

THE RESTRAINED PRESIDENCY AND PRESIDENTIAL CHARACTER: THE
RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN DR. IVAN ELAND'S PRESIDENTIAL
RANKINGS AND JAMES BARBER'S
CHARACTER TYPES

THESIS

Presented to the Graduate Council of
Texas State University - San Marcos
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements

for the Degree

Master of ARTS

by

Dillon T. Jones, B.A.

San Marcos, Texas
May 2012

THE RESTRAINED PRESIDENCY AND PRESIDENTIAL CHARACTER: THE
RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN DR. IVAN ELAND'S PRESIDENTIAL
RANKINGS AND JAMES BARBER'S
CHARACTER TYPES

Committee Members Approved:

Theodore Hindson, Chair

Kenneth Ward

Patricia Parent

Approved:

J. Michael Willoughby
Dean of the Graduate College

COPYRIGHT

by

Dillon Tyler Jones

2012

FAIR USE AND AUTHOR'S PERMISSION STATEMENT

Fair Use

This work is protected by the Copyright Laws of the United States (Public Law 94-553, section 107). Consistent with fair use as defined in the Copyright Laws, brief quotations from this material are allowed with proper acknowledgment. Use of this material for financial gain without the author's express written permission is not allowed.

Duplication Permission

As the copyright holder of this work I, Dillon Tyler Jones, authorize duplication of this work, in whole or part, for educational or scholarly purposes only.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Throughout this lengthy process of writing a thesis, there are numerous people that have helped me both directly and indirectly in the thesis process. First, I would like to thank my parents, Mike and Lisa Jones for raising me well enough to put me in this position in the first place. I would also like to thank everyone else I'm close to including friends, family, and of course my fiancée Kristin for their support during the past year.

As for those who had a more direct impact on the thesis material, itself, I first would like my committee chair, Dr. Hindson, for not only being very helpful in terms of the direction of my thesis, but for peaking my interest in the presidency through the undergraduate and graduate courses I have taken from him. I would also like to thank my other committee members, Dr. Ward, for teaching me how to think (not what to think), and Dr. Parent for kindly joining my committee at short notice. I can't leave out thanking Dr. Ivan Eland, himself, for not only writing the book that my thesis is centered around, but for also giving me the opportunity to discuss his book further in an interview. As for James Barber, even though I may not fully agree with his presidential character classification system, I must thank him for coming up with this system in the first place or this thesis wouldn't be possible.

In addition, I thank all of the professors I've taken classes with in the Political Science Department at Texas State University-San Marcos for giving me the food for thought I need to progress my studies. Last, but certainly not least, I would like to thank

the Political Science office staff for their advice, logistical support, and reminding me to get everything in on time.

This manuscript was submitted on March 8, 2012.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
LIST OF FIGURES	x
ABSTRACT.....	xi
 CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
The Problem and Questions	1
Barber's Categories.....	2
Eland's Criteria	4
Themes in Eland's Criteria	7
Hypotheses	8
II. PRIMARY RELATIONSHIPS	12
Eland's Rankings of Presidential Success	12
Barber's Categories with Eland's Rankings	13
Statistical Analysis of Eland's Rankings and Scores in Barber's Character Categories	14
Eland/Barber Analysis Conclusions	15
Implementing Maranell's Presidential Types	18
Maranell Classifications with Eland's Rank and Score	19
Statistical Analysis of Eland's Rankings and Scores in Barber and Maranell's Combined Character Categories	27
BEM Test Conclusions	29
BEM Test Exceptions	30
III. SECONDARY RELATIONSHIPS	32
BEM Presidential Term Comparisons	32
Presidential Time Quadrant Scores.....	36
BEM Presidential/Congressional Party Differentials (PCPD).....	39
The Siena College Presidential Rankings	43

IV. THE PRESIDENTS.....	50
Introduction.....	50
George Washington	50
John Adams.....	52
Thomas Jefferson	54
James Madison.....	56
James Monroe	58
John Quincy Adams	59
Andrew Jackson	60
Martin Van Buren	62
John Tyler	64
James Polk	65
Zachary Taylor.....	67
Millard Fillmore.....	68
Franklin Pierce	70
James Buchanan.....	71
Abraham Lincoln	73
Andrew Johnson.....	75
Ulysses S. Grant.....	76
Rutherford B. Hayes	78
Chester Arthur.....	79
Grover Cleveland	81
Benjamin Harrison	83
William McKinley	85
Theodore Roosevelt	87
William Taft.....	89
Woodrow Wilson	90
Warren G. Harding.....	92
Calvin Coolidge	94
Herbert Hoover	96
Franklin D. Roosevelt	98
Harry S Truman	101
Dwight Eisenhower.....	103
John F. Kennedy	105
Lyndon B. Johnson	107
Richard Nixon.....	109
Gerald Ford	110
James Earl Carter	112
Ronald Reagan	114
George H. W. Bush.....	116
William Clinton	117
George W. Bush.....	120
Barack Obama.....	122
V. CONCLUSION	124

REFERENCES	129
------------------	-----

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
1. Eland's Rankings of Presidential Success	12
2. Barber's Categories with Eland's Rankings	13
3. Statistical Analysis of Eland's Rankings and Scores in Barber's Character Categories	14
4. Pederson (Maranell) Classifications with Eland's Rank and Scores	19
5. Statistical Analysis of Eland's Rankings and Scores in Maranell's Character Categories	20
6. Combined Barber and Maranell Classifications with Eland's Rank and Scores	26
7. Statistical Analysis of Eland's Rankings and Scores in Barber and Maranell's Combined Character Categories	27
8. BEM Presidential Term Comparisons	32
9. Time Quadrant Scores.....	36
10. BEM Presidential/Congressional Party Differentials (PCPD).....	39
11. Siena College Poll Presidential Rankings.....	44
12. Statistical Analysis of the Siena College Poll Presidential Rankings in Barber and Maranell's Combined Character Categories	45

ABSTRACT

THE RESTRAINED PRESIDENCY AND PRESIDENTIAL CHARACTER: THE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN DR. IVAN ELAND'S PRESIDENTIAL RANKINGS AND JAMES BARBER'S CHARACTER TYPES

by

Dillon Tyler Jones, B.A.

Texas State University - San Marcos

Spring 2012

SUPERVISING PROFESSOR: THEODORE HINDSON

The goal of this thesis is to take a ranking of American presidents with criteria based on restraint on presidential power and compare it to James Barber's presidential character classifications. Dr. Ivan Eland's book *Recarving Rushmore* ranks presidents based on his notion Constitutional originalism, that is, his conception on how presidents should act in terms in the categories of Peace, Prosperity, and Liberty as they relate to how the founding fathers would expect.

Primary tests are done to see if there are any relationships between a president having a high or low ranking on Eland's list and his Barber presidential character type. After these relationships are found, secondary tests are performed to find other relationships in terms of number of terms elected, time period of the presidency, and Congressional party in power in relationship to the president's party. From part of these secondary tests, we can infer that there may be other determining factors outside the said criteria of both Eland and Barber that affect their rankings and character classifications of American presidents.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Problem and Questions

A common thread regarding ranking American presidents seems to include holding presidents who have severed during crises, war-time, and have passed significant legislation in high regard. Dr. Ivan Eland takes a very different approach in presidential ranking in his book, *Recarving Rushmore*, which ranks presidents in terms of his own interpretations of Peace, Prosperity, and Liberty. Eland generally gives high rankings to those who avoided using presidential power and expanding the power of the federal government, while giving low rankings to those who expanded both presidential and federal power. Given this different set of presidential ranking criteria, I set out to see how high or low rankings using this criteria relates to the labels of presidential character types as defined by James David Barber.

In his book, *The Presidential Character*, James David Barber explains four different categories that American presidents can be placed under: Active-Positive, Active-Negative, Passive-Positive, and Passive-Negative. He places each president from Theodore Roosevelt through George H. W. Bush, as well as the first four presidents of the United States, into one of these categories. Dr. Ivan Eland ranks every president through George W. Bush based on how well they uphold Eland's version of original intent of the Constitution in terms of policies leading to peace, prosperity, and liberty. Using Eland's presidential criteria and Barber's character evaluation system, the main question arises:

Are there any relationships between Eland's higher or lower presidential rankings based on his conceptions of Peace, Prosperity, and Liberty and Barber's presidential character types, and if so, what are those relationships? Along with that question come several secondary questions: If there are relationships with exceptions, why do these exceptions occur? Since Barber doesn't classify all of the presidents, is there another classification procedure and ranking made for those missing presidents that can adequately fill in the rest of the list? Can any relationships be made between the number of terms a president serves and its Barber/Eland category and ranking? Can further relationships be made between which time period a president serves and its category and ranking? Are there any relationships between a united or divided government (political party of the president compared to the ones controlling the House of Representatives and the Senate) and a president's category and ranking? How does Eland's list compare to a more mainstream presidential Ranking list like the Siena College survey? Are there relationships between higher or lower Siena College rankings and a certain Barber character classification?

Barber's Categories

Before diving into any relationships, it is essential to define James Barber's categories for presidential Character. For the Active-Positive presidency, "there is a congruence, a consistency, between being very active and the enjoyment of it, indicating relatively high self-esteem and relative success in relating to the environment" (Barber 2009, 9). Essentially, the Active-Positive president has no problem in putting forth effort to utilize the power of the presidency and is emotionally rewarded for doing so.

Examples Barber gives as Active-Positive presidents are Thomas Jefferson and Franklin D. Roosevelt.

On the other hand, Barber sees Active-Negative presidents as putting forth the same intense effort as an Active-Positive president, but without receiving the same emotional reward. Presidents in this category are ambitious, yet compulsive as if to make up for something. Barber puts it more eloquently in saying, “Active-Negative types pour energy into the political system, but it is an energy distorted from within” (9). Barber classifies John Adams and Lyndon B. Johnson as Active-Negative presidents.

Like Active-Negative presidents, Passive-Positive presidents also have low self-esteem. However, instead of being compulsive and active to make up for this issue, they are rewarded by being agreeable and cooperative with others rather than being assertive. Barber sees these types as having a hopeful attitude with a superficial optimism (10). He describes James Madison and William Taft as having this Passive-Positive character type.

Lastly, Barber describes Passive-Negative presidents as those who “do little in politics and enjoy it less” (10). They see themselves taking this leadership position as part of dutiful service instead of an urge to achieve results and maintain power. These types tend to stray away from conflict and focus more on emphasizing what they see as the “proper way”. George Washington and Calvin Coolidge are examples Barber gives of Passive-Negative presidents.

Although Barber’s writing on presidential character tries to be more analytical than preferential, he does give some clues as to which types are better in relation to other. He seems to put Active-Positive types over the others. He states in the case of Active-Positive presidents, “there is an emphasis on rational mastery, and on using the brain to

move the feet” (9). These are more encouraging words than given to the other category types. Next in ranking would most likely be the Passive-Negative presidents. Although he says they lack the experience and flexibility to act effectively as presidents, he also says they “become guardians of the right and proper way, above sordid and politicking of lesser men” (10). Next would be the Passive-Positive types whose “dependence and fragility of hopes and enjoyments make disappointment in politics likely” (10). Lastly, Barber describes the presidencies of Woodrow Wilson, Herbert Hoover, and Lyndon B. Johnson as “tragic tales”. He puts all three of these presidents in the Active-Negative category.

Eland’s Criteria

Another step needed before finding relationships is to define the criteria Dr. Ivan Eland gives in ranking the presidents. In the introduction to *Recarving Rushmore*, Eland states, “This book uses the founders’ conception of limited government, discerned by trying to determine their original intent in the Constitution, as a basis for evaluating presidential action in the areas of peace, prosperity, and liberty” (Eland 2009, 9).

Additionally, he states that the degree in which presidents “uphold the founders’ vision of a limited federal government with an appropriately constrained executive” (10) will be part of the criteria in ranking. Further, Eland holds presidents accountable for executing and enforcing any Constitutional Amendments made, and he takes the context in which each era the president takes office into consideration. In other words, “Each president cannot be blamed for the size of government he inherited and the power he was expected to wield at the time he took office” (Eland 2009, 10).

Before diving into all of the presidents and their rankings, Eland explains the criteria in the areas of Peace, Prosperity, and Liberty. Concerning Peace, Eland explains the relatively safe geographic position the United States has which gives it a safeguard against conventional military attack or invasion. To keep and maintain peace, Eland promotes a noninterventionist foreign policy as being most closely related to the founders' views. Thus, presidents who have had a more interventionist military policy would more likely get lower rankings. The criterion of Prosperity gives more points to presidents who give the federal government less influence in the economy. In relating to the founders' views, he explains how the federal government accounted for a very small percentage of the nation's Gross Domestic Product during the founding and early years after. He also describes the founders' belief that "private markets, unfettered by government intervention and regulation, would lead to prosperity" (Eland 2009, 10). Thus, presidents that promote higher taxes and more regulation would be given lower rankings. In the Liberty category, Eland explains how the purpose of the American Revolution was to guarantee Americans that liberty that was being eroded by the British king. He describes the expansion of executive power as distorting the founders' version of checks and balances and as subverting liberties protected and enshrined in the Bill of Rights (Barber 2009, 12-13).

The main idea of this thesis is not to argue that Eland's view of the Presidency should be the predominant one, but rather to relate his rankings based on his particular ideology to the categories that Barber gives. To give Eland's theory of the presidency more relevance, it would be best to compare his criteria that he gives in his book to a fortified political ideology. As seen in his book, Eland puts much emphasis on policy

relating to the founders' original intent of the Constitution. I dare not dive into an argument about what the true intent of the founders was, as there are numerous competing arguments from all sides of the political spectrum. However, I propose that the category Eland's thought mostly relates to a sort of constitutional originalism similar to the definition Constitutional scholar Keith Whittington gives: "The critical originalist directive is that the Constitution should be interpreted according to the understandings made public at the time of the drafting and ratification. The primary source of those understandings is the text of the Constitution itself, including both its wording and structure" (Whittington 1999, 35).

To give further context to this originalist way of thought, it's helpful to explain the Constitutional text from that point of view. Article 2 of the United States Constitution gives the Executive branch few specific powers and duties. The president must give the following oath, "I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will faithfully execute the Office of President of the United States, and will to the best of my ability, preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States" (United States Constitution 1787). The president's duties include being the Commander-in-Chief of the Army and Navy, and its powers include the ability to sign Treaties and make appointments with the consent of the Senate. The president may also from time to time make a State of the Union address to the Congress to recommend policies (United States Constitution 1787). Article 1 Section 7 gives the president the power to sign or veto laws made by the Congress. Article 1 Section 8 lists the specific powers of Congress by listing which kinds of laws and bills they can make, while Article 1 Section 9 specifically states which kinds of laws the Congress cannot make. Thus, the responsibility of the President to protect and defend the

Constitution also lies in its discretion over which laws it chooses to sign or not sign. Theoretically, the originalist will look at these provisions as narrowly as possible, especially when it comes to the power of being “commander-in-chief” and in signing the laws Congress makes. These laws from Congress would come from a narrow view of the enumerated powers given in Article 1 Section 8, especially when it comes to the “general welfare” and “interstate commerce” clauses which have expanded in meaning during America’s history.

Themes in Eland’s Criteria

Throughout *Recarving Rushmore*, there are several themes throughout the presidents that Eland consistently praises or faults. For all three categories, presidents are ranked lower for setting the precedent for bad policies in the future. For the most part, the themes include the following:

Peace Pros	Peace Cons
Non-Intervention	Aggressive Foreign Policy
Fixing foreign-policy problems peacefully	Commitments to foreign alliances
Keeping out of foreign entanglements	Undeclared wars
Anti-imperialism	Aggressive economic sanctions
Friendly Indian Policy	Peace-time military build up
	Military Drafts

Prosperity Pros	Prosperity Cons
Low taxes/tariffs	High taxes/tariffs
Limited federal economic intervention	Creating bureaucratic agencies
Hard-money policy (Gold Standard)	Public improvement projects
	Pork barrel projects

Liberty Pros	Liberty Cons
Expansion of civil rights to minorities	Indian relocation/violence
Benevolent Indian Policy	Limiting 1 st Amendment rights
Enforcing 14 th Amendment	Suspending habeas corpus
	Suppressing freedoms abroad
	Labor dispute intervention

Hypotheses

To address the hypotheses, the first main question must be asked, “Are there any relationships between Eland’s higher or lower Presidential rankings based on his conceptions of Peace, Prosperity, and Liberty and Barber’s Presidential Character types, and if so, what are those relationships?” I would predict that there indeed are relationships between the two authors’ categories and rankings. The first relationship I would predict would be the one between Active presidents and a lower ranking on Eland’s list. One using Eland’s criteria of ranking presidents would want to see a restrained president, thus having an Active president may include many actions done by a president not explicitly set in writing in the Constitution. I believe the question, “which type between the Active-Positive and Active-Negative presidents would have the lower Eland rankings?” would be more difficult to answer. One could say that the Active-Positive president would have a lower Eland ranking because their more positive outlook and enjoyment of the power of the presidency could lead to even more disregard for the explicit powers set forth in the Constitution. On the other hand, one could say the Active-Negative presidents could rank lower on that scale because their lack of self-esteem and their eagerness to make up for it through presidential power could make them disregard the Constitution. The other main relationship I would predict regarding this question is the relationship between Passive-Negative presidents and a higher ranking on Eland’s list.

The fact that they are passive should not automatically make one assume they have a higher ranking. Passive-Positive types may not have the drive for power, but their eagerness to be liked and their flexibility on principles may just give that power to those around him or to Congress. Once that power is given to those entities, it is harder to predict which policies will be explored. Passive-Negative types, on the other hand, focus more on principles and see themselves as doing a dutiful service instead of trying to exude power or hand that power to somebody else. I believe these qualities would lead to presidencies of restricted power, which would give them a better ranking on Eland's ranking list.

The next question is, "If there are relationships with exceptions, why do these exceptions occur?" Like the vast majority of relationship tests, I believe there will most likely be exceptions, especially when we are looking at just one person's categories compared to another's. There is no universal grounding to support either Barber or Eland's categories and rankings as valid, so there is always room for dispute. Another important question is, "Since Barber doesn't classify all of the presidents, is there another classification procedure and ranking made for those missing presidents that can adequately fill in the rest of the list?" This is a relevant question because Barber only classifies the first four presidents and the presidencies of Theodore Roosevelt through George H. W. Bush, leaving out the presidents of the Nineteenth Century. In his article, "Amnesty and Presidential Behavior: A 'Barberian' Test", Political Scientist William Pederson uses research from Gary Maranell's "The Evaluation of Presidents: An Extension of the Schlesinger Polls" to classify those nineteenth century presidents into the Barber categories. He does this by correlating the "flexibility of presidents to the

positivity of presidents and the “inflexibility” to the negativity of presidents. Although these relationships did not always match up right, Pederson found the relationships valid enough for his own research, which will be explained later.

