

**POLITICS & GOVERNMENT***Great Expectations*

"Looking for Leadership, 1980" by Thomas E. Cronin, in *Public Opinion* (Feb.-March 1980), Circulation Department, c/o AEI, 1150 17th St. N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

In a recent Gallup Poll, 73 percent of Americans surveyed said that "the public expects more of a President today than in the past." Another survey late last year showed that Americans believe "strong leadership" to be the single most important quality in a President.

In 1787, the Founding Fathers designed the Presidency as a "managerial" position; Presidents were not supposed to take many domestic initiatives, writes Cronin, a University of Delaware political scientist. Today, many academics agree with historian Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., that the three-branch U.S. system of government has worked best when strong Presidents have "overcome the tendency toward inertia inherent in a structure of checks and balances."

Yet Americans have conflicting attitudes toward the Presidency. They are a people, says Cronin, "who want to be led, yet [who] also want to be free and to be left alone." Hence, the oft-repeated pattern of an activist President followed by a more conservative one. Americans have visions of a presidential candidate "blessed with the mind of a Jefferson, the courage of a Lincoln, the grace of a Kennedy," yet early in an election year, they are apt to mistake eloquence for effectiveness.

Cronin worries that Americans' expectations are impossibly, even dangerously, high: "We venerate the presidency," he writes, and therefore, "we often savage our presidents." Americans should realize that a healthy society can get along with good rather than great leaders.

**FOREIGN POLICY & DEFENSE***Maturity or Weakness?*

"America in Decline: The Foreign Policy of 'Maturity'" by Robert W. Tucker, in *Foreign Affairs* (America and the World 1979), 428 East Preston St., Baltimore, Md. 21202.

All U.S. Presidents during the 1970s portrayed the communist takeover in Indochina, OPEC's new power, and the Soviet Union's rise to military parity as evidence that Washington could no longer hope to dominate world politics, says Tucker, a Johns Hopkins political scientist. Consequently, he writes, they characterized the nation's loss of military superiority and its acceptance of OPEC as elements of a foreign policy of "maturity."

He suggests that the seeds of America's inability to deter Moscow's moves in Afghanistan were planted by Richard Nixon and Henry Kissinger. Both men felt that Vietnam had soured the American people