

1. Record Nr.	UNINA9910554281503321
Autore	Driesen David M.
Titolo	The specter of dictatorship : judicial enabling of presidential power // David M. Driesen
Pubbl/distr/stampa	Stanford, California : , : Stanford University Press, , [2021] ©2021
ISBN	1-5036-2862-0
Descrizione fisica	1 online resource (249 pages)
Collana	Stanford studies in law and politics
Disciplina	352.230973
Soggetti	Presidents - United States
Lingua di pubblicazione	Inglese
Formato	Materiale a stampa
Livello bibliografico	Monografia
Nota di bibliografia	Includes bibliographical references and index.
Nota di contenuto	Frontmatter -- CONTENTS -- PREFACE -- INTRODUCTION -- 1 AVOIDING TYRANNY AT THE FOUNDING -- 2 THE RISE OF PRESIDENTIAL POWER -- 3 DECLINING TO ADJUDICATE CLAIMS AGAINST THE PRESIDENT -- 4 IMPLIED PRESIDENTIAL AND CONGRESSIONAL POWER -- 5 THE SPECTER OF DICTATORSHIP: Poland, Hungary, and Turkey -- 6 PARALLELS TO AMERICA'S DEMOCRATIC EROSION -- 7 JUDICIAL TREATMENT OF PRESIDENTIAL POWER IN AN AGE OF DEMOCRATIC DECLINE -- CONCLUSION -- NOTES -- BIBLIOGRAPHY -- INDEX
Sommario/riassunto	Reveals how the U.S. Supreme Court's presidentialism threatens our democracy and what to do about it. Donald Trump's presidency made many Americans wonder whether our system of checks and balances would prove robust enough to withstand an onslaught from a despotic chief executive. In <i>The Specter of Dictatorship</i> , David Driesen analyzes the chief executive's role in the democratic decline of Hungary, Poland, and Turkey and argues that an insufficiently constrained presidency is one of the most important systemic threats to democracy. Driesen urges the U.S. to learn from the mistakes of these failing democracies. Their experiences suggest, Driesen shows, that the Court must eschew its reliance on and expansion of the "unitary executive theory" recently endorsed by the Court and apply a less deferential approach to presidential authority, invoked to protect national security and combat emergencies, than it has in recent years. Ultimately, Driesen argues that concern about loss of democracy should play a major role in the

Court's jurisprudence, because loss of democracy can prove irreversible. As autocracy spreads throughout the world, maintaining our democracy has become an urgent matter.