Another secondary question is, “Can any relationships be made between the number of terms a president is elected to and his Barber/Eland category and ranking?” I believe that electability would not correlate with being a decent president on Eland’s list. I believe that the perception of activity would most likely correlate with better electability. Thus, I would hypothesize that Active presidents would be more likely be elected more than once, and that those presidents elected more than once would have a lower average ranking on Eland’s list because of this activity. Next, I ask, “Can further relationships be made between which time period a President serves and its category and ranking?” As this relates to Barber’s categories, I believe that there would be more Active presidents in the modern era of the Twentieth Century. Since the New Deal, there has been an increase in domestic policy legislation signed off by presidents, as well as more foreign intervention implemented by presidents. However, this question is harder to answer as it relates to Eland’s ranking. This is because he ranks the presidents in the context of the era of which they presided. Thus, in the twentieth century where presidential power has grown since the previous decades, Eland wouldn’t necessarily hold it against a president for merely continuing this expectation of presidential power. Lastly I ask, “Are there any relationships between a united or divided government (political party of the president compared to the ones controlling the House of Representatives and the Senate) and a president’s category and ranking?” As for how this pertains to Eland’s ranking, I believe that presidents in office during times of divided

government will have a better ranking. This would be because regardless of presidential character, it is harder to get legislation passed with divided government. Less legislation would be associated with Eland's libertarian interpretation of the Constitution because libertarians favor a weaker federal government. It is harder to predict the relationship between divided government and Barber's categories because I believe it is harder for a president's character to have influence over whether or not there is divided government or vice versa. For example, an Active president may want to get more legislation passed, but isn't able to because the opposite party controls the House of Representatives and/or the Senate.

As for the questions, "How does Eland's list compare to a more mainstream presidential ranking list like the Siena College survey?" and "Are there relationships between higher or lower Siena College rankings and a certain Barber character classification?" I would contend that Eland's rankings would be vastly different from the more "mainstream" rankings done in the Siena College Poll due to the fact that their criteria are very different. I would also contend that there will be a relationship between the presidents who rank highly on the Siena College Poll with the Active-Positive Barber classification.

CHAPTER II

PRIMARY RELATIONSHIPS

Eland's Rankings of Presidential Success

Figure 1 shows Eland's rankings and ratings of all presidents through George W. Bush.

Excellent	Poor
1. John Tyler	15. Benjamin Harrison
2. Grover Cleveland	16. Gerald Ford
3. Martin Van Buren	17. Andrew Johnson
4. Rutherford B. Hayes	18. Herbert Hoover
Good	19. Ulysses S. Grant
5. Chester Arthur	20. William Taft
6. Warren G. Harding	21. Theodore Roosevelt
7. George Washington	22. John Adams
8. Jimmy Carter	23. James Buchanan
9. Dwight Eisenhower	24. Franklin Pierce
10. Calvin Coolidge	Bad
Average	25. James Monroe
11. William Clinton	26. Thomas Jefferson
12. John Quincy Adams	27. Andrew Jackson
13. Zachary Taylor	28. James Madison
14. Millard Fillmore	29. Abraham Lincoln
	30. Richard Nixon
	31. Franklin D. Roosevelt
	32. Lyndon B. Johnson
	33. George H. W. Bush
	34. Ronald Reagan
	35. John F. Kennedy
	36. George W. Bush
	37. James Polk
	38. William McKinley
	39. Harry S. Truman
	40. Woodrow Wilson

Figure 1: Eland's Rankings of Presidential Success

One of the most noticeable observations when first glancing at Eland's rankings is the large number of Poor and Bad presidents compared to Excellent, Good, and even Average. Another noticeable aspect from the list is that none of the revered, strong, well-known presidents are listed as Excellent. In fact, several presidents listed in the top 15 according to the conservative Federalist Society/Wall Street Journal and the liberal Siena Research Institute surveys of history, political science, law, and economic professors are listed as Bad according to Eland (Eland 2009, 14). These presidents would include Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, Franklin D. Roosevelt, John F. Kennedy, James Polk, and Harry S Truman.

Barber's Categories with Eland's Rankings

Figure 2 shows all presidents that Barber has classified and their respective Eland rankings and ratings.

B)Bad, P)Poor, A)Average, G)Good, E)Excellent

Active Positive (8)	Passive Positive(4)
G 8. Jimmy Carter	G 6. Warren G. Harding
P 16. Gerald Ford	P 20. William Taft
B 26. Thomas Jefferson	B 28. James Madison
B 31. Franklin D. Roosevelt	B 34. Ronald Reagan
B 33. George H. W. Bush	
B 35. John F. Kennedy	
B 39. Harry S. Truman	
P 21. Theodore Roosevelt	
Active Negative (5)	Passive Negative (3)
P 19. Herbert Hoover	G 7. George Washington
P 22. John Adams	G 9. Dwight Eisenhower
B 29. Richard Nixon	G 10. Calvin Coolidge
B 32. Lyndon B. Johnson	
B 40. Woodrow Wilson	

Figure 2: Barber's Categories with Eland's Rankings

Statistical Analysis of Eland's Rankings and Scores in Barber's Character Categories

Rating converted to Score as follows: Bad=-2, Poor=-1, Average=0, Good=1, Excellent=2

Active-Positive			Active-Negative		
	Eland Rank	Eland Score	Statistic	Eland Rank	Eland Score
Mean	26.1250	-1.3750	Mean	28.1429	-1.6000
Median	28.5000	-2.0000	Median	30.0000	-2.0000
Mode	None	-2.00	Mode	None	-2.00
Std. Deviation	10.50765	1.06066	Std. Deviation	9.70272	.54772
Range	31.00	3.00	Range	24.00	1.00
Minimum	8.00	-2.00	Minimum	16.00	-2.00
Maximum	39.00	1.00	Maximum	40.00	-1.00

Passive-Positive			Passive-Negative		
Statistic	Eland Rank	Eland Score	Statistic	Eland Rank	Eland Score
Mean	22.0000	-1.0000	Mean	8.6667	1.0000
Median	24.0000	-1.5000	Median	9.0000	1.0000
Mode	None	-2.00	Mode	None	1.00
Std. Deviation	12.11060	1.41421	Std. Deviation	1.52753	.00000
Range	28.00	3.00	Range	3.00	.00
Minimum	6.00	-2.00	Minimum	7.00	1.00
Maximum	34.00	1.00	Maximum	10.00	1.00

Positive			Negative		
	Eland Rank	Eland Score		Eland Rank	Eland Score
Mean	23.8182	-1.1818	Mean	21.0000	-.6250
Median	26.0000	-2.0000	Median	20.0000	-1.0000
Mode	None	-2.00	Mode	None	-2.00
Std. Deviation	10.69409	1.16775	Std. Deviation	12.15378	1.40789
Range	33.00	3.00	Range	33.00	3.00
Minimum	6.00	-2.00	Minimum	7.00	-2.00
Maximum	39.00	1.00	Maximum	40.00	1.00

Figure 3: Statistical Analysis of Eland's Rankings and Scores in Barber's Character Categories

Passive			Active		
Statistic	Eland Rank	Eland Score		Eland Rank	Eland Score
Mean	16.2857	-.1429	Mean	27.0000	-1.4615
Median	10.0000	1.0000	Median	30.0000	-2.0000
Mode	None	1.00	Mode	None	-2.00
Std. Deviation	11.17608	1.46385	Std. Deviation	9.52190	.87706
Range	28.00	3.00	Range	32.00	3.00
Minimum	6.00	-2.00	Minimum	8.00	-2.00
Maximum	34.00	1.00	Maximum	40.00	1.00

Figure 3, Continued: Statistical Analysis of Eland's Rankings and Scores in Barber's Character Categories

Figure 3 shows my first attempt at finding a relationship between Barber's presidential character categories and Eland's presidential rankings. For each Character Category, I made two calculations. The first calculation finds the statistics, including the mean and median, of Eland's ranking of the presidents in the category. The next calculation is made out of a scoring system designed for Eland's rankings. I assigned that Excellent presidents would be worth 2 points, Good presidents worth 1 point, Average presidents worth 0 points, Poor presidents worth -1 point, and Bad presidents worth -2 points. The same statistical analysis was taken with the Eland Score as well.

Eland/Barber Analysis Conclusions

The first relationship to examine would be between a higher/lower ranking on Eland's list and Activity/Passivity. There is a fairly stark contrast between Active and Passive presidents when it comes to their rank/score averages. The Active presidents had a mean of 27 (out of 40 presidents) and mean score of -1.46. The Passive presidents had

a mean of 16.29 and mean score of -.14. From this we see the Active presidents clearly ranking in the bottom 20 and Passive presidents ranking in the top 20. Aside from the Passive presidents ranking ten spots better than the Active presidents, they even scored a positive median score, giving a Good median score. The Active presidents, on the other hand, averaged a much lower score, averaging between Poor and Bad ratings.

Although not as stark of a contrast, there is a noticeable difference between Positive and Negative presidents. Negative presidents ranked in the middle of Eland's presidential list at 21 and with a mean score just below average at -.63. Positive presidents ranked somewhat worse at 23.82 and scored worse than a Poor average with a mean score of -1.18.

Taking the four total combinations of character combination types, both Active types scored vastly different than the two Passive types. Both Active types averaged low rankings and scores, with Active-Positive presidents having a mean ranking of 26.13 and score of -1.38 and Active-Negative presidents having a mean of 28.14 and scoring -1.6. It is interesting to note how closely these two categories score together and how poorly they rank and score.

The two Passive categories, however, did not score so evenly. As would be assumed from the calculations between Active and Passive types, both Passive types scored and ranked better than the Active types. Passive-Positive presidents had a mean ranking in the middle of Eland's list at 22, but averaged a score of -1: an average of Poor. Passive-Negative types, on the other hand, had much better rankings and scores than the other three types. Passive-Negative types had a mean ranking of 8.67 out of 40 and averaged a score of 1: an average of Good.

Judging from these relationships, it would appear that my major hypotheses were correct. Active presidents did rank and score significantly worse than Passive presidents. Again, this would make sense from Eland's libertarian perspective of wanting a more limited role for the president. However, I was not expecting such close scores and ranking between the Active-Positive and Active-Negative presidents. It appears that the Positive or Negative attitude of a president did not necessarily impact the president's actions as it relates to abiding narrowly to the Constitution as long as he was in the Active category. It would also appear that the hypothesis that Passive-Negatives would rank and score better is also true. Their average ranking of 8.67 was much better than the next best ranking average (Passive-Positive at 22). Even more notably, the Passive-Negative category was the only category of the main four types to have an average score above average. In fact, all three Passive-Negative presidents (Washington, Eisenhower, and Coolidge) were ranked as Good presidents by Eland, averaging out a score of 1 (Good). From this analysis, it appears that a president's lack of drive for power and willingness to hold on to strong ideals, as Barber describes Passive-Negatives, ties most strongly to Eland's criteria of the ideal president.

Although from this analysis we see some strong relationships, these conclusions would not be fair assumptions through this single investigation. As mentioned earlier, Barber only focused on the first four presidents and most of the twentieth century presidents, leaving out all of the 19th century presidents. If we want to see if these relationships hold while including these missing presidents, it is imperative to find another analysis to make up for this missing gap.

Implementing Maranell's Presidential Types

In March of 1968, Gary Maranell began his project to expand on the Schlesinger Polls of Presidential Greatness. Instead of focusing only on greatness, he made a questionnaire asking questions on presidential prestige, strength of action, idealism, activeness, flexibility, and accomplishments. These questionnaires were given to 1,095 members of the Organization of American Historians and 571 of those returned were deemed to be sufficiently complete (Maranell 1970, 104-106). William Pederson's article, "Amnesty and Presidential Behavior: A 'Barberian' Test", used Maranell's research regarding presidential activity and flexibility to relate to Barber's presidential character categories. Maranell's analysis of presidential activity was compared to Barber's categories of Active/Negative presidents, while his analysis of presidential flexibility/inflexibility was compared directly with Barber's Positive/Negative types (Pederson 1977, 178). Adequate relationships were found between flexible and positive presidents, as well as between inflexible and negative presidents.

Maranell Classifications with Eland's Rank and Score

<u>Active Positive (8)</u>	<u>Passive Positive (13)</u>
B 26. Thomas Jefferson	G 6. Warren G. Harding
B 31. Franklin D. Roosevelt	P 20. William Taft
B 35. John F. Kennedy	E 3. Martin Van Buren
B 39. Harry S. Truman	E 4. Rutherford B. Hayes
B 29. Abraham Lincoln	G 5. Chester Arthur
B 28. James Madison	A 14. Millard Fillmore
G 7. George Washington	P 15. Benjamin Harrison
P 21. Theodore Roosevelt	P 19. Ulysses S. Grant
<u>Active Negative (8)</u>	P 23. James Buchanan
P 22. John Adams	P 24. Franklin Pierce
B 32. Lyndon B. Johnson	B 25. James Monroe
B 40. Woodrow Wilson	B 38. William McKinley
E 2. Grover Cleveland	G 9. Dwight Eisenhower
A 12. John Quincy Adams	<u>Passive Negative (4)</u>
B 27. Andrew Jackson	G 10. Calvin Coolidge
B 37. James Polk	E 1. John Tyler
P 17. Andrew Johnson	A 13. Zachary Taylor
	P 19. Herbert Hoover

Figure 4: Pederson (Maranell) Classifications with Eland's Rank and Scores

Active-Negative		
Statistics	Eland Rank	Eland Score
Mean	23.6250	-1.0000
Median	24.5000	-1.5000
Mode	None	-2.00
Std. Deviation	12.97181	1.41421
Range	38.00	4.00
Minimum	2.00	-2.00
Maximum	40.00	2.00

Passive-Negative		
Statistics	Eland Rank	Eland Score
Mean	10.5000	.5000
Median	11.5000	.5000
Mode	None	-1.00
Std. Deviation	7.14143	1.29099
Range	17.00	3.00
Minimum	1.00	-1.00
Maximum	18.00	2.00

Passive-Positive		
Statistics	Eland Rank	Eland Score
Mean	15.7692	-.1538
Median	15.0000	-1.0000
Mode	None	-1.00
Std. Deviation	10.36946	1.40512
Range	35.00	4.00
Minimum	3.00	-2.00
Maximum	38.00	2.00

Active Positive		
Statistics	Eland Rank	Eland Score
Mean	27.0000	-1.5000
Median	28.5000	-2.0000
Mode	None	-2.00
Std. Deviation	9.75412	1.06904
Range	32.00	3.00
Minimum	7.00	-2.00
Maximum	39.00	1.00

Positive		
Statistic	Eland Rank	Eland Score
Mean	19.7500	-.6000
Median	20.5000	-1.0000
Mode	None	-2.00
Std. Deviation	11.57072	1.42902
Range	36.00	4.00
Minimum	3.00	-2.00
Maximum	39.00	2.00

Active		
Statistic	Eland Rank	Eland Score
Mean	25.3125	-1.2500
Median	27.5000	-2.0000
Mode	None	-2.00
Std. Deviation	11.22330	1.23828
Range	38.00	4.00
Minimum	2.00	-2.00
Maximum	40.00	2.00

Figure 5: Statistical Analysis of Eland's Rankings and Scores in Maranell's Character Categories

Rating converted to Score as follows: Bad=-2, Poor=-1, Average=0, Good=1, Excellent=2

Negative			Passive		
Statistic	Eland Rank	Eland Score	Statistic	Eland Rank	Eland Score
Mean	19.2500	-.5000	Mean	14.5294	.0000
Median	17.5000	-1.0000	Median	14.0000	.0000
Mode	None	-2.00	Mode	None	-1.00
Std. Deviation	12.75735	1.50756	Std. Deviation	9.77316	1.36931
Range	39.00	4.00	Range	37.00	4.00
Minimum	1.00	-2.00	Minimum	1.00	-2.00
Maximum	40.00	2.00	Maximum	38.00	2.00

Figure 5, Continued: Statistical Analysis of Eland's Rankings and Scores in Maranell's Character Categories

Rating converted to Score as follows: Bad=-2, Poor=-1, Average=0, Good=1, Excellent=2

Figure 4 shows Pederson's adaptation of Maranell's presidential classifications of activeness and flexibility in Barber's terms of being Active or Passive and Positive or Negative. This list classifies all American presidents through Lyndon Johnson. To determine whether or not Maranell's presidential "flexibility" can be adequately translated to Barber's "positivity", we must compare the presidents in Pederson's list to the classifications of the presidents that were also used in Barber's list. Pederson defines flexibility as, "an evaluation of the flexibility or inflexibility of the approach each president took in implementing his program or policies" (Pederson 1977, 176-177). Although flexibility can't be directly translated to positivity by definition, one could notice similarities at first glance. Positive presidents are going to be more open to implement policies based on what those around them want, in order to feel liked. Negative presidents may be stricter in the policies they implement because of their lack of self-esteem and/or their will to hold to certain values or principles. Thus, "flexibility" could conceivably be translated to "positivity" in this case. Positive presidents will be

more flexible in their policy-making based on their need to be liked, while Negative presidents will be more inflexible in their will to hold to principles or to make up for their lack of self-esteem.

Of the ten presidents from Taft to Lyndon Johnson, eight presidents translated correctly from Pederson's adaptation of Maranell's typology to Barber's typology. The two that didn't translate correctly were Hoover and Eisenhower. Pederson's adaptation classified Hoover as Passive-Negative instead of Active-Negative as Barber had. The adaptation found Eisenhower to be Passive-Positive instead of Passive-Negative. The relationships between the classification types of Barber and Maranell were not as high when it came to early American presidents. Unlike Barber's classifications, the Maranell adaptation puts Washington and Madison in the Active-Positive category (177).

However, Pederson points out that Barber's "weakest" statements were about those two presidents. He states, "Barber briefly mentions that Washington 'fits best' with the Passive-Negative type; John Adams is clearly an Active-Negative; Jefferson 'was clearly' an Active-Positive; and Madison 'comes closest' to a Passive-Positive" (177). He also notes that Madison was ranked the least active of the Active-Flexibles.

Overall, 75 per cent of Barber's judgments on character types correlate to Pederson's categories adapted from Maranell and 80 percent of Barber's detailed analyses correlate with the Maranell adaptation (177). Pederson found this relationship high enough to use in his research on comparing presidential personality types with amnesties. With this previous research done, I find this relationship adequate enough to use in comparing presidential character types with Eland's presidential rankings.

Looking at the Maranell adaptation categories with the Eland scoring system (Figure 5), we see Active presidents averaged poorly with a mean of 25.31 ranking and a -1.25 score, while Passive presidents averaged much better with a mean 14.53 ranking and a mean 0 score (Average). Positive and Negative presidents were given very similar rankings and scores. Positive presidents had a mean ranking of 19.75 and score of -.6, while Negative presidents averaged a 19.25 ranking and a -.5 score. Ranking from worst to best in the four main categories, Active-Positives averaged a 27 rank/-1.5 score, Active-Negatives averaged a 23.63 rank/-1 score, Passive-Positives averaged a 15.77 rank/-.15 score, and Passive-Negatives averaged a 10.75 rank/.5 score.

The findings from the Maranell/Eland test ended up very similar to those of the Barber/Eland test. In both cases, Active presidents ranked and scored much worse than the Passive presidents. The difference between Positive and Negative presidents in both cases was small, but the Maranell/Eland test difference was barely visible. The average rankings in both cases from first to last were Active-Positive, Active-Negative, Passive-Positive, and Passive-Negative. Their scores similarly ranked in that same order, with the exception of the Barber/Eland test having a slightly higher Active-Positive score(-1.37) than Active-Negative (-1.6). The Maranell/Eland test did show a slightly bigger rank/score difference between Active-Positives (27/-1.5) and Active-Negatives (23.63/-1) than the Barber/Eland test in which there was less than a 2 point difference in average rank and .23 difference in score between those two categories. This slightly bigger difference in the Maranell/Eland test could be attributed from the addition of Grover Cleveland (ranked 2nd and Excellent by Eland) and John Quincy Adams (ranked 12th and Average by Eland) into the Active-Negative category. Those two additions also help

explain why the Active-Negative category in the Maranell/Eland test scored better than the same category in the Barber/Eland test.

With the addition of the several nineteenth century presidents came many more Passive-Positive presidents to add to the list. Only four Passive-Positive presidents are given from Barber, while thirteen are given in the Maranell adaptation. These additions helped give Passive-Positive category in the Maranell/Eland a better average ranking and score. The addition of two of Eland's four Excellent presidents, Martin Van Buren and Rutherford B Hayes, as well as three of his six Good presidents, Warren G. Harding, Chester Arthur, and Dwight Eisenhower, helped boost that average and score. With the best average and score of the four categories, Passive-Negatives scored well on the Maranell/Eland test, but not as well as they did on the Barber/Eland test. This would be due to Washington and Eisenhower moving out of that category and into the Active-Positive and Passive-Positive categories, respectfully. "Poor" ranked president, Hebert Hoover, was also added, but the addition of Eland's top ranked president, John Tyler, into the category helped set off some of those losses.

The main basis of presidential character types in this case comes from that of James Barber, so for every instance that he has classified a president, we would want to use his classification. However, as mentioned before, there needed to be a way to classify all those presidents that Barber did not classify. After seeing how closely Pederson's adaptations of Maranell's presidential Activity and Flexibility correlate with Barber's presidential Activity and Positivity, we can conclude that this adaptation would be adequate enough to fill in the gaps that Barber left. Thus, the following figure (the figure that the secondary questions will be based from) will include all of the presidents

that Barber classified, as well as all other presidents that Pederson (Maranell) did classify that Barber did not.

Note that throughout this thesis, all “Maranell” classifications are referring to Pederson’s adaptation of Maranell’s Flexible/Inflexible traits to Positive/Negative labels.

<u>Active Positive (9)</u>	<u>Passive Positive (15)</u>
G 8. Jimmy Carter	G 6. Warren G. Harding
P 16. Gerald Ford	P 20. William Taft
B 26. Thomas Jefferson	B 28. James Madison
B 31. Franklin D. Roosevelt	B 34. Ronald Reagan
B 33. George H. W. Bush	E 3. Martin Van Buren
B 35. John F. Kennedy	E 4. Rutherford B. Hayes
B 39. Harry S. Truman	G 5. Chester Arthur
B 29. Abraham Lincoln	A 14. Millard Fillmore
P 21. Theodore Roosevelt	P 15. Benjamin Harrison
<u>Active Negative (10)</u>	P 19. Ulysses S. Grant
P 19. Herbert Hoover	P 23. James Buchanan
P 22. John Adams	P 24. Franklin Pierce
B 29. Richard Nixon	G 9. Dwight Eisenhower
B 32. Lyndon B. Johnson	B 25. James Monroe
B 40. Woodrow Wilson	B 38. William McKinley
E 2. Grover Cleveland	<u>Passive Negative (5)</u>
A 12. John Quincy Adams	G 7. George Washington
B 27. Andrew Jackson	G 9. Dwight Eisenhower
B 37. James Polk	G 10. Calvin Coolidge
P 17. Andrew Johnson	E 1. John Tyler
	A 13. Zachary Taylor

Figure 6: Combined Barber and Maranell Classifications with Eland's Rank and Scores

Statistical Analysis of Eland's Rankings and Scores in Barber and Maranell's Combined Character Categories

Rating converted to Score as follows: Bad=-2, Poor=-1, Average=0, Good=1, Excellent=2

Active-Positive

	Eland Rank	Eland Score
Mean	26.4444	-1.4444
Median	29.0000	-2.0000
Mode	None	-2.00
Std. Deviation	9.87562	1.01379
Range	31.00	3.00
Minimum	8.00	-2.00
Maximum	39.00	1.00

Active-Negative

	Eland Rank	Eland Score
Mean	23.7000	-1.1000
Median	24.5000	-1.5000
Mode	none	-2.00
Std. Deviation	11.78558	1.28668
Range	38.00	4.00
Minimum	2.00	-2.00
Maximum	40.00	2.00

Passive-Positive

	Eland Rank	Eland Score
Mean	18.4286	-.5000
Median	19.5000	-1.0000
Mode	None	-1.00
Std. Deviation	11.18869	1.45444
Range	35.00	4.00
Minimum	3.00	-2.00
Maximum	38.00	2.00

Passive-Negative

	Eland Rank	Eland Score
Mean	8.0000	1.0000
Median	9.0000	1.0000
Mode	1.00	1.00
Std. Deviation	None	.70711
Range	12.00	2.00
Minimum	1.00	.00
Maximum	13.00	2.00

Figure 7: Statistical Analysis of Eland's Rankings and Scores in Barber and Maranell's Combined Character Categories

Passive		
Statistic	Eland Rank	Eland Score
Mean	15.6842	-.1053
Median	14.0000	.0000
Mode	None ^a	-1.00 ^a
Std. Deviation	10.82206	1.44894
Range	37.00	4.00
Minimum	1.00	-2.00
Maximum	38.00	2.00

a. Multiple modes exist. Smallest value shown.

Active		
	Eland Rank	Eland Score
Mean	25.0000	-1.2632
Median	27.0000	-2.0000
Mode	None	-2.00
Std. Deviation	10.71344	1.14708
Range	38.00	4.00
Minimum	2.00	-2.00
Maximum	40.00	2.00

Positive		
	Eland Rank	Eland Score
Mean	21.5652	-.8696
Median	23.0000	-1.0000
Mode	None	-2.00
Std. Deviation	11.19994	1.35862
Range	36.00	4.00
Minimum	3.00	-2.00
Maximum	39.00	2.00

Negative		
	Eland Rank	Eland Score
Mean	18.4667	-.4000
Median	17.0000	-1.0000
Mode	None	-2.00
Std. Deviation	12.39739	1.50238
Range	39.00	4.00
Minimum	1.00	-2.00
Maximum	40.00	2.00

Figure 7, Continued: Statistical Analysis of Eland's Rankings and Scores in Barber and Maranell's Combined Character Categories

As would be expected, the combination of the Barber and Maranell classifications with Eland's rankings (BEM score) proved to be very similar to the separate Barber and Maranell scores by themselves. Like the other two scores, the BEM scores showed a significant point difference in mean ranking between Active and Passive presidents, 25 to 15.68. The average Active score was just above the Average Maranell/Eland score at -1.26. For Passive presidents the mean BEM ranking and score ended up being between the Barber/Eland and Maranell/Eland scores. For Positive presidents, the BEM average

ranking and score came in the middle between the Barber/Eland and Maranell/Eland rankings at 21.56 and -.87. Negative presidents under the BEM score averaged a ranking just below the other two score tests at 18.47 and averaged a score between the other two tests at -.4.

The BEM Active/Passive-Positive/Negative combinations scored very similarly to the other two tests as well. Active-Positives averaged rankings and scores very close to the other two at 26.44 and -1.44. The BEM average ranking for Active-Negative presidents was just above the Maranell/Eland test at 23.7, while the average score came up between the scores of the other two tests at -1.1. Passive-Positive presidents had a BEM average ranking and score between the other two tests at 18.43 and -.5. The BEM Passive-Negative average ranking and score ended up most closely with the Barber/Eland test at 8 and 1. This would be due to moving Hoover back into the Active-Negative category and moving Washington and Eisenhower back into the Passive-Negative category by using Barber's categorization as the precedent.

BEM Test Conclusions

With these very similar scores, we can essentially make the same conclusions with the BEM test as we did with the others. Active presidents are much worse than Passive presidents from Eland's perspective. Of Eland's ten Excellent or Good presidents, only two were classified as Active. Within the Active presidents, Positive presidents scored slightly worse than Negative presidents in the BEM test. Although Passive presidents ranked and scored much better than Active presidents, it does not conclude that Eland would favor all Passive presidents as a whole. Although Passive

presidents averaged a BEM ranking of about 16 out of 40, its score was still slightly below average at -.11. This would be in part because Eland only scored a select few presidents as Excellent or Good compared to Poor or Bad. Scoring the presidents like this would bring a lower score on average in most cases. Like in the first two tests, the Passive-Negative character combination was the only combination to have a positive score on the BEM test. We see a clear relationship between Passive-Negative character type and a high ranking and score on Eland's presidential ranking list. The character combination with the most variety in high/low ranking is the Passive-Positive type. Over one third of the Excellent, Good, and Average presidents ended up in the category; two of them being Excellent. Although the majority of Passive-Positives were Poor or Bad, only two ranked 30th or below (Reagan at 34, McKinley at 38). To explain these Passive-Positive classifications of presidents more thoroughly, further secondary questions will need to be answered, including the effects of having the same party in power in Congress.

BEM Test Exceptions

To answer the first secondary question: Yes, there are exceptions in the overall relationships. The evidence of relationship for Active-Positive types was very clear. Of the eight presidents in that category, all but two were ranked Bad, with Gerald Ford being ranked Poor. The only exception to the overall relationship in this case was Jimmy Carter, ranked number 8 and Good. Of the Active-Negative presidents, eight of the ten were ranked Poor or Bad, with John Quincy Adams being ranked Average. The only real exception was Grover Cleveland, ranked 2 and Excellent. As mentioned before, the

Passive-Positive category still needs more questions answered. Although two-thirds were ranked Poor or Bad, the 3,4,5, and 6 ranked presidents were also put in this category: Van Buren, Hayes, Arthur, and Harding, respectively. The Passive-Negative BEM test had no real exception to the rule. All were ranked Good or Excellent except Zachary Taylor who still ranked 13 (Average). Further explanation of these exceptions can be found in their individual profiles in Chapter 4.

CHAPTER III

SECONDARY RELATIONSHIPS

BEM Presidential Term Comparisons

0 Elections Won

	Eland Rank	Eland Score
Mean	10.6000	.2000
Median	14.0000	.0000
Std. Deviation	7.16240	1.30384
Minimum	1.00	-1.00
Maximum	17.00	2.00

0 Elections Won Character Type

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Active-Negative	1	20.0	20.0	20.0
Active-Positive	1	20.0	20.0	40.0
Passive-Negative	1	20.0	20.0	60.0
Passive-Positive	2	40.0	40.0	100.0
Total	5	100.0	100.0	

1 Election Won

	Eland Rank	Eland Score
Mean	19.7368	-.5263
Median	20.0000	-1.0000
Std. Deviation	11.41073	1.34860
Minimum	3.00	-2.00
Maximum	39.00	2.00

1 Election Won Character Type

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Active-Negative	5	26.3	26.3	26.3
Active-Positive	5	26.3	26.3	52.6
Passive-Negative	2	10.5	10.5	63.2
Passive-Positive	7	36.8	36.8	100.0
Total	19	100.0	100.0	

Multiple Elections Won

	Eland Rank	Eland Score
Mean	24.6429	-1.2143
Median	27.5000	-2.0000
Std. Deviation	11.46639	1.42389
Minimum	2.00	-2.00
Maximum	40.00	2.00

Multiple Elections Won Character Types

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Active-Negative	4	28.6	28.6	28.6
Active-Positive	3	21.4	21.4	50.0
Passive-Negative	2	14.3	14.3	64.3
Passive-Positive	5	35.7	35.7	100.0
Total	14	100.0	100.0	

Figure 8: BEM Presidential Term Comparisons

President	Times Elected	President	Times Elected
George Washington	2	Grover Cleveland	2
John Adams	1	Benjamin Harrison	1
Thomas Jefferson	2	William McKinley	2
James Madison	2	Theodore Roosevelt	1
James Monroe	2	William Taft	1
John Quincy Adams	1	Woodrow Wilson	2
Andrew Jackson	2	Warren G. Harding	1
Martin Van Buren	1	Calvin Coolidge	1
John Tyler	0	Herbert Hoover	1
James Polk	1	Franklin D. Roosevelt	4
Zachary Taylor	1	Harry Truman	1
Millard Fillmore	0	Dwight Eisenhower	2
Franklin Pierce	1	John F. Kennedy	1
James Buchanan	1	Lyndon B. Johnson	1
Abraham Lincoln	2	Richard Nixon	2
Andrew Johnson	0	Gerald Ford	0
Ulysses S. Grant	2	Jimmy Carter	1
Rutherford B. Hayes	1	Ronald Reagan	2
Chester Arthur	0	George H. W. Bush	1

Figure 8, Continued: BEM Presidential Term Comparisons

(White House 2012)

Figure 8 will help answer the question of whether or not any significant relationships can be made between BEM scores and rankings and the number of terms a president serves. The first measurement can be made in terms of their Character categories. Of the three different levels of Elections Won (0, 1, and 2+), there are no major discrepancies regarding the distribution of Character types. Each level has an approximately even amount of Active and Passive presidents and a higher percentage of Passive-Positive presidents than any other character type.

However, there are major differences regarding Eland's ranking and score in the three different term levels. Presidents who were never actually elected president, but obtained the office via the death or resignation of a president, had by far the best mean and median Eland rankings and scores of 10.6 and .2, respectively. I would argue there are a few possible explanations for this. First, these presidents served fewer than four years, giving them less time to exert presidential power. Second, since they were not elected president by either popular or electoral vote, there may be less public and Congressional confidence and trust in the president. This may encourage Congress to not grant the president as much power as they would otherwise. Thirdly, there may be more disagreement between the interim president and Congress regarding policy issues. John Tyler's presidency is a good example of this, since even though his own party was in power in Congress, his policy views were not in line with Congress, making it less likely that legislation would be passed. In most cases for Eland, less legislation leads to a better presidential ranking.

Presidents who won one election scored in the middle of the pack in Eland's mean ranking and score with 19.74 and -.53 respectively. Presidents who won multiple terms,

however, scored considerably worse in Eland's rankings and scores, especially when the median is also taken into account. These presidents had a median Eland ranking of 27.5 and median score of -2, or Bad.

With this information taken into consideration, it would be easy to assume that Eland's criteria for presidential excellence doesn't fall in line with popular opinion at the times when presidents are re-elected. Besides Washington, Cleveland, and Eisenhower, all other multiple term presidents scored Poor or Worse.

Presidential Time Quadrant Scores

Quad 1 (1789-1850)

Statistic	Eland Rank	Eland Score
Mean	18.2727	-.5455
Median	22.0000	-1.0000
Mode	None	-2.00
Std. Deviation	11.68838	1.63485
Range	36.00	4.00
Minimum	1.00	-2.00
Maximum	37.00	2.00

Quad 1 Character Statistics

Character Type	Frequency	Percent
Active-Negative	4	36.4
Active-Positive	1	9.1
Passive-Negative	3	27.3
Passive-Positive	3	27.3
Total	11	100.0

Quad 2 (1851-1900)

Statistic	Eland Rank	Eland Score
Mean	16.4444	-.4444
Median	17.0000	-1.0000
Mode	None	-1.00
Std. Deviation	8.74802	1.23603
Range	27.00	4.00
Minimum	2.00	-2.00
Maximum	29.00	2.00

Quad 2 Character Statistics

	Frequency	Percent
Active-Negative	2	22.2
Active-Positive	1	11.1
Passive-Positive	6	66.7
Total	9	100.0

Quad 3 (1901-1953)

	Eland Rank	Eland Score
Mean	22.7000	-.7000
Median	20.5000	-1.0000
Mode	None	-2.00
Std. Deviation	13.70361	1.49443
Range	36.00	4.00
Minimum	4.00	-2.00
Maximum	40.00	2.00

Quad 3 Character Statistics

Character Type	Frequency	Percent
Active-Negative	2	20.0
Active-Positive	3	30.0
Passive-Negative	1	10.0
Passive-Positive	4	40.0
Total	10	100.0

Figure 9: Time Quadrant Scores

Quad 4 (1954-1992)			Quad 4 Character Statistics			
Statistic	Eland Rank	Eland Score		Frequency	Percent	
Mean	24.6250	-1.1250	Active-Negative	2	25.0	
Median	31.0000	-2.0000	Active-Positive	4	50.0	
Mode	None	-2.00	Passive-Negative	1	12.5	
Std. Deviation	11.61203	1.35620	Passive-Positive	1	12.5	
Range	27.00	3.00	Total	8	100.0	100.0
Minimum	8.00	-2.00				
Maximum	35.00	1.00				

Figure 9, Continued: Time Quadrant Scores

Figure 9 shows the BEM scores in relation to the different time quadrants the presidents served. Each quadrant is approximately fifty years long, with the first quadrant being eleven years longer to encompass the latter part of the eighteenth century, and the last quadrant being shortened to forty-three years, since the last president measured is George H.W. Bush. The quadrant with the best Eland average ranking and score is Quadrant Two (1850-1900) with a 16.44 mean and -.44 score. The worst quadrant is the quadrant with the most recent presidents, Quadrant Four (1950-1992). As a whole, the first two quadrants scored better than the last two, concluding that presidents tended to meet Eland's criteria for rating for presidents during the first half of our history.

On the Activity/Passivity scale, of the twenty Passive presidents, twelve were in the first two quadrants while only seven in the most recent two. Notable observations from the Positivity/Negativity scale include six out of the nine presidents in the second quadrant having a positive/flexible attitude towards the presidency and more than half of all Negative presidents being in Quadrant One. This big drop in Negative-type presidents

since America's founding may say a lot about the shift in which type of presidents are elected.

As mentioned before, the Passive-Positive presidents were the least conclusive when it comes to Eland's ratings. Quadrant Two, which has several of these Passive-Positive types, was the time period of the start of the Civil War as well as the Reconstruction period afterwards. We will examine later if Congressional party control had any effect on the BEM score outcomes, especially when it comes to the Passive-Positive presidents, which include some of the worst and best presidents on Eland's scale.

As for the Activity-Positivity character combinations, nearly half of all Active-Positives presided in the last half of the twentieth century, including the presidencies of John F. Kennedy, Gerald Ford, Jimmy Carter, and George H. W. Bush. One third of Active-Negative presidents presided in Quadrant One, one half of the Passive-Positives presided in Quadrant Two, and the majority of Passive-Negatives presided during Quadrant One. Overall, we see the trend of having more Active presidents during the second half of our Country's history, which would also explain why presidents have had a worse Eland ranking in this recent history.

BEM Presidential/Congressional Party Differentials (PCPD)

President	Years with same party in Congress(House+Senate) in power/Total Years (House+Senate)	President	Years with same party in Congress(House+Senate) in power/Total Years (House+Senate)
George Washington	14/16	Grover Cleveland	10/16
John Adams	8/8	Benjamin Harrison	6/8
Thomas Jefferson	16/16	William McKinley	8/8
James Madison	16/16	Theodore Roosevelt	16/16
James Monroe	16/16	William Taft	6/8
John Quincy Adams	4/8	Woodrow Wilson	12/16
Andrew Jackson	16/16	Warren G. Harding	4/4
Martin Van Buren	8/8	Calvin Coolidge	12/12
John Tyler	6/8	Herbert Hoover	6/8
James Polk	6/8	Franklin D. Roosevelt	24/24
Zachary Taylor	0/2	Harry Truman	12/16
Millard Fillmore	0/6	Dwight Eisenhower	4/16
Franklin Pierce	6/8	John F. Kennedy	6/6
James Buchanan	6/8	Lyndon B. Johnson	10/10
Abraham Lincoln	16/16	Richard Nixon	0/12
Andrew Johnson	0/8	Gerald Ford	0/4
Ulysses S. Grant	14/16	Jimmy Carter	8/8
Rutherford B. Hayes	2/8	Ronald Reagan	6/16
Chester Arthur	6/8	George H. W. Bush	0/8

(Senate Historical Office 2012), (Office of the Clerk 2012)

Figure 10: BEM Presidential/Congressional Party Differentials (PCPD)

Active-Negative			Active-Positive			Passive-Positive			Passive-Negative		
PCPD Score			PCPD Score			PCPD Score			PCPD Score		
Mean	.6500		Mean	.7500		Mean	.723214		Mean	.575000	
Median	.7500		Median	1.0000		Median	.750000		Median	.750000	
Mode	.75		Mode	1.00		Mode	1.0000		Mode	None	
Active			Passive			Positive			Negative		
PCPD Score			PCPD Score			PCPD Score			PCPD Score		
Mean	.6974		Mean	.6842		Mean	.733696		Mean	.625000	
Median	.7500		Median	.7500		Median	.875000		Median	.750000	
Mode	1.00		Mode	1.00		Mode	1.0000		Mode	.7500	
PCPD 0-.5			PCPD .51-.75			PCPD .76-1					
	Eland Rank	Eland Score		Eland Rank	Eland Score		Eland Rank	Eland Score		Eland Rank	Eland Score
Mean	18.2000	-.5000	Mean	20.3636	-.5455	Mean	21.5882	-.8824			
Median	15.0000	-.5000	Median	20.0000	-1.0000	Median	25.0000	-2.0000			

Figure 10, Continued: BEM Presidential/Congressional Party Differentials (PCPD)

The PCPD scores are calculated by taking the total years in both the Senate and House in which the political party of the president is also in charge in Congress divided by the total years in office (which is doubled since House and Senate years are added separately).

Example: Democratic President Grover Cleveland had 6 years with a Democratic majority in the House and 4 years with a Democratic Majority. This total: 10 is divided by the total possible years he could have had a majority in the House: 8 + total possible years he could have had a majority in the Senate: 8.

$$10/(8+8)=.625$$

Figure 10 examines the role of divided and undivided government in terms of the party in control of Congress and the party of the President. Unlike the BEM scores, which show a bigger difference between Active and Negative presidents when it comes to Eland's rating, the PCPD scores show a bigger difference between Positive and Negative presidents. With 0 meaning a totally divided government and 1 meaning the same party in power on the presidential and Congressional level, Active presidents had a slightly higher score than Passive presidents, scoring a mean of .70 and .68 respectively. Positive presidents scored a .73, while Negative presidents scored a .63. On a 0 to 1 scale, this is a significant difference, especially when taking into account that the party of the president is usually shared by the House and/or the Senate, making most presidents closer to a rating of 1.

This makes further sense when taking into account that several of these presidents' Positive/Negative categorizations are derived from Maranell's Flexibility/Inflexibility categorizations. Using these criteria, we see more flexible/positive presidents preside when government is less divided and more inflexible presidents when government is more divided. It appears that during divided government, presidents would be more apt to stick their values and principles in being opposed to the party in control of Congress. The opposite would be said for those presiding during periods of undivided government in that presidents may be more apt to give in or listen to Congress since their same party is in control.

As for the category combinations, there is little difference between the Active-Positive PCPD score, .75 and the Passive-Positive PCPD score, .72. However, there is a small, yet significant difference between Active-Negatives, .65, and Passive-Negatives,

.56. Thus, out of all four categories, the Passive-Negative presidents preside under the most divided government.

Using Barber's character criteria regarding Positive vs. Negative presidents, it may just seem like a coincidence that Negative presidents presided during more periods of divided government than Positive presidents. However, if we use Maranell's conversion back to flexible vs. inflexible, it seems to make more sense. Because of the differences between political parties and their political opposition to each other, it would be natural for presidents to be less flexible in their policy decisions when his opposing party is in charge in Congress. Another instance to take into account is that during John Tyler's presidency, Tyler had his same party in control in Congress, yet opposed them on most issues. If the PCPD could take that into account, the PCPD scores for Negative and Passive-Negative presidents.

Noticeable relationships were also found relating divided government to Eland's ranking and score. Splitting the PCPD scores into intervals, presidents with $<.5$ PCPD score had a median Eland score of 15, presidents with $.51-.75$ PCPD score had a median Eland score of 20, and presidents with $.76-1$ PCPD score had a median Eland score of 25. This shouldn't come as a major surprise since Eland's criteria favors presidencies in which less legislation gets passed, since he favors a weaker, limited federal government. Since it would be harder to get legislation passed during periods of divided government, it would be harder to then expand federal power, unless executive powers are used.

The Siena College Presidential Rankings

In the Siena College 2010 Presidential Expert Poll, 238 unique individual responses ranked the 43 presidents in 20 different categories. The averaging of the 20 different categories produced an averaged overall ranking for each president. An explanation of who was invited to do this survey is quoted from the Siena College website:

“We invited scholars that have recently published either peer-reviewed articles on individual presidents or the presidency or full books on individual presidents or the presidency to participate. In addition, we sent invitations to department heads of American universities and colleges in the fields of history and political science and asked them to pass the invitation along to the scholar(s) working in American history or the presidency or to those with expertise or research interest in individual presidents or the presidency.” (Siena Research Institute 2010).

Overall Rank

	1. Background (Family, Education, Experience)	2. Party Leadership	3. Communication Ability (Speak, Write)	4. Relationship with Congress	5. Court Appointments	6. Handling of U.S. Economy	7. Luck	8. Ability to Compromise	9. Willing to take Risks	10. Executive Appointments	11. Overall Ability	12. Immigration	13. Domestic Accomplishments	14. Integrity	15. Executive Ability	15. Foreign Policy Accomplishments	17. Leadership Ability	18. Intelligence	19. Avoid Mistake	20. Your Present View	OVERALL RANK
E. Roosevelt	5	1	1	2	2	1	5	2	3	3	2	4	3	16	3	1	3	10	4	2	1
T. Roosevelt	6	7	3	5	1	2	2	12	1	4	3	1	2	6	4	4	4	6	3	4	2
Lincoln	28	6	2	6	4	5	13	1	2	2	1	2	1	1	1	5	2	3	2	1	3
Washington	7	18	12	3	3	4	1	3	4	1	4	9	4	2	2	3	3	1	12	1	3
Jefferson	1	4	6	4	6	16	6	11	8	5	5	3	6	14	5	7	6	1	6	5	5
Madison	3	10	11	9	7	12	17	7	15	9	6	8	12	5	14	20	17	2	10	8	6
Monroe	9	12	15	8	14	9	9	8	17	8	16	16	8	10	11	2	13	15	7	9	7
Wilson	8	8	9	16	8	8	15	37	9	10	8	5	9	11	10	10	12	4	29	10	8
Truman	35	15	14	20	15	6	11	15	6	7	7	15	7	8	8	6	9	17	8	6	9
Eisenhower	12	17	21	10	9	11	8	5	20	17	11	20	13	9	7	9	7	19	5	7	10
Kennedy	13	19	4	13	12	7	27	6	10	6	14	7	15	35	13	17	11	11	16	14	11
Polk	17	9	13	12	21	15	7	23	7	16	17	14	11	24	9	8	10	20	9	11	12
Clinton	22	11	8	25	11	3	10	4	18	11	10	10	10	41	15	18	14	9	34	15	13
Jackson	30	2	10	14	27	28	4	38	5	19	12	13	14	23	6	19	5	23	12	13	14
Obama	32	21	7	18	13	17	16	10	13	14	18	6	16	12	16	22	16	8	21	18	15
L. Johnson	15	3	16	1	5	10	28	9	12	12	9	12	5	34	12	43	15	21	37	16	16
J. Adams	4	29	18	26	10	13	23	32	16	15	13	17	22	3	19	12	20	7	15	12	17
Reagan	34	5	5	7	31	21	3	14	11	31	19	18	23	26	20	13	8	36	13	17	18
J.Q. Adams	2	34	20	35	16	14	30	29	23	13	15	11	18	4	21	16	26	5	20	21	19
Cleveland	19	16	17	15	17	22	20	19	24	18	20	22	17	19	17	21	19	25	14	19	20
McKinley	21	14	19	11	23	18	24	20	21	20	21	23	19	22	18	15	18	27	11	20	21
G.H. Bush	11	27	33	23	34	32	26	16	29	27	27	31	28	20	22	14	22	24	18	22	22
Van Buren	16	13	23	19	24	38	33	13	32	25	24	24	27	29	23	25	27	22	27	24	23
Taft	14	36	29	30	18	20	32	24	36	22	23	30	21	18	25	23	31	18	28	23	24
Arthur	41	31	32	27	28	19	14	21	27	26	30	25	20	32	27	26	28	32	17	26	25
Grant	26	28	24	22	25	29	21	22	22	40	28	26	26	27	34	24	21	29	31	31	26
Garfield	20	22	22	24	32	23	41	27	31	29	25	28	25	25	26	31	23	26	22	27	27
Ford	27	25	35	17	22	36	31	17	35	23	31	33	30	15	32	27	30	34	26	25	28
Coolidge	25	24	38	21	26	30	32	28	41	30	32	37	31	17	28	32	33	28	19	28	29
Nixon	18	20	26	36	38	25	34	33	14	37	22	19	24	43	24	11	29	16	43	37	30
Hayes	29	33	30	29	29	26	19	18	33	33	33	32	33	28	30	30	32	30	24	29	31
Carter	31	39	27	39	20	40	38	31	25	21	29	21	29	7	36	29	35	13	36	30	32
Taylor	37	35	28	37	37	24	36	34	28	28	34	27	37	21	31	34	25	37	25	33	33
B. Harrison	39	32	34	28	30	35	29	30	39	36	36	34	32	31	35	28	34	35	23	32	34
W. Harrison	24	30	25	31	33	27	42	35	30	24	37	35	36	30	33	39	24	31	33	34	35
Hoover	10	26	31	33	19	43	43	40	42	32	26	38	41	13	29	36	37	14	40	38	36
Tyler	33	42	39	42	39	31	22	39	26	34	35	29	34	33	37	35	36	33	32	36	37
Fillmore	40	41	40	38	35	33	25	25	37	35	38	36	35	36	38	33	39	39	30	35	38
G.W. Bush	36	23	42	32	41	42	18	42	19	41	40	40	38	39	39	42	38	42	38	39	39
Pierce	38	37	37	41	40	34	35	36	38	38	39	39	39	38	40	40	40	38	35	40	40
Harding	43	38	36	34	36	39	37	26	40	43	43	43	40	42	43	37	41	43	39	41	41
Buchanan	23	40	41	40	42	41	40	41	43	39	42	42	43	40	42	41	43	40	41	43	42
A. Johnson	42	43	43	43	43	37	39	43	34	42	41	41	42	37	41	38	42	41	42	42	43

Figure 11: Siena College Poll Presidential Rankings

Active Positive (9) (+/- Difference from Eland Score)	Passive Positive (15) (+/- Difference from Eland Score)
30. Jimmy Carter +22	38. Warren G. Harding +32
26. Gerald Ford +10	23. William Taft +3
5. Thomas Jefferson -21	2. Theodore Roosevelt -19
1. Franklin D. Roosevelt +30	6. James Madison -22
21. George H. W. Bush -12	17. Ronald Reagan -17
11. John F. Kennedy -24	22. Martin Van Buren +19
9. Harry S. Truman -30	29. Rutherford B. Hayes +25
3. Abraham Lincoln +26	24. Chester Arthur +19
1. Franklin D. Roosevelt +30	35. Millard Fillmore +25
Active Negative (10)	32. Benjamin Harrison +17
33. Herbert Hoover +15	25. Ulysses S Grant
16. John Adams -6	39. James Buchanan +16
28. Richard Nixon -1	37. Franklin Pierce
15. Lyndon B. Johnson -17	7. James Monroe
8. Woodrow Wilson -32	20. William McKinley
19. Grover Cleveland +17	Passive Negative (5)
18. John Quincy Adams +6	G 7. George Washington
14. Andrew Jackson -13	G 9. Dwight Eisenhower
12. James Polk -25	G 10. Calvin Coolidge
40. Andrew Johnson +23	E 1. John Tyler
	A 13. Zachary Taylor

(Siena Research Institute 2010)

(Overall Average Distance from Eland's Ranking: 17.55)

Passive-Positive			Passive-Negative		
	Siena College Rank	Difference from Eland		Siena College Rank	Difference from Eland
Mean	25.2857	17.2857	Mean	21.2000	14.4000
Median	24.5000	18.0000	Median	27.0000	17.0000
Std. Deviation	10.60064	6.61500	Std. Deviation	13.36787	12.99231
Range	33.00	25.00	Range	30.00	32.00
Minimum	6.00	3.00	Minimum	4.00	1.00
Maximum	39.00	28.00	Maximum	34.00	33.00

Figure 12: Statistical Analysis of the Siena College Poll Presidential Rankings in Barber and Maranell's Combined Character Categories

Active-Positive

	Siena College Rank	Difference from Eland
Mean	12.0000	21.5556
Median	9.0000	22.0000
Std. Deviation	10.96586	7.07303
Range	29.00	20.00
Minimum	1.00	10.00
Maximum	30.00	30.00

Active-Negative

	Siena College Rank	Difference from Eland
Mean	20.3000	15.6000
Median	17.0000	16.0000
Std. Deviation	10.12203	9.38320
Range	32.00	30.00
Minimum	8.00	2.00
Maximum	40.00	32.00

Active

	Siena College Rank	Difference from Eland
Mean	16.3684	18.4211
Median	15.0000	19.0000
Std. Deviation	11.08157	8.69429
Range	39.00	30.00
Minimum	1.00	2.00
Maximum	40.00	32.00

Passive

	Siena College Rank	Difference from Eland
Mean	24.2105	16.5263
Median	25.0000	18.0000
Std. Deviation	11.14839	8.41539
Range	35.00	32.00
Minimum	4.00	1.00
Maximum	39.00	33.00

Positive

	Siena College Rank	Difference from Eland
Mean	20.0870	18.9565
Median	22.0000	19.0000
Std. Deviation	12.41302	6.97058
Range	38.00	27.00
Minimum	1.00	3.00
Maximum	39.00	30.00

Negative

	Siena College Rank	Difference from Eland
Mean	20.6000	15.2000
Median	18.0000	17.0000
Std. Deviation	10.82194	10.25531
Range	36.00	32.00
Minimum	4.00	1.00
Maximum	40.00	33.00

Figure 12, Continued: Statistical Analysis of the Siena College Poll Presidential Rankings in Barber and Maranell's Combined Character Categories

As is shown, the Eland and Siena College poll rankings are nearly reciprocals of each other. With an average difference in ranking of 17.55, the difference in ranking criteria becomes obvious. The largest ranking gap turns up with the Active-Positive presidents with a difference of 21.56, with the lowest gap in Passive-Negative presidents of 14.4.

The Siena College polls also show a large difference when compared to Barber's character classifications. While Active-Positive presidents ranked the worst of the four categories with an average of 27.125 from Eland, they ranked the best of the four categories with a mean of 12. The other three categories with the Siena College poll averaged in the middle of the pack, with Passive-Positives averaging the worst at 25.29.

Of the four singular categories, Active presidents ranked the best at 16.37, while Passive presidents ranked worst at 24.21, with an even higher median difference of 10. This high regard for Active presidents, specifically Positive ones, illustrates the greatest contrast from Eland's rankings. To further illustrate the contrast, even the few Active-Positive presidents ranked highly or at least in the top 20 by Eland such as Jimmy Carter and Gerald Ford are ranked much lower by the Siena College polls.

An obvious reason for the difference in rankings is the criteria needed to be a good president. As mentioned before, Eland's criteria system gives points for presidents based on how well they do from a limited government, somewhat libertarian perspective of the Constitution in the categories of Peace, Prosperity, of Liberty. Of course, Eland's system is not scientific, but I would argue it gives a valid overall interpretation of how libertarians may rank presidents, with a few exceptions. Another item to note from Eland's criteria is that it doesn't cover such categories such as education, background,

luck, etc. The scores come mainly from what kinds of policies presidents tried to enact. Their success in getting these policies passed is not necessarily a big factor, since in some cases Congress might be directly opposed to the president's policies.

The Siena College criteria include a much broader range of factors in rankings the presidents. Several of the categories would most likely be rather meaningless to Eland since they don't directly involve the kinds of policies a president is trying to set forth. These categories would include Background, Luck, Ability to Compromise, Communication, Imagination, and Intelligence. Although these categories may indirectly lead to certain policy decisions, they do not directly affect policy.

Other categories may be included in Eland's criteria, but with a different interpretation. For example, in Eland's view it may be good for the president to have a bad relationship with Congress if the president is trying to limit Congress's expansion of federal power. Eland may also differ with other scholars in terms of who would be considered good Executive appointments and Supreme Court appointments. Eland would most likely give better rankings to presidents with fewer Domestic and Foreign Accomplishments, while other scholars may consider having "accomplishments" in these areas as creating more federal domestic programs and/or winning more military victories abroad. Scholars may interpret Executive Ability" as expanding executive power and give better rankings to presidents who are able to expand that power. For Eland, Leadership Ability may affect rankings in different ways as well. For example, if Quincy Adams had been more successful in leading Congress to get more domestic programs passed, Eland would have ranked him worse than he did. Thus, in this case, less leadership ability leads to a better ranking for Quincy Adams. Eland would disagree with

giving points to presidents who are “willing to take risks”. Just because a President is willing to take risks, it does not mean it will lead to better policy. Lastly, Party Leadership would be interpreted differently for Eland. Going against one's own party may be a plus for presidents in some cases if the party is trying to expand federal power. A perfect example of this would be Eland's favorite president, John Tyler, who went against his own Whig party that wanted higher tariffs and to expand federal programs.

CHAPTER IV

THE PRESIDENTS

Introduction

The following section includes profiles of every president, excluding William Henry Harrison and James Garfield since they were not profiled by Eland. The Siena College Poll rankings are adjusted to not include these presidents as well as Barack Obama who was not ranked by Eland either. Each profile includes a brief summary of Eland's own description of the presidents in terms of Peace, Prosperity, and Liberty, followed by my own interpretations of their character classification and their Siena College Poll Ranking.

George Washington

Eland Ranking: 7, Good

1789-1797 (Elected Twice)

Siena College Poll Ranking: 4

Barber Classification: Passive-Negative;

Maranell Classification: Active-Positive

Although Eland has Washington in the Good category, he spends most of his time in his Peace and Prosperity sections explaining why he wasn't put in the top 3 like many

other analysts do. Coming with the territory of being the nation's first president under the new Constitution, Washington set the precedent for what the role of the presidency would entail for years to come. Eland argues this was especially true for foreign policy in stating that under Washington, “the executive branch became the sole maker of U.S. Foreign policy, a role that was not stipulated in the Constitution” (Eland, p. 21). The argument here is that although the Constitution gives the president the role of Commander-in Chief, that isn't explicit enough to give all military powers to the president. Eland disapproves of his role in fighting various Indian tribes, which took up 80 percent of the federal budget.

As Prosperity is concerned, Eland disapproves of the power the president assumed from the Constitution in places that were not explicit in giving presidential or even federal power. For example, he let Alexander Hamilton, Secretary of the Treasury, set tariffs and create a national bank. Eland argues that since the Constitution does not explicitly give any part of the federal government the power to establish a bank, that it does not have the right to do so, and that the Tenth Amendment implies that it would be the states' role to legislate such items.

However, he still deserves a Good ranking for Eland based on the notion that he could have been a lot worse. Although he did set some power extending precedents, Washington could have extended that power even further. He warned against permanent alliances and maintaining a large standing army, while also voluntarily leaving office after two terms after many suggesting he remain in power for life (Eland 2009, 19-24).

Although Barber and Maranell differ in their classifications of both Activity and Positivity in Washington's character, I believe each of their classifications could make

sense in Washington's unique precedent setting case. Washington could be considered Active-Positive by the fact that he expanded presidential powers somewhat by filling in some blanks in which the Constitution was vague about presidential power. On the other hand, the Passive-Negative classification works as well from the perspective that Washington could have broadened presidential power a lot more than he did and resisted the nudging of others who wanted him to be president for life.

Washington is one of the few presidents that is ranked highly by both Eland and the Sienna College. Washington is ranked in the top ten in every category by the Siena College except for Party Leadership, Communication Ability, and Intelligence. His number one rankings in the Luck, Executive Appointments, Leadership Ability, and Avoid Crucial Mistakes categories, along with his high rankings in other categories helped him get his number four ranking. However, like most cases where the Eland and Siena College rankings are similar, they are ranked similarly for different reasons. Eland's high ranking for Washington is based mostly by the fact that he could have expanded the president's power drastically, but held back from doing so. The Siena College doesn't have a category that explicitly praises restraint of power.

John Adams

Eland Ranking: 22, Poor

1797-1801 (Elected Once)

Siena College Poll Ranking: 16

Barber/Maranell Classification: Active-Negative

What saves Adams from a Bad rating is his avoidance of war with France. While Adams could have given in to the wants of his own Federalist party, he decided to send a

peace commission to France in 1799. Eland also likes the fact Adams disbanded the army after naval hostilities were over in fear of Hamilton staging a coup in order to get the United States to rejoin the British Empire.

What put Adams in the Poor category for Eland are his poor Supreme Court appointment and the signing of the Alien and Sedition Act. Adams had appointed Federalist John Marshall, who Eland argues envisioned an expansionary government. In *Marbury v. Madison*, Marshall essentially gave the Supreme Court the power of judicial review, a power not explicitly given in the Constitution. Eland argues that the Alien and Sedition Act was the second-worst compromise of American personal freedoms, exceeded only by Woodrow Wilson's laws enacted in World War I. Eland views this act to be a direct attack on the First Amendment's guarantee of free speech, giving Adams a low score in the Liberty category (25-29).

Both Barber and Maranell classify Adams as an Active-Negative, and it would seem that this classification fits Adams well. His passage of the Alien and Sedition Act illuminates the Active and Negative parts of his character. This expansion of federal power exemplifies the Active part, while the clamping down on dissent shows his distaste for anyone not agreeing with his policies, exemplifying the Negative character.

The Siena College ranks Adams only six presidents higher than Eland does. However, the three categories in which he ranks in the top 7: Background, Integrity, and Intelligence, are not categories that Eland would necessarily seem applicable in ranking a president. If these categories were taken out of the equation, he would have been ranked closer to Eland's 22 ranking.

Thomas Jefferson

Eland Ranking: 26, Bad

1801-1809 (Elected Twice)

Siena College Poll Ranking: 5

Barber/Maranell Classification: Active-Positive

It may come as a surprise to some libertarians to see Thomas Jefferson in the Bad category. Eland argues Jefferson was a hypocrite in that his views for limited government which were touted during the nation's founding were not carried out during his presidency. Although Jefferson advocated a restrained foreign policy, Eland views his negotiation of the Louisiana Purchase as blatantly unconstitutional. Since the Constitution doesn't give any federal power to purchase land, Eland argues there should have been a Constitutional Amendment first. Instead, Jefferson decided to purchase this land from France (or rather France's claim to the territory which the Indians inhabited) and then rammed the purchase through Congress.

Jefferson is deducted many points in the Prosperity category due to his embargoes placed on France and Britain. Eland argues that these embargoes hurt the American economy and had little effect on the British and French economies. This impediment to international trade led to massive U.S. unemployment and to the starvation of American people. In order to enforce this embargo, Jefferson violated personal liberties by prohibiting the haul of the goods by “carts, wagons, and sleds” (35) which could be used to take goods onto sea vessels. Eland quotes historian Leonard Levy's statement that this embargo to this day is the most repressive and unconstitutional act ever passed by Congress during peace time. Lastly, Eland explains the bad precedent set by Jefferson in the relocation of Indians to empty western lands (30-37).

Jefferson is classified as an Active-Positive by both Barber and Maranell. His purchase of the Louisiana Territory and embargoes help show is more obvious Active characteristics. To explain Jefferson's Positive Character, Barber states, "A child of the Enlightenment, he applied his reason to organizing connections with Congress aimed at strengthening the more popular forces" (Barber 2009, 11). In other words, although he used his presidential power, he did it while having a good relationship with Congress, thus not appearing to just go over the heads of Congress when governing. If Congress had been more openly against the president's purchase of land and Jefferson did it anyway, this might have shifted him more towards the Negative category.

Like most Active-Positive presidents, there is a large gap between the Eland and Siena College rankings; in this case, 21. With his number five ranking, he is ranked number one in the Background and Intelligence categories, as well as number four in Relationship with Congress, as noted by Barber's explanation. His number five ranking in Executive Ability shows the obvious difference in the criteria and theory of the presidency between Eland and the Siena College poll. It seems that the more active a president is in using executive powers, the higher ranking he will have in Executive Ability. It could be assumed that Eland would harshly disagree with this criterion.

James Madison

Eland Ranking: 28, Bad

1809-1817 (Elected Twice)

Siena College Poll Ranking: 6

Barber Classification: Passive-Positive

Maranell Classification: Active-Positive

In explaining Madison's placement in the Bad Category, Eland writes rather extensively on his role in the War of 1812. Although Madison was not the main proponent of the war, he gave in to the “war hawks” such as John Calhoun and Henry Clay who were desperate to declare war on Britain. Eland argues that Madison ignored several other options that would have kept the U.S. out of a war it was not prepared for and not yet strong enough to fight. With the war, Madison proposed the expansion of the regular army and the consolidation of state militias into federal control. These proposals were mostly rejected by Congress. In addition, Madison loses points in his invasion of Florida. Madison backed U.S. Settlers' seizure of a Spanish fort at Baton Rouge and ordered the Orleans territory's governor to invade western Florida and establish a government. Eland argues this was unconstitutional due to the fact that no war was declared by Congress in this case.

With war comes the need to fund it, thus Madison, along with Congress, approved new taxes, including the stamp tax, as well as new protective tariffs. Eland argues that the increase in taxes that follows the expansion of government does not coincide with the founders' principles of limited government. With this said, the reason Madison was able to not go even lower in ranking is that he didn't restrict civil liberties during the war (Eland 2009, 38-49).

Both Barber and Maranell classify Madison as having Positive character; however, Barber classifies him as Passive, while Maranell classifies him as Active. His Positive trait that they both agree upon is shown in his willingness to be flexible and giving in to what Congress wanted in the War of 1812, as well as the new taxes that came along afterwards. Barber states, “Madison comes closest to the passive-positive, or compliant, type; he suffered from irresolution, tried to compromise his way out, and gave in too readily to the “war-hawks” urging combat with Britain” (Barber 2009, 11). I would argue that his Passive classification from Barber comes from the fact that he was not actively engaging the war, but passively let Congress persuade him into it. The Maranell classification of Madison as Active type can be explained through interpreting that even though he wasn’t actively engaging the war, the fact that he did end up approving the war helps recognize him as Active.

As another highly ranked president by the Siena College Poll, Madison scored best in the Intelligence and Background categories, second and third respectively. Although he ranked much poorer in the Foreign Policy Accomplishments category than his predecessors, as Eland would agree, he still ranked 20th in that category-the middle of the pack compared to all presidents. Madison’s demerits in foreign policy and tax policy in Eland’s view, were enough to put him in the Bad category and a twenty-two president drop from Siena’s six place ranking.

James Monroe

Eland Ranking: 25, Bad

1817-1825 (Elected Twice)

Siena College Poll Ranking: 7

Maranell Classification: Passive-Positive

Attributing to Monroe's Bad ranking is his implementation of the Monroe Doctrine, which was the exchange of staying out of European affairs for Europeans not colonizing new territories in the New World. This declaration was done without congressional legislation or approval, an action Eland sees as unconstitutional. Like Madison, Monroe also ordered an invasion of Spanish controlled Florida without declaration of war.

As Prosperity is concerned, Monroe lost points with Eland for approving multiple increases in tariffs, not attempting to abolish the national bank, and trying to allocate federal funding for internal improvement projects. He lost points in the Liberty category for continuing Jefferson's policy of relocating Indians off their lands and outside of the western boundaries (Eland 2009, 50-54).

The passage of the Monroe Doctrine without Congressional approval, along with his ordering the invasion of Florida may make one assume him an Active president. Although Maranell classified Monroe as Passive, he was the least passive of all Passive presidents. The fact that he his party controlled Congress and had no strong opposition from Congress may have helped move him into the Passive category. Also attributing to this may be that he signed bills from Congress that increased tariffs and increased funding for internal projects; he was not necessarily strongly advocating them.

Not surprisingly, he is ranked highly by the Siena College poll. The Siena College Poll's approval of the Monroe Doctrine is exhibited by Monroe's number two ranking in Foreign Policy Accomplishments, beneath only Franklin D. Roosevelt. His number eight ranking in Domestic Accomplishments may exhibit the Siena College poll's approval of the higher tariffs and internal improvements.

John Quincy Adams

Eland Ranking: 12, Average

1825-1829 (Elected Once)

Siena College Poll Ranking: 17

Maranell Classification: Active-Negative

Eland describes Quincy Adams as an average, ineffective president. As a president who won neither the popular vote nor the electoral vote to his opponent, he didn't have valid popular support in the first place. In foreign policy, he lightly meddled in Latin America, "blocking Columbia and Mexico from taking Cuba and Puerto Rico from Spain" (56). He also violated the Senate's power to ratify treaties by participating in the Panama Congress.

Quincy Adams lost points in the Prosperity category for proposing an "Antebellum New Deal" which included internal improvements such as national roads and passenger railroads. In order to pay for these improvements, he was forced to sign the "Tariff of Abominations". For someone like Eland, any rise in taxes would be seen as being opposed to limited government principles. What actually helped Quincy Adams not drop into the Poor or Bad category was Congress's unwillingness to pass many of his

internal improvement proposals. If he would have been more successful in getting them passed, he probably would have been ranked lower (55-59).

Maranell classifies Quincy Adams as an Active-Negative. It would be interesting to see if Eland would agree with Adams being an Active president. For him to be classified as Active, it would have to be under the context of his Latin American intervention and his internal improvement proposals. Activity, in this case, would not mean that the president has to be successful in what he is trying to accomplish, it would just have to imply that he is trying in the first place. His Negative characteristic may be explained by the fact he didn't compromise with Congress, who didn't want to pass his progressive legislation.

The Siena College's slightly lower rank of Quincy Adams may be explained by his not compromising with Congress. He is ranked very low in the categories of Relationship with Congress-35, Ability to Compromise-29, and Party Leadership-34. These rankings may also be attributed from having a divided government during his presidency.

Andrew Jackson

Eland Ranking: 27, Bad

1829-1837 (Elected Twice)

Siena College Poll Ranking: 14

Maranell Classification: Active-Negative

Although opposing a central national bank would usually be seen in a positive light by many proponents of limited government, opposing the renewal of the Second Bank of the United States was not enough to move Andrew Jackson out of the Bad

category. His expansion of presidential power and harsh treatment of Indians were enough to outshine this one accomplishment.

After South Carolinians favored nullification of a federal tariff law and threatened to secede if Congress used force against the state, Jackson came out in full force in favor of federal law supremacy. Jackson sent two warships to surround the Carolina coast and fortified the surrounding federal forts. Although Jackson eventually offered a compromise tariff to alleviate a violent situation, his previous actions set a bad precedent, in Eland's view, that the president can threaten states with violent force for noncompliance. Although Eland admits that what Jackson did could be technically Constitutional, he argues that the overt aggression he showed for noncompliance went against the founding principles and that it set the precedent for Lincoln to use force a few decades later.

As for Jackson's Indian policy, he signed the Indian Removal Act, which evicted Indians off land that had been guaranteed to them by over ninety treaties. He ordered state militias as well as the U.S. Army to push the natives westward, which would soon be called the Trail of Tears (60-69).

Eland's explanation of Jackson seems to be right on par with Maranell's classification of him as an Active-Negative president. Eland classifies Jackson as one of the three most powerful presidents of the nineteenth century along with Jefferson and Lincoln. In this context with the actions shown by him during his presidency, it is easy to classify him as Active. His "my way or the highway" attitude in his policy towards the Indians and Southern states make it rather simple to classify him as Negative.

Jackson's middle-of-the-pack ranking by the Siena College poll is attributed by his low rankings in categories such as Background and Ability to Compromise combined with his high rankings in Party Leadership, Luck, Willing to take Risks, and Leadership Ability, and Executive Ability. Thus, it could be assumed that Jackson's use of power and ability to get what he wanted done helped rank him in the top half of U.S. presidents.

Martin Van Buren

Eland Ranking: 3, Excellent

1837-1841 (Elected Once)

Siena College Poll Ranking: 23

Maranell Classification: Passive-Positive

As the first of only four Excellent presidents on Eland's list, Van Buren received this third place ranking due to his noninterventionist foreign policy and his fiscally conservative economic policy. Eland contends that Van Buren avoided potential wars with both Canada and Mexico. He disarmed American rebels who were trying to take Canadian territory and successfully warned the governor of Maine not to get into violent conflict with the British on the Canadian border over a disputed border. Van Buren avoided conflict with Mexico after Jackson had pursued monetary claims against the country. The president was able to get Mexico to accept arbitration by commission, thus ending that potential conflict. In addition, he avoided straining relations with Mexico further by deciding not to annex the newly independent Texas.

After the Panic of 1837, Van Buren resisted government intervention to make money more easily available by maintaining a hard money policy in which money was redeemable in gold. Eland argues that this policy limited inflation, made the market more

stable, and made the economic crisis last shorter than it would have otherwise. In addition, he “reduced public spending, balanced the budget, and railed against the creation of national debt” (73). He also was able to get Congress to stop funding state governments with internal improvement aid to infrastructure on the grounds that the Constitution did not authorize it.

Eland declared that the only thing holding Van Buren from being ranked number one was his continuation of the violent removal policies against the Indians (70-75).

Maranell's Passive classification of Van Buren generally fits Eland's explanation and his tendency to have higher rankings for Passive presidents. As mentioned, Passive-Positive presidents tend to be a mixed bag when it comes to Eland rankings. I would contend that this Positive classification works in this case because this Democratic president had a Democratic House and Senate during all four years of his presidency. Van Buren did not have to hold on to his principles since Congress generally went along with what he wanted to do anyway.

Not surprisingly, the Siena College poll did not hold Van Buren with such high regard, giving him his 23rd place ranking. His poorest category ranking was Handling the U.S. Economy in which he received a 38th place ranking. The reasoning for this could include that the economy was doing poorly during his presidency, his conservative policies as it pertains to handling the economy, or a combination of both. The poll results obviously don't agree with Eland's assessment that Van Buren's policies kept the economy from getting worse.

John Tyler

Eland Ranking: 1, Excellent

1841-1845 (Not Elected)

Siena College Poll Ranking: 34

Maranell Classification: Passive-Negative

Although not a perfect president by Eland's standards, Tyler's resiliency in opposing his own party's platform of expanded federal influence on the economy and his peaceful reactions to internal disputes were enough to move him to the top of the list. As seen with previous presidents, an aggressive Indian policy will make any president lose points with Eland. Tyler was able to end the “longest and bloodiest Indian war in U.S. History- the Second Seminal War-by allowing several hundred Seminoles to stay on their reservation in Florida instead of being sent to lands with of the Mississippi River” (78-79).

Tyler helped avoid a potential violent crisis by showing restraint during Thomas Dorr's rebellion in Rhode Island over voting rights. Rhode Island asked for military forces to help the state, but Tyler sent his Secretary of War to fact-find first before sending any forces. Dorr was eventually arrested and released, and Rhode Island adopted universal voting rights for white males. He also avoided further conflict with Britain by getting Britain and Maine to compromise on land distribution between New Brunswick and Maine, in addition to agreeing on a joint ban of the slave trade with Britain. However, attributing to Tyler's imperfection was his annexing Texas without the two-thirds vote by the Senate required in making a treaty with a separate nation, as well as his sending troops near the Mexican border at Corpus Christi. He also lost points in extending the Monroe Doctrine to Hawaii, a territory not yet owned by the United States.

In economic policy, Tyler vetoed his own party's bills to “recharter the national bank and distribute federal aid to states” (81). In addition, he favored a tight monetary policy of paper money being backed by silver and gold (77-82).

Tyler's opposition to his own party in not going against his own principles, even if it helped go against him in his re-election, fits right in with Maranell's Negative classification. His mostly non-aggressive Indian and foreign policy, along with his non-expansionary domestic policy would rightfully explain his classification of Passive as well.

In another example of the Siena College poll's love for leadership and compromise, Tyler ranked towards the very bottom in the categories of Party Leadership, Relationship with Congress, Communication Ability, and Ability to Compromise. In Tyler's case of having to go against his own party on most issues, the Siena College poll saw this situation as hurting him since he couldn't lead his party to view the issues the way he wanted. While this poll saw this situation in a negative light, Eland oppositely applauds his stances on not compromising with his own party in Congress since doing so would have led to policies that expanded federal government power.

James Polk

Eland Ranking: 37, Bad

1845-1849 (Elected Once)

Siena College Poll Ranking: 12

Maranell Classification: Active-Negative

Although James Polk held relatively conservative views when it comes to the federal government's role in the economy, his overt march to war with Mexico and near

clash with British Canada put him near the very bottom of Eland's list. As a believer in Manifest Destiny, Polk wanted the United States to extend all the way to the Pacific coast. After failing to buy California and New Mexico from Mexico, he sent General Zachary Taylor to the disputed Mexican border. After cutting off Mexican supplies in a blockade of the Rio Grande, Mexico raided north of the Rio Grande, and in turn the United States army fought back. Polk was then able to get Congress to declare war against Mexico, leading to a United States victory and an eventual selling of Mexican land to the United States. Polk also risked war in his claim of the Oregon border up to 54 degrees 40 minutes north latitude. In an attempt to claim this land, Polk withdrew from the 1818 treaty with Britain, but the country was saved from war in Britain's preferring of negotiation over warfare, which led to the territory's extension to the forty-ninth parallel.

