflected in the issues that excite the interest of students and other observers of the presidency and presidents.

With these considerations in mind, the editors agreed with the suggestion advanced by Hans Baade and myself that it was time to reappraise the presidential office with a view toward developing a new set of perspectives for the 1970’s. The papers fall into three categories: those that focus on the office itself, those that examine efforts to improve and rationalize the office through reorganization, and those that examine the operational dynamics of the office. From the papers should come a broad, although not necessarily comprehensive, set of perspectives on the presidency and the issues that surround it. Only one observation can be made with any degree of certainty: the presidency is in a constant state of flux. The extent to which the people of the United States manage to adapt the presidency to the solution of their needs and to meeting the challenges that confront them will be a major determinant of the nation’s ultimate fate. Although the presidency has definite limitations, and many of the papers explicitly recognize them, it remains the focal

---

1 See 21 Law & Contemp. Prob. 607 (1956).
point of American political life and is still the most effective means available for mobilizing energy and resources for the achievement of national goals.

Two papers in the symposium warrant special mention. Thomas E. Cronin's contribution is based on extensive field research conducted during the past two years. It represents the first original empirical scholarship in the area since the seminal writings of Richard E. Neustadt fifteen years ago.² Hopefully it will set the stage for additional innovative analyses of the presidency. Hans Baade, a foreign-trained scholar permanently resident in an American university, served in 1969 as a consultant to the West German equivalent of the Hoover Commission. His participant-observer's account of the work of that body includes a highly interesting analysis of the relevance, and irrelevance, of American experiences with governmental reorganization in the West German context. It furnishes a comparative perspective that should serve as an antidote to any imbalance resulting from a reading of the American-oriented pieces.

This symposium is in no way intended to provide definitive answers to the questions and problems surrounding the presidency. Its purpose is to stimulate interest and continued concern in the expectations held for the presidency and the uses made of it as its development unfolds.

Norman C. Thomas
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