In addition, Polk expanded presidential powers by creating the first unified executive budget and chose not to come out against slavery with the creation of new Southern states with the newly gained territory. Furthermore, when he announced that an abundance of gold had been found in California, it led to the California Gold Rush in which white settlers trampled into the Indian territory, leaving over one hundred thousand Indians killed. Although not a direct cause of what happened, Polk's announcement indirectly led to the destruction of Indian rights (83-91).

Eland's explanation of Polk agrees fairly directly with his Active-Negative status. He was very active when it comes to foreign policy, while his lack of willingness to negotiate helps give him the Negative character category.

The Siena College poll's high ranking of Polk comes from its trend of giving high regard for presidents that enhance their executive power. His top ten rankings in the

categories of Willing to take Risks, Executive Ability, and Foreign Policy

Accomplishments help drive this point home. The Mexican-American War is thus seen as a foreign policy accomplishment according to the poll.

Zachary Taylor

Eland Ranking: 13, Average

1849-1850 (Elected Once)

Siena College Poll Ranking: 31

Maranell Classification: Passive-Negative

Zachary Taylor's sixteen month presidency is given an Average ranking by Eland. Although he disagrees with Taylor's domestic economic policy and his risking a small civil war in 1850, he did not make enough bad decisions to put him in the Poor category. After California and New Mexico were acquired from Mexico, the debate rose on whether or not they could turn in to free or slave states. After California was declared a state and New Mexico was declared a territory, Taylor dissuaded Texas from acquiring New Mexico by sending troops to occupy New Mexico. The Compromise of 1850 provided a temporary solution to the slavery issue between the North and South, but was not signed until Taylor had passed away. Eland argues that he would have vetoed the legislation.

As Prosperity and Liberty are concerned, Taylor lost points for his policy of high tariffs and subsidies and his ignoring the murdering of the Indian population in California (92-95). I am somewhat surprised, given Eland's explanation of Taylor, that he wasn't ranked lower.

However, his relatively high ranking and his Passive-Negative Maranell classification goes along with Eland's support of Passive-Negative presidents. As the worst ranked Passive-Negative on Eland's list at 13, I'm not sure if Eland would agree with his Passive classification since he sent troops to New Mexico. However, Eland does argue that the sending of troops may have been the right thing to do in this case, and the notion that he would have vetoed the 1850 Compromise legislation may go with the Negative categorization as well.

Taylor is ranked in the bottom half of presidents in all twenty Siena College poll categories. The categories that he ranked lowest in are categories that Eland may not give much relevance to such as Background, Party Leadership, Luck, and Intelligence. These categories don't necessarily directly affect policy.

Millard Fillmore

Eland Ranking: 14, Average

1850-1853 (Never Elected)

Siena College Poll Ranking: 35

Maranell Classification: Passive-Positive

Millard Fillmore ranks just below Taylor at 14, the lowest ranked Average president. Although Fillmore provided mostly a continuation of Taylor's policies, he did sign the Compromise of 1850, which Taylor may have vetoed. Eland describes this legislation as a mixed bag since while it may have prevented a civil war from occurring earlier, it set the stage for further conflict and had to be passed with the Fugitive Slave Act, which Eland describes as unconstitutional since the Constitution does not explicitly give the federal government the power to return slaves to slave-owners.

Fillmore lost Peace points for coercing trade with Japan. Although Eland is a proponent of free trade, he saw this coercion as a form of mercantilism. He made up for this action by promoting a “good neighbor” policy with Latin America, patching up relations with the region after Polk's aggressive actions. However, Fillmore lost Prosperity points for heavily subsidizing railroad construction in the West (96-100).

Fillmore's Passive-Positive character can be attributed by his giving into the wants of Congress. Eland states, “Like Zachary Taylor, his predecessor, Fillmore was leery of Congress regulating slavery, but the Constitution said that Congress may admit new states and make the rules and regulations governing U.S. territory” (99). So, in this case we see Fillmore going along with Congress, even though he may have disagreed with them. This situation shows his Positive character, perhaps wanting to be liked and avoid confrontation, along with his Passive character, which would imply that the legislation that went through, including the Fugitive Slave Act, was more the doing of Congress than the president who just signed it through.

Fillmore ranked near the bottom of every Siena College category except for Luck and Ability to Compromise. His higher ranking in Ability to Compromise makes sense, given the previous explanation of him giving into the wants of Congress, despite his low ranking in Relationship with Congress. Fillmore's overall ranking, however, shows the poll's blame on the president for the policies that were passed, instead of Congress.

Franklin Pierce

Eland Ranking: 24, Poor

1853-1857 (Elected Once)

Siena College Poll Ranking: 37

Maranell Classification: Passive-Positive

Franklin Pierce's Poor ranking is mostly attributed by his approval of the Kansas-Nebraska Act which brought the country closer to civil war. This act admitted California as a free state while letting Utah and New Mexico potentially become slavery territories. Although, like Fillmore, he doubted Congress should regulate slavery, but he let it go anyway since the Constitution said Congress has the power to admit new states and make regulations regarding U.S. Territory. In addition, Eland argues he intruded in the territories' decision-making process by allowing pro-slave Missourians into Kansas to set up a pro-slavery government. Pierce also appointed pro-slavery governors to these territories. This would lead to the mini-civil war in Kansas known as “bloody Kansas”. Another example of his pro-slavery policy was his attempt to get Spain to give up Cuba so it could be admitted into the United States as a slave state.

Other negative aspects of his presidency according to Eland included the razing and burning of Greytown on the Coast of Nicaragua, which he believes was a precursor to the idea that turmoil and instability in one country justifies intervention by U.S. Military. In addition, Pierce continued railroad subsidies and federally subsidized cable communications with Europe. Pierce also loses points with Eland for the fifty-two treaties with the Indians that essentially stole “an area the size of Texas from the tribes.

Policies that kept Pierce from being ranked lower include his signing of the Canadian Reciprocity Treaty which settled the long-time border dispute with Canada, the

lack of federal spending on internal improvements, and the reduction of the national debt by 83 percent (101-105).

It would be difficult to determine if Eland would agree Pierce was a Passive president with the intervention in Nicaragua and using federal troops to enforce the Fugitive Slave Act. However, since this Democratic president had a Democratic House for his whole term and a Democratic Senate for half of his term, it could be argued he was just following his party in Congress. Also, Pederson's adaptation of Maranell's Flexible presidents as Positive presidents helps fit Pierce in the Positive category in his letting Congress regulate slavery, even though he doubted that it should.

Pierce ranked towards the very bottom in every Siena College poll category, undoubtedly because of the lead up to the Civil War that the policies under his presidency led to. The main difference between the rankings of Eland and the Siena College poll appears to be that Eland puts more of the blame on Congress, while the poll puts more of the blame on the president.

James Buchanan

Eland Ranking: 23, Poor

1857-1861 (Elected Once)

Siena College Poll Ranking: 39

Maranell Classification: Passive-Positive

Although Eland puts some of the blame on James Buchanan for helping start the Civil War, he does not put as full of blame on him as other rankers of presidents do, giving him a middle of the pack ranking among all presidents. One of the triggers Buchanan pulled to help start the war was endorsing slave codes and federal protection of

slave ownership, even north of the Missouri Compromise line. In addition, he divided the Democratic Party by only selecting Southern Democrats to his cabinet and supported the pro-slavery minority in Kansas in its acceptance of the Lecompton constitution. According to Eland, Buchanan should have let the South secede peacefully, with the belief that slavery would not be able to last much longer in the South anyway. Instead, he did nothing to stall the crisis, which ended up in Lincoln's lap, and he even "rejected a peace convention planned by loyal southerners to try and halt the secessionist movement" (112). Buchanan lost further Peace points in his unsuccessful attempts to gather a military force to preemptively invade Mexico.

As Prosperity is concerned, he lost points for increasing federal expenditures by fifteen per cent and leaving behind a budget deficit, but is given credit for restraining from signing legislation from Congress that would expand federal programs and influence such as the Homestead Act. He lost Liberty points because he was willing to use military force against the Mormons in Utah (106-115).

Explaining Buchanan's classification as a Passive-Positive president is not an easy task. At first glance, I would argue it may be easy to classify him as Active-Negative, given his usage of power and his trend of disagreeing with Congress. It must be noted, however, that the Maranell scoring of his flexibility (converted as positivity) was only +.01, so he can barely be perceived as truly flexible (positive). As for his Passive trait, the Maranell classification must have seen him as just going with the wishes of Congress and those in his cabinet.

The Siena College Poll ranks Buchanan as the second worst president, only better than Andrew Johnson. He is ranked in the bottom four in every category except for

Background, in which he is ranked in the middle of the pack. If it weren't for that one decent ranking, he would have been ranked last overall. It would be easy to assume that those in the Siena College poll put the brunt of the blame of the Civil War on Buchanan.

Abraham Lincoln

Eland Score: 29, Bad

1861-1865 (Elected Twice)

Siena College Poll Ranking: 3

Maranell Classification: Active-Positive

Not surprisingly, Abraham Lincoln, who is considered by many as one of the greatest American presidents as seen in the Siena College poll, is not put on such a high pedestal by Eland. Although Eland agrees with the end outcome of the Civil War with the freeing of African American slaves, he does not necessarily agree with the means presidents, including Abraham Lincoln, took to get that outcome. Eland argues Lincoln may have been able to avoid war if he would have withdrawn forces from Fort Sumter “and claimed that he had negotiated a good deal with the South for the compensation for that fort” (118). Even though Eland argues that the war was constitutional if it was fought in order to preserve the union, he also contends that “For a ‘free’ government that is based on self-determination, using force to compel people to continue to live under that government severely undermines their freedom and self-determination” (120). In addition, Eland severely disapproves of Lincoln setting the precedent of instituting a military draft. Options Eland give to avoiding the war while eventually freeing the slaves include offering slave owners compensation for eventual emancipation and letting the

South secede while repealing the Fugitive Slave Act, which would cause slaves in the South to rebel and find haven in the North.

As Prosperity is concerned, Lincoln loses points with Eland for creating nationally chartered banks that could create greenbacks not “immediately redeemable for gold and silver” (125) and for increasing the money supply. Additionally, Lincoln presided over the first income tax.

Part of the main reason Lincoln is ranked as highly as he is would be that the slaves were freed under his presidency, although Eland doesn’t agree with the tactics he used. However, Lincoln still lost many Liberty points for his unilateral suspension of habeas corpus, creation of military tribunals, shutting down newspapers, deporting an opposing Congressman, and other similar acts during the war (116-130).

Overall, Lincoln is a decent example of an Active-Positive president. Eland doesn’t describe the presidents in Barber’s character terms; however, he does describe Lincoln as passive on issues not related to the Civil War since he let Congress pass tariff increases, an income tax, the creation of the Department of Agriculture, etc. On the other hand, he describes him as very active when it comes to the Civil War. Since the war is seen as the biggest issue for Lincoln, it’s not surprising the Maranell characterization puts him as Active-Positive. He was flexible with Congress, which helps explain his Positive aspect.

For those in the Siena College poll, it can be assumed that the means to get to the eventual freeing of the slaves were not a major factor in evaluating Abraham Lincoln. He was ranked first in several categories, including Ability to Compromise (Positive), Overall Ability, Domestic Accomplishments, Executive Ability, and Integrity. If it

weren't for his low ranking in the arguably arbitrary category of Background, he may have been ranked first or second overall. The twenty-six ranking difference between the Siena College poll and Eland further shows the difference in thought regarding the use of presidential power.

Andrew Johnson

Eland's Ranking: 17, Poor

1865-1869 (Never Elected)

Siena College Poll Ranking: 40

Maranell Classification: Active-Negative

Eland's relatively good ranking of Andrew Johnson compared to other presidential scholars come from his advocating a more peaceful reintegration of the South into the Union. The downside of that, however, is that he pushed harder for Southern white reintegration than for the integration of blacks. He did give into the Radical Republicans which set the policy of military occupation of the South, making him lose Peace points with Eland. He loses additional points by excessively using presidential power to veto Constitutional legislation and declining to use the money it appropriated. Although Eland would advocate a limited amount of appropriated money, the rule of law would truncate this appropriation, meaning the president can't disobey the Constitution. Johnson is cut some slack for having to endure excessive Congressional power, including the overriding of Johnson's veto of not signing off on military rule over local government.

As for Johnson's impeachment, Eland doesn't view it as much of a detriment to his presidency since much of it had to do with his opposition to Congress. What further

helped save him from a Bad ranking was his mostly conservative economic policy. Vedder and Gallaway ranked Johnson second of thirty-nine presidents on his limited government and anti-inflation policies. Much of this had to do with his transferring of resources back to the private sector after the Civil War (131-138).

Maranell's classification of Andrew Johnson as Active-Negative fits him perfectly. His use of presidential power against Congress helps show his Active character and his reluctance to go along with Congress helps exemplify his Negative aspect.

From Johnson's dead last position in the Siena College poll, it can be assumed that his impeachment trial and some of the negative aspects of Reconstruction helped bring him down on the list. He was ranked dead last in several categories, including not surprisingly in Relationship with Congress and Ability to Compromise.

Ulysses S. Grant

Eland Ranking: 19, Poor

1869-1877 (Elected Twice)

Siena College Poll Ranking: 25

Maranell Classification: Passive-Positive

One aspect keeping Grant out of Eland's Bad category was his generally restrained foreign policy. He refused to be pressured into recognizing the Cuban rebellion, thus avoiding for the time being a war with Spain. On the home front, however, he reluctantly gave in to Congress's reconstruction efforts and enforced these laws in the South with military force. Eland argues that the rigorous enforcement of these laws helped cause the backlash by groups such as the Ku Klux Klan who stepped

up their attacks against blacks. Eland believes Grant should have pleaded with Congress to lift military rule and replaced the military with civilian officials.

Grant scored much better in the Prosperity category with his passage of the Public Credit Act which made the administration pay bond holders in gold and begin to redeem greenbacks. He also restrained from voting for a congressional bill to create more greenbacks during the Panic of 1873, helping give him a Vedder and Gallaway ranking of third. Eland's trend of not overly counting scandals and corruption against presidents continues with Grant, arguing he was overly faulted for the effects of the corruption.

Grant gained some Liberty points for supporting the Civil Rights Act of 1875, even though it would be ignored mostly by the rest of society. On the other hand, Eland sees his well-intended Indian policy as a failure. Although he sees the creation of the reservation system as an attempt to prevent Indian annihilation, he argues the movement of people into reservations today would be considered "ethnic cleansing" (139-149).

Republican Ulysses S. Grant having a Republican Congress for the vast majority of his presidency, and his giving into its Reconstruction agenda, even if reluctantly, helps explain his Passive-Positive classification. Even if he held different policy stances, since he went along with Congress, he can be considered both Passive-not extending his presidential power and Positive-going along with the wishes of Congress.

Grant is one of the few presidents ranked closely in the middle of the pack by both Eland and the Siena College poll. He is ranked towards the middle in most of the Siena College poll categories, with the exceptions of Executive Ability and Executive Appointments. His very low Executive Appointments ranking would most likely be attributed to the scandals that occurred within his administration.

Rutherford B. Hayes

Eland Ranking: 4, Excellent

1877-1881 (Elected Once)

Siena College Poll Ranking: 29

Maranell Classification: Passive-Positive

Rutherford B. Hayes is first in a string of presidents that Eland hold in high regard. Eland is a fan of his restrained foreign policy in which he avoided war with Mexico after the United States sent troops into Mexico to hunt down bandits who were stealing livestock the United States side of the border. However, like Van Buren, Hayes would have been ranked even higher if it weren't for his use of force against the Indians.

As for economic policy, Eland applauds his hard-money policies. He vetoed a move by congress to expand the money supply, although that veto was overturned. He was able to; however, bring the U.S. back to the gold standard and help pay off the federal debt. Eland also agrees with his dealing of labor disputes since he generally refused to send federal troops to break up strikes.

Hayes earns points in the Liberty category for his advocacy for black voting rights. He thought that the policies of using military force in the South were counter-productive and used the removal of troops as a bargaining chip to get Democratic governors of two states to honor black civil rights, although the governors' promises were not kept. He also vetoed legislation from the Democratic Congress that would have blocked the enforcement of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth amendments in the South (150-156).

Hayes' restraint of power in both foreign and domestic policy helps explain his correct characterization of being a Passive president. However, with Eland's assessment

of Hayes, I find it harder to argue his classification of being a Positive-type president. As a Republican with a Democratic Congress, he went against their economic and Reconstruction legislation that they tried to pass, making him seem less flexible. Since the Maranell classification translates inflexibility into negativity, it would seem more appropriate to classify him as Negative. If Hayes had the characteristics of enjoying his job as president and the need to make others happy, he would be in the Positive category under Barber's classification. However, since Barber did not classify Hayes, the Maranell classification is the only one used in this case, making it harder to argue his Positive classification.

With a low Siena College Poll ranking, the scholars ranking Hayes obviously saw him in a different light. Although his rankings in most of the categories were low, he ranked decently in Ability to Compromise compared to the other categories with a ranking of 16. This decent ranking correlates better to his Positive classification than did Eland's assessment. His low rankings in both Domestic and Foreign Accomplishments may show the poll's disapproval of his restraint he used in dealing with Mexico and in dealing with domestic economic policy.

Chester Arthur

Eland Ranking: 5, Good

1881-1885 (Never Elected)

Siena College Poll Ranking: 24

Maranell Classification: Passive-Positive

One notch lower from Hayes and first in Eland's Good category is Chester Arthur. Eland first notes, regarding Peace, that Arthur's expansion of the Navy during peacetime

is what kept him out of the Excellent category. However, his advocacy for a limited government economic policy is what gives him his high ranking. He opposed pork-barrel infrastructure projects, advocated hard-money policies, and attempted to abolish most internal taxes. However, his efforts were mostly ignored by Congress. His civil service reform made for the hiring of civil servants based on merit rather than cronyism. However, Eland argues this set the precedent for the expansion of the bureaucracy down the road. As Liberty is concerned, Eland argues Arthur could have done more to stop white settlers from stealing land promised to the Indians (158-162).

Like Hayes before him, Arthur fits the Passive category well with his non-expansionary economic policy. Although he built up the Navy, he didn't actively deploy them in war, which can keep him in the Passive category as well. Also like Hayes, his Positive characterization is questionable. Even though he had a mostly Republican Congress, he still went against them on fiscal issues. In order to argue the legitimacy of his Positive classification, it may have to go along the lines of Barber's character analysis of the president's attitude towards his job. His Positive categorization may also be argued with the idea that even though he vetoed Congressional bills, he didn't stand up for his ideas enough to get Congress to go along with him.

The Siena College poll ranked Arthur in the middle-of-the pack, with average rankings in Relationship with Congress and Ability to Compromise that may be used to argue his Positive classification. His highest and lowest ranked categories, Luck-13 and Background-40, would be considered arbitrary by Eland. Arthur's lackluster overall ranking shows the lack of reverence for him from the Siena College poll compared to Eland's number 5 ranking.

Grover Cleveland

Eland Ranking: 2, Excellent

1885-1889, 1893-1897 (Elected Twice)

Siena College Poll Ranking: 19

Maranell Classification: Active-Negative

Coming in at number 2 on Eland's list is Grover Cleveland, the only Excellent president on Eland's list with multiple presidential terms. As Peace is concerned, Eland notes he resisted war with Spain over the rebellion in Cuba, declined a treaty that would have annexed Hawaii, and proposed a treaty to make peace over dispute with U.S. fishermen in Canada, although that treaty was rejected by the Senate. However, he lost points in this category for his avid enforcement of the Monroe Doctrine by building up the Navy and intervening in British affairs with Latin American countries (166).

Although Cleveland supported hard-money policy and was opposed to the Bland-Allison Act that compelled the government to increase the money supply, he did not actively try to overturn it with an alternative policy. Although Eland argues the continuation of that policy had a negative impact, he doesn't believe Cleveland should be at fault since he didn't try to expand presidential power and meddle in Congressional affairs. In other words, for Eland, keeping presidential power limited in balance with the checks and balances of the other institutions takes precedent over trying to overturn bad policy. However, Cleveland was able to urge the repeal of the Sherman Silver Purchase Act which had expanded the money supply and inflated the currency. He gains further Prosperity points for his advocacy for tariff reduction. He was unsuccessful in getting lower tariffs passed through Congress in his first term, but was able to get tariff reductions in his second term, albeit at a price. That price was the implementation of a

small income tax on the wealthy. Although it would soon be deemed unconstitutional, it may have set further precedent for the 16th Amendment a couple decades later. Although he has this fault, Eland finds it admirable that he vetoed more bills that benefited “special interests” than all previous presidents combined (154).

Cleveland lost points in the Liberty category for declaring martial law in the Pullman Car Company strike in Chicago, backing segregation as constitutional, and promoting federal activism through the passage of the Interstate Commerce Act, which helped set the precedent for further federal regulation in the Progressive movement years later (163-171).

Although Eland ranks Cleveland as the second best president, he does not shy away from shining light on what he deems as flaws. He holds all presidents, including his Excellent presidents with his same standards.

At first thought, it may seem like Cleveland should fit in as a Passive-Negative; however, the Maranell classification puts him as an Active-Negative. His high veto count against mixed-majority Congresses in both of his terms helps exemplify his Negative character. The bigger debate is whether he fits as an Active or Passive president. Arguments for a Passive classification may include his advocacy for limited federal income expansion through tariffs, his somewhat restrained foreign policy, his restraint on federal spending, and his opposition of federal welfare. It should also be noted that he was ranked as the third least Active presidents in the Active category, just over Andrew Johnson and John Quincy Adams. However, I believe that his Active classification could be argued with his enforcement of the Monroe Doctrine, creation of the Department of Labor, his militaristic action during the Pullman Car Company strike, and passage of the

expansionary Interstate Commerce Act may be enough to classify him as Active. After looking at these actions alone, it may be hard to fathom that Eland has him ranked as the 2nd best president with his limited government criteria in ranking presidents.

As with all of Eland's Excellent presidents, the Siena College Poll's ranking of Cleveland is not nearly as high. The poll's 19 ranking of Cleveland puts him in the middle of the pack with no single category ranking far off from that overall ranking. In Eland's conclusion, he alludes to this average ranking of Cleveland by modern day historians by referencing Michael Farquar's comment about Cleveland: "He was a good guy and a hard worker who might well have been a great president had anything at all important occurred during his tenure. Alas, it didn't so he is not particularly noteworthy" (170). This quote helps to illustrate the bias many historians may have for overtly active presidents who may preside over a crisis, whether or not the crisis is caused by the president. With a lack of legislation and historical acts such as war, presidents seem to go lower in the rankings.

Benjamin Harrison

Eland Ranking: 15, Poor

1889-1893 (Elected Once)

Siena College Poll Ranking: 32

Maranell Classification: Passive-Positive

Eland's Poor ranking of Benjamin Harrison comes partially from his dealings with foreign policy and the Indians. Although he used international arbitration to avoid conflicts with Chile, Italy, Britain, and Germany, he continued to build up the navy and pursued U.S. claims abroad in pressing for a canal in Central America, coaling stations in

the Caribbean, and the annexation of Hawaii. Additionally, Eland faults Harrison for his aggressive policies towards the Indians, including the massacre at Wounded Knee Creek.

Harrison also fared poorly under Prosperity with his support high tariffs, the Sherman Silver Purchase Act which increased the money supply, and the Sherman Antitrust Act which set the precedent for government market intervention. His policies were a mixed bag in the Liberty category. Eland faults him for his discriminatory restrictions on immigration from Asia, but applauds his enforcement of the Fourteenth Amendment in the South which allowed the federal government to guarantee individual rights when states refused to do so. He also unsuccessfully pressed for black voting rights (172-176).

Overall, Harrison does fit the mold of a Passive-Positive president. Although he did show some Active tendencies in foreign policy, his economic policies largely came largely just from the bills that Congress had passed or whatever was already in place and didn't overtly advocate big changes. His going along with Congress also helps paint him as Positive. As a Republican president with a Republican controlled Senate his whole term and Republican controlled House for half his term, it was easy for him to just go along with his party.

Although Eland scores Harrison as a Poor president, his 15 ranking still places him fairly well compared to the other presidents. The Siena College poll; however, views Harrison as a much worse president. Like other presidents mentioned before, Harrison is ranked towards the very bottom of the list in categories Eland would deem arbitrary. The categories in this case include Background, Willing to Take Risks, and Intelligence.

William McKinley

Eland Ranking: 38, Bad

1897-1901 (Elected Twice)

Siena College Poll Ranking: 20

Maranell Classification: Passive-Positive

As the third worst president on his list, Eland considers William McKinley to be the first “modern president”. This would include using the White House as a bully pulpit and going over the heads of Congress and speaking directly to the people. Although he may not have put in place the large progressive programs that would come later, Eland argues that his expansion of presidential power and federal income laid the framework for presidents like Teddy Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson.

In the Peace category, Eland faults McKinley for starting the Spanish-American War. Although Eland notes that he did at first attempt diplomacy and was criticized by Congress for not rushing to war after the U.S.S Maine blew up in Havana Harbor, he eventually caved in and asked for a declaration of war. Eland cites professor Jackson Lears who argued that McKinley “allowed [Theodore Roosevelt] et al to push him into a savage and unjustified war” (179). Furthermore, he notes author Michael Farquar’s argument that McKinley was so chained to public opinion that he essentially allowed a newspaper to declare war on Cuba. Although he did not act aggressively at first to start a war, once the war started, Eland claims he became an “activist commander in chief who kept in touch with his field commanders by telegraph and was not shy about interfering with their military decisions” (180). Eland also argues that this war set the precedent for American military intervention in Latin America and was even the first to use the

“Roosevelt corollary to the Monroe Doctrine by using the idea that the United States should stabilize Latin American states that were having internal problems” (p. 185).

McKinley fares poorly in the Prosperity category for increasing not only tariffs, but inheritance taxes, excise taxes and a stamp tax on public documents in order to fund the war and an expanded federal government. However, Eland does give him credit for reluctantly putting the country on the gold standard.

McKinley loses points in the liberty category not necessarily for a loss of freedoms in the United States, but in the Philippines. Although a professed motivation for war with Spain was to stop the repression of the Cuban independence movement, Eland argues that the death of about two hundred thousand Filipinos during the U.S. insurgency is considered a repression of liberty (178-186).

After noting McKinley’s expansion of presidential power, one may be quick to argue against Maranell’s classification of McKinley as Passive. Before getting into that character aspect, his Positive aspect can easily be argued for, even using Barber’s criteria. As noted earlier, historians have noted McKinley’s ties to public opinion and instances when he is easily persuaded on issues such as going into war. These examples tie in perfectly with Barber’s explanation of a Positive president, even though he never classified McKinley. As for his classification as a Passive president, even though it may be hard to take his expansion of presidential power out of the equation, this classification may be argued with the ideas that he did not aggressively pursue the war (Congress and the media did) and that since he had a Republican Congress, there was no need for him to be active in economic policy since he just went along with his party.

The Siena College Poll's very average ranking of McKinley again contrasts with Eland's assessment. Ironically, I would argue that if those in that poll agreed with Eland's assessment that McKinley was the first "modern president" and gave the tools for Teddy Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson to use in the Progressive Era, then he would have been ranked much higher. However, his fairly high ranking in Relationship with Congress does help argue for his Passive-Positive characterization as mentioned above.

Theodore Roosevelt

Eland Ranking: 21, Poor

1901-1909 (Elected Once)

Siena College Poll Ranking: 2

Barber/Maranell Classification: Active-Positive

Known for being the leader of the Progressive movement during the period, it may seem surprising that Teddy Roosevelt is ranked in the middle of the pack rather than towards the bottom. Eland seems to put most of the blame on this expansion of federal power on McKinley, as mentioned before. However, Eland does give plenty of explanation for Roosevelt's classification as a Poor president. Regarding Peace, Roosevelt lost points for maintaining a "muscular" foreign policy, challenging the Kaiser in Venezuela, expanding the Monroe Doctrine, launching the Great White Fleet in the Pacific, the acquisition of the Panama Canal Zone, trying to "whitewash" oppression in the Philippines, and generally expanding presidential powers. However, Eland does credit him for solving some international disputes peacefully such as the mediation of the Russo-Japanese War and the European competition over Morocco.

As Prosperity is concerned, Roosevelt lost points for endorsing the antitrust program. Eland also condemns him for using favoritism in deciding which trusts to bust. He is also faulted for going around Congress and using executive orders to establish national parks. Under Peace, Roosevelt lost points for using federal coercion in the United Mine Workers labor dispute, which Eland believes helped set the precedent for federal government involvement in future labor disputes. Eland also questions whether or not the founding fathers would have supported the creation of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. His mixed record in race relations is illustrated in the fact that he thought African-Americans were inferior to whites because of “natural limitations”, but still infuriating the South by inviting Booker T. Washington to the White house (187-205).

Both Maranell and Barber classify Roosevelt as an Active-Positive president, and Eland’s explanation of his presidency seems to go along with that assessment. He was active in both foreign policies with his expansion of the Monroe Doctrine and domestic policy with his trust busting. As a Republican with a Republican controlled Congress during his whole presidency, his policies were mostly supported by congress, leaving less conflict between the branches. Because of this, flexibility wasn’t a major issue, giving the perception of a Positive president.

The Siena College Poll’s more mainstream assessment of presidents held Teddy Roosevelt in much higher regard. Ranking in the top ten of all categories except Ability to Compromise he ranked first in Court Appointments, Willing to take Risks, and Imagination, the latter two being categories that Eland would not use in his criteria. This overall high ranking is yet another example of historians’ favoritism towards powerful presidents.

William Taft

Eland Ranking: 20, Poor

1909-1913 (Elected Once)

Siena College Poll Ranking: 23

Barber/Maranell Ranking: Passive-Positive

Eland argues that although Progressives at the time saw Taft as a conservative disappointment, he essentially continued Roosevelt's policies and shouldn't be seen as a laissez-faire president like many see him. For the Peace category, Eland argued against Taft's "dollar diplomacy" through encouraging U.S. bankers to fund railway construction in China, but gave him credit for attempting to create an international framework that would arbitrate disputes that may otherwise lead to war.

Although Eland argues Taft continued Roosevelt's progressive policies, he contends that Taft's false public image as a quiet conservative let businesses be at ease which helped keep a steady recovery from the Panic of 1907. However, Taft loses many points for proposing the 16th Amendment to establish the income tax, which eventually got ratified during Wilson's administration. Taft is also faulted for approving high tariffs, initiating nearly double the antitrust suits against businesses than Roosevelt, and increasing presidential power by attempting to consolidate the executive budget and give cabinet members a nonvoting seat in Congress. However, Taft did gain some points in the Liberty category for enacting the Publicity Act which "allowed the public to examine records of donors to campaigns for public candidates to the House of Representatives" (211) (206-2011).

Both Maranell and Barber classify Taft as a Passive president, which fits his reputation as a quiet, lethargic president. However, Eland's explanation of Taft paints

him more as an Active president. Given Eland's context, it could be argued that nearly any president presiding right after Theodore Roosevelt may be perceived as passive. However, Eland's explanation of Taft does seem to agree with his classification as a Positive president. As a Republican with a Republican controlled Congress for much of his term as President, there was no reason for him to go against the grain in policy, even though he may not have been as progressive as Republicans in congress wanted him to be. Barber's characterization of Taft as "genial, agreeable, friendly, (and) compliant" (Barber 2009, 195) fits well in Maranell's criteria as well, giving him traits of a "flexible" president.

With an average ranking in the Siena College poll, he had low rankings in the categories of Party Leadership, Luck, Willing to Take Risks, and Imagination. The latter three would more than likely be perceived as arbitrary by Eland, as explained before. Party Leadership can be relative, depending on if one sees the policies of the party in question as favorable. This low ranking in this category would be perceived as a positive for Eland, since he wouldn't agree with the Progressive movement that many of the Republicans stood for.

Woodrow Wilson

Eland Ranking: 40 (Worst), Bad 1913-1921 (Elected Twice)

Siena College Poll Ranking: 8 Barber/Maranell Classification: Active-Negative

Eland ranks Woodrow Wilson as the worst president in American history. He goes into detail about Wilson's faults, but to summarize, he fared poorly in the Peace

category for deciding to enter World War I, refusing any sensible amendments to the League of Nations treaty that would have ensured the United States wouldn't enter unnecessary wars, going along with the "war guilt" clause in the Paris Peace Conference that led to German frustration and the rise of Adolf Hitler, and using military intervention in Mexico, Nicaragua, Haiti, Dominican Republic, Cuba, and Panama. Eland coins Wilson as the most interventionist president in U.S. history.

Regarding Prosperity, Eland faults Wilson heavily for the creation of the Federal Reserve System. Eland argues that the Federal Reserve, in tandem with the new income tax, helped pave the way for the expansion of the federal government for years to come. In addition, Wilson lost points for strengthening antitrust laws, presiding over the prohibition of alcohol, and passing the National Defense Acts of 1916 and 1917 which gave him the power to fix prices and regulate industries during war time.

In the Liberty category, Eland faults Wilson for eroding civil liberties. Included in this erosion are the passage of the Selective Service Act of 1917, which authorized Wilson to draft men to fight the war, of the Espionage Act, which made discouragement of military recruitment illegal, and the Sedition Act of 1918. Concurrently, he ordered the War department to censor telegraph and phone traffic and arrested thousands of socialists. As for civil rights, Eland puts Wilson down for being a white supremacist and getting Congress to pass laws restricting civil liberties of African Americans (Eland 2009, 212-229).

There need be no debate over Wilson's classification as an Active-Negative president, as both Barber and Maranell classify him. Eland's explanation helps argue his activity in both foreign and domestic policy. Barber successfully describes his Negative

classification by illustrating his actions during the League of Nations negotiations with the Senate. Although the opposing Republican Senators proposed some amendments to the treaty, Wilson would not accept any changes, leading to the rejection of the treaty (Barber 2009, 15). Barber centers these types of actions around the character of the man himself; however, the Negative classification works well in Maranell's version through this example of inflexibility.

Woodrow Wilson is no outlier in the trend of the Siena College poll's favoritism towards powerful presidents. However, it is interesting to note that he is the only Active-Negative president ranked in the top 10 in the Siena College poll. Like presidents mentioned before, Wilson ranks highly in categories that Eland doesn't use in his presidential ranking criteria. These categories include Background, Willing to Take Risks, Imagination, and Intelligence. He would have ranked higher if it weren't for his fitting low ranking in Ability to Compromise.

Warren G. Harding

Eland Ranking: 6, Good

1921-1923 (Elected Once)

Siena College Poll Ranking: 38

Barber/Maranell Classification: Passive-Positive

Although Eland partially docked Harding for scandals such as the Teapot Dome scandal, his Good ranking shows Eland didn't put nearly as much emphasis on this type of corruption as other historians. Harding did very well in the Peace category for advocating a restrained foreign policy. He refused to participate in the League of Nations

and led the negotiations of the “first significant arms control agreement in U.S. history” in the Washington Naval Treaty.

Harding did fairly well in the Prosperity category for generally setting good economic policies. This included cutting taxes and becoming the first postwar president to cut federal expenditures to prewar levels. However, he is faulted with presiding over the increase of the money supply and high tariffs, which Eland argues played a role in causing the Great Depression. He is also faulted for creating the authority to create a consolidated executive budget and promoting government subsidies. As for Peace, Eland gives Harding credit for freeing most of those arrested during the Red Scare and having a good civil rights record compared to Woodrow Wilson (Eland 2009, 230-235).

Warren Harding arguably fits the bill of a Passive-Positive president as both Barber and Maranell concur. His refusal to enter the League of Nations and relatively laizze-faire economic policies help paint him as the Passive president he was. In Barber’s explanation of Harding’s Positive nature, he shows his need to please his friends. He quotes Charles Evans Hughes in speaking of Harding’s death, “He literally wore himself out in the endeavor to be friendly” (Barber 2009, 210). He speaks further of his appointing friends to his cabinet and his distaste for turning down old political friends. Barber’s explanation also runs smoothly with Maranell’s “flexibility” trait in stating, “His grasp of policy was rudimentary and he was easily swayed by forceful argument” (212). Flexibility in this case would mean his willingness to give in to policy arguments and his lack of want or ability to stick to any principles he made have advocated.

Harding’s very low ranking by the Siena College Poll shows how much the scandals were taken into consideration when evaluating the presidency. Also, most likely

at play was his image as a “do nothing” president since he didn’t preside over any wars and had no major legislation passed. He is ranked dead last in Background, Executive Appointments (scandals taken into consideration), Overall Ability, Imagination, Executive Ability, and Intelligence. Continuing the trend, Eland would not use most of these categories in his consideration.

Calvin Coolidge

Eland’s Ranking: 10, Good *1923-1929 (Elected Once)*

Siena College Poll Ranking: 27 *Barber/Maranell Classification: Passive-Negative*

Although Calvin Coolidge argued before his presidency that the government was better off having limited government, Eland argues that some of his actions as president went against limited government principles, putting him lower on the list than his predecessor, Harding. Coolidge lost points in the Peace category for loaning tax-payer money to Germany for them to pay war reparations to France and Britain and for endorsing U.S. entry into the Court of International Justice. However, he is credited for exercising military restraint and handling some foreign policy issues without creating expensive commitments.

As for Prosperity, Eland credits Coolidge for vetoing bills from Congress that would have expanded federal pensions for veterans of all wars, expanded farm subsidies, and that would have spent the budget surplus on pork-barrel projects. In addition, he reduced the federal budget, debt, and taxes. However, Eland faults Coolidge for expanding the money supply, which he argues helped cause the Great Depression. He

uses the argument that this monetary expansion led to the expansion of credit to business, leading to businesses over-calculating and over-investing in projects. The eventual liquidation of these projects led to mass unemployment. In the Liberty Category, Eland gives Coolidge credit for supporting an anti-lynching law and “cleaning up” the scandals of the Harding administration. However, he is faulted for not protecting the rights of African Americans as much as he should and signing a law that stopped any new Japanese immigration to the U.S (Eland 2009, 236-241).

Barber classifies Coolidge as the clearest example of a Passive-Negative president in the twentieth century. Barber explains how he would get out of doing much of the presidential work by giving it to others. He also states, “His method was to concentrate on matters only the President had to decide, and to define that category as narrowly as possible” (Barber 2009, 172). Barber’s Passive-Negative classification of Coolidge is based more on his character and attitude towards the office of the presidency. Maranell’s classification of Coolidge also rightfully puts Coolidge in the Passive-Negative category. However, his Negative classification in this case would be based more off his inflexibility, illustrated by his many vetoes of Congressional laws. I would argue that Coolidge’s presidency could be compared to John Tyler’s in the sense that they each reached office via the President’s death and they each vetoed much legislation passed by Congresses with their same respective parties in power.

Coolidge’s Siena College poll ranking is seventeen slots worse than his Eland ranking. He also continues the trend of ranking very poorly in categories that Eland wouldn’t use in his criteria such as Communication, Willing to Take Risks, and Imagination. On the other hand, Coolidge ranks very well in the Luck category. I would

contend that Eland would argue that the good economy during his tenure was due to his overall laissez-faire economic policies rather than just sheer chance. Illustrating the overall bias against who don't preside over major wars, Eland quotes John McGinnis's statement, "Coolidge was not a truly great president, like Washington or Lincoln. While he successfully handled small foreign policy crises in China, Mexico, and Nicaragua without saddling the United States with permanent and expensive commitments, he was never tested by a substantial foreign war" (Eland 2009, 238). I would have to agree that discrediting a president for not presiding over a major war is completely arbitrary and unfair in presidential assessment.

Herbert Hoover

Eland's Ranking: 18, Poor

1929-1933 (Elected Once)

Siena College Poll Ranking: 33

Barber Classification: Active-Negative

Maranell Classification: Passive-Negative

Hoover's Poor, middle of the pack rating from Eland comes from a mixture of good and policies throughout the three categories. He does well in the Peace category for avoiding poisoning sanctions and/or actually using force against Japan after the country invaded Manchuria, even though Eland argues he was ideologically a committed interventionist.

However, Hoover fared poorly in the Prosperity category for practicing "Activist Government". Eland argues that Hoover set precedents for Franklin D. Roosevelt's activism by creating the Reconstruction Finance Corporation which lent money to several

sectors of the economy. In addition, he signed the Emergency Relief and Construction Act which increased federal authority to lend money to states. Further, Eland faults Hoover for deepening the economic downturn by coercing businesses to maintain wages and employment levels, as well as subsidizing many farm products. Lastly, Hoover gave in to increasing several types of taxes such as the estate tax and gift tax, and he signed the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act which raised tariffs to their highest level in American history. However, Eland does give Hoover credit for vetoing the Tennessee Valley Authority which intended to create public works jobs. In the Peace category, Hoover lost points for publishing the names of taxpayers who received large tax refunds and ordered the Justice Department to publish the names of those who lobbied for federal judge appointments (Eland 2009, 242-247).

While both character classifiers classify Hoover as Negative, Maranell classifies him as Passive, while Barber classifies him as Active. Eland's explanation of Hoover makes him fit more closely in Barber's Active category, Barber's explanation of Hoover paints him more Negative than Eland most likely would. While Eland faulted Hoover for being too much of an economic activist, Barber paints him as stubborn in not giving enough federal intervention until it was too late in quoting Hoover: "No governmental action, no economic doctrine, no economic plan or project can replace that God-imposed responsibility of the individual man and woman to their neighbors...I am opposed to any direct or indirect government dole" (Barber 2009, 23). This illustrates this perceived inflexibility in sticking to his principles in not giving government aid until finally giving in in 1932. Since Eland views Hoover as giving in to federal economic intervention, he would most likely not see him as Negative in character as Barber.

The Siena College poll is more aligned with Barber's argument that Hoover failed as a president (18). Hoover ranks very low in the categories of Ability to Compromise (illustrating the Negative trait), Willing to Take Risks, and Avoid Crucial Mistakes, while ranking dead last in Handling of U.S. Economy, and Luck. These types of rankings can imply the conventional notion that Hoover didn't do enough to help during the Great Depression.

Franklin D. Roosevelt

Eland's Ranking: 31, Bad

1933-1945 (Elected 4 times)

Siena College Poll Ranking: 1

Barber/Maranell Classification: Active-Positive

Similar to the large contrast in Abraham Lincoln's Eland and Siena College poll rankings, the difference in rankings of the revered Franklin D. Roosevelt illustrates the gap in value/criteria of the two rankers. In the Peace category, Roosevelt lost points for his actions before, during, and after World War II. For his actions before the war, Eland takes away points for signing the first peacetime draft in American history, violating the Neutrality Act of 1935 by trading fifty destroyers to the British, and provoking Japanese violence by issuing an oil embargo on that country. As for wartime actions, Eland disapproves of the bombing of cities which led to the deaths of hundreds of thousands of civilians. Although he admits Germany and Japan were responsible for the deaths of millions of citizens, Eland argues that the U.S. using similar tactics in return in order to get their governments to change course would be considered "terrorism" when other groups or countries do so today. However, Eland does give credit for at least obtaining

victory in the war. As for postwar actions, Eland faults Roosevelt in being deceitful to the public about the Yalta Agreement by not being honest about the fact that the Soviets would not want to give up control over the Eastern Europe buffer zone.

Although Eland doesn't blame Franklin Roosevelt for setting the precedent of expanding the welfare state and government services as others had done in the past, he does hold him to blame for resurrecting old government agencies from World War I and expanding federal government influence altogether. He goes into detail about how Roosevelt did so, but to summarize in brief, Eland sees the New Deal legislation that expanded federal regulatory power and created large public work programs as only prolonging the economic downturn and as going against the ideals of the founding fathers. Furthermore, he expanded presidential power through the War Powers Act that allowed him to regulate international financial transactions and censor all foreign communications. In addition, he created the Executive Office of the President.

Roosevelt fared poorly in the Liberty category for not attempting to rescue the Jews during the war, avoiding civil rights issues, and incarcerating Japanese-Americans in prison camps without charges or trials. In addition, Eland is against his censorship of radio programs and newspapers of anti-war dissidents during World War II (Eland 2009, 248-266).

It would be very difficult to argue against Maranell and Barber's categorization of Roosevelt as Active-Positive. His actions before and during the war, as well as the expansion of presidential power and federal economic power help argue for his Active character. Barber's explanation of Roosevelt's Active-Positive character concurrently goes with Maranell's flexibility translation as well. He explains how he got enjoyment

out of presidency, which can also be illustrated by his running for election four times in a row. However, his flexibility is seen by the fact that he didn't necessarily have strong philosophical economic values that he had to convince others to abide by. Although he greatly expanded the scope of federal government and spent much federal money, he was not necessarily a pure Keynesian, as Eland also admits. He tried to do whatever he could do in the short term to turn around the economy and with little resistance to do so in Congress with a Democratic controlled legislative branch during his whole presidential tenure.

As the best ranked president in the Siena College poll, it is obvious that those in this poll view Roosevelt as the one who brought America out of the depression, contrary to Eland's beliefs. He ranked first in the categories of Party Leadership, which is illustrated through keeping a fully Democratic Congress throughout his four terms, Communication, Handling of U.S. Economy, and Foreign Policy Accomplishments. Many of these, again, would not be considered applicable according to Eland. However, even a category that Eland would use as part of the criteria such as Handling of U.S. Economy is seen in completely different perspectives. Short term economic growth is not always going to be a plus for Eland, especially if he believes it leads to downturns in the future.

Harry S. Truman

Eland's Ranking: 39, Bad

1945-1953 (Elected Once)

Siena College ranking: 9

Barber/Maranell Classification: Active-Positive

As the second worst president in American history according to Eland, Harry Truman does poorly across the board of Eland's criteria. Under Peace, Eland labels Truman as the "Father of the Permanent U.S. Empire". His interventions, alliances, foreign aid, and overall activist response to the Soviet Union help give him this label. Eland contends Truman overreacted to the North Korean invasion of South Korea by sending American troops to intervene without Congressional approval. He argues that he set the precedent of getting U.N. approval, but not Congressional approval before sending troops to war, as done later by George H.W. Bush and Bill Clinton. Other drawbacks include the large increase in defense spending, doubling the size of the armed forces, and extending involuntary military service. Eland also blames Truman for creating the "Military Industrial Complex" which included the continuation of producing wartime materials during peacetime and giving lucrative military contracts to industry. In addition, Eland faults Truman for dropping the nuclear bomb on civilians in Japan and for helping fuel the start of the Cold War.

Truman also did poorly in the Prosperity category for increasing domestic government intervention. Although Congress blocked much of his original government expanding proposals, Congress did end up passing parts of his "Fair Deal" such as the housing Act and Employment Act. In addition, Truman used executive power to send troops to seized coal mines, railroads, and steel mills during labor disputes. As for

Liberty, Eland faults Truman for extending wartime domestic surveillance during the Cold War, but does give him credit for being a strong public voice for African American Civil Rights (Eland 2009, 267-285).

I would concur in Maranell and Barber's assessment of Truman as an Active-Positive president. His activist foreign and domestic policies clearly paint Truman as Active. As for his Positive character, although he brought America to war without a declaration of war, Congress gave him the authority to do so anyway, so there was no reason to be that inflexible in that situation. In domestic policy, even though he didn't get all of the legislation he wanted passed, Truman wasn't rigid enough in his beliefs, as Barber explains (Barber 2009, 325), to actively go against Congress.

Again, the Siena College poll high ranking of an Active-Positive president does not match up with Eland's low ranking. Although Truman ranked poorly in the Background category (again, irrelevant in Eland's criteria), he ranks in the top ten in the majority of categories. While Eland paints Truman to be a foreign policy disaster, he ranks number six in Foreign Policy Accomplishments according to the Siena College Poll, again showing the stark contrast in what is perceived as "success".

Dwight Eisenhower

Eland's Ranking: 9, Good

1953-1961 (Two terms)

Siena College Poll Ranking: 10

Barber Classification: Passive-Negative

Maranell Classification: Passive-Positive

As one of only two presidents rated Good or better by Eland in the latter half of the twentieth century, Dwight Eisenhower does well in the Peace category for his overall noninterventionist foreign policy. Eisenhower is credited for ending the Korean War despite the pressure and advice from most of his advisors, Republicans, and most Democrats to continue military action. Eland also agrees with his idea that Europeans should have picked up most of the military and financial burden of defending themselves from the Soviets. Although Eland disapproves of Eisenhower continuing to build up nuclear weapons past the limits of deterrence, he does give him credit for at least attempting to get an arms control agreement with the Soviets. In regards to CIA covert action, Eland was against these actions but does give him credit for not giving into the pressure of using overt military action.

Under Prosperity, Eland applauds Eisenhower's restraint on military spending and his warning the people the threats to liberty and the democratic process that the Military Industrial Complex imposes. However, Eland does fault him for not attempting to rescind the expanded domestic power of the federal government that the two previous presidents had put in place and for expanding the "welfare state" though federal subsidies to the private health insurance industry and student loans. For Liberty, Eland puts down Eisenhower for not enforcing the fourteenth amendment in the South and not openly

endorsing the *Brown v. Board of Education* ruling. Lastly, he lost points for creating “executive privilege” through “shielding executive branch from McCarthy’s congressional committee” (p. 298) (286-298).

Barber and Maranell differ in assessing Eisenhower as either a Passive-Positive or Negative. I would contend that Barber’s classification fits best in regards to his foreign policy, while Maranell’s classification fits well in his domestic policy. Going against the wishes of both parties and his cabinet in not using over military action is a perfect sign of Passive-Negative character. However, he did not try to do anything to overturn previous domestic policy and in fact expanded federal domestic power as the progressives would want. Even though he presided over a divided government for most of his presidency, there was not an immense struggle between him and Congress when it came to domestic policy, giving the picture of a Passive-Positive president.

Eisenhower is only presidents ranked very similarly by Eland and the Siena College poll. He ranks well in most of the Siena College categories, except for the notably “arbitrary in Eland’s criteria” categories such as Communication, Willing to Take Risks, Imagination, and Intelligence. Interestingly, he is ranked fifth in Ability to Compromise. This high ranking seems to fit better with Maranell’s Passive-Positive categorization of Eisenhower rather than Barber’s Passive-Negative assessment.

John F. Kennedy*Eland's Ranking: 35, Bad**1961-1963 (Elected Once)**Siena College Poll Rank: 11**Barber/Maranell Classification: Active-Positive*

Kennedy's Peace policies play the biggest part in his Bad rating from Eland. Eland argues that the perception of weakness Kennedy had during the Bay of Pigs incident led to near disaster during the Cuban Missile Crisis. He argues that Kennedy used tough rhetoric during the crisis as to not appear weak politically. He contends that if he wouldn't have made as big of a deal out of the situation publicly, the showdown would not have been as contentious. However, Eland does give Kennedy credit once the crisis got heavy for opting for a naval quarantine rather than an airstrike or invasion to remove the Soviet missiles. As for American intervention in the Eastern hemisphere, Eland faults Kennedy for allowing U.S. combat aircraft to fight North Vietnamese planes over South Vietnam, having a small ground force there, and then lying to the media about having those ground troops. In addition, he condemns Kennedy for supporting a coup to topple South Vietnamese President Ngo Dinh Diem which he argues help greatly escalate the Vietnam War.

Under Prosperity, Eland speaks against Kennedy's attempt, although unsuccessful, to get his Keynesian domestic programs passed through Congress. He is also faulted for pressuring steel unions into a no-wage-increase contract, which didn't stop steel prices from rising by 3.5 percent anyway and led to Kennedy using the Justice Department to vigorously investigate these companies' executives. As for Liberty, Eland condemns Kennedy's timidity on civil rights, arguing he was just trying to appease the southern

Democrats by not being as active as he could have been. Furthermore, Eland contends Kennedy nominated five racist federal judges in order to create support for Medicare and federal education aid (299-311).

Barber and Maranell's Active-Positive classification of Kennedy is accurate. He was clearly active in his foreign policy and in his attempts, although unsuccessful to get domestic legislation passed. His attempt to appear strong during the Cuban Missile crisis, as Eland contends, shows a good example Barber's Positive criteria in that he was trying to be liked after mishandling the Bay of Pigs. This Positive character is also seen in timid civil rights policy when he attempted to keep the southern Democrats on his side. Barber argues that his political ideology priorities were obscure and that he found the presidency rewarding, which are clear characteristics of a Positive president (Barber 2009, 364).

The Siena College poll paints a rosier picture of Kennedy's president, ranking him fairly high on the list. Not surprisingly, he ranked very well in categories Eland wouldn't use such as Communication Ability and Imagination. Although Eland would most likely agree with Kennedy's poor ranking in the Integrity category, wouldn't necessarily use that criterion in his ranking unless it directly contributed to policy. Another notable category ranking is his middle-of-the-pack ranking in Foreign Policy Accomplishments compared to Eland's harsh condemnation of his foreign policy actions. Lastly, in relation to character type, his high ranking in Ability to Compromise helps argue his Positive character.

Lyndon B. Johnson

Eland's Ranking: 32, Bad *1963-1969 (Elected Once)*

Siena College Poll Ranking: 15 *Barber/Maranell Classification: Active-Negative*

Not surprisingly Eland's Bad ranking of Johnson can be explained through his interventionist foreign policy. Eland faults Johnson for escalating the war in Vietnam and doing so based on the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution rather than through a formal declaration of war through Congress. Eland contends that Johnson kept escalating the war in fear of being criticized for "losing" Vietnam and was very pessimistic about achieving progress or victory with the war. Although he lost most of his Peace points through the Vietnam conflict, Eland also condemns his invasion of the Dominican Republic in order to replace a popularly elected leader with a ruler friendlier to the U.S. However, Eland does give him credit for pursuing arms control with the Soviets.

Also as would be expected, the expansion of federal domestic policies through the Great Society and War on Poverty made Johnson fare poorly in the Prosperity category. He contends that these programs resulted in the waste of trillions of dollars and didn't necessarily help the most needy, but helped those already in the middle class instead. Eland also shows concern with the creation of National Public Radio and the Public Broadcasting System, fearing its possible use for supporting the government's message. In the Liberty category, Eland applauds Johnson's accomplishments with civil rights with the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and in risking the backlash from southern Democrats while doing so. However, he loses points in this category for spying on

domestic antiwar protesters and for his extensive bugging of political opponents' phone calls (Eland 2009, 312-322).

Lyndon Johnson fits the category of Active-Negative accurately. Like Kennedy, he was very active in both foreign and domestic policy; however, he was actually able to get his domestic legislation passed. His Negative categorization comes mainly through his actions and character regarding foreign policy. Barber iterates that right after Kennedy's death while talking to Vietnam ambassador, Lodge, said, "I am not going to be the President who saw Southeast Asia go the way China went" and later told his advisors to "increase pressure and press on" (Barber 2009, 25). Barber contends that his stubborn character, along with some insecurity, compelled him to continue an "increasingly unrealistic line of policy" (26). Barber's explanation, as well as Johnson's wiretapping of rivals' phones, helps argue his Negative character. Overall, his character description fits better in Barber's criteria rather than Maranell's "flexibility" since Johnson had a good relationship with his Democratic congress and did not have to actively go against members of Congress or his cabinet.

The Siena College poll fits this previous argument well by giving him a number one ranking in Relationship with Congress. Although the poll's assessment looks to agree with Eland's condemnation of Johnson's foreign policy by giving him a dead last ranking in Foreign Policy Accomplishments, his high rankings in areas such as Party Leadership, Court Appointments, Ability to Compromise, and Domestic Accomplishments help even his rankings out to give him a decent ranking of fifteen. His high ranking in Domestic Accomplishments arguably shows the poll's approval of the policies implemented in the Great Society and the Civil Rights Act.

Richard Nixon

Eland's Ranking: 30, Bad

1969-1974 (Elected Twice)

Siena College Poll Ranking: 28

Barber Classification: Active-Negative

Nixon receives a Bad rating from Eland, but for many reasons beyond his scandals. Eland condemns his prolonging the war in Vietnam at the cost of American lives as well as Vietnamese civilians. He quotes Nixon speaking to Henry Kissinger on the White House tapes saying, “You’re so goddamned concerned about the civilians, and I don’t give a damn. I don’t care” (Eland 2009, 325). However, Nixon is credited for having a slightly more humble foreign policy after the war in Vietnam via reducing U.S. commitments around the world. Eland also gives him credit for ending the draft.

Nixon does worse in the Prosperity category, as Eland declares him to be the “last liberal president”. He is faulted for taking U.S. currency completely off the gold standard, which devalued the dollar. In addition, he increased spending on social programs and created new programs such as the Environmental Protection Agency, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, and the Consumer Product Safety Commission.

Although Eland pays only little credence to the scandals of most other presidents, Nixon’s Watergate scandals gives him a very poor score in the Liberty category. This is because this scandal posed a greater threat to the U.S. political system through Nixon’s illegal activities in the 1972 election, misuse of intelligence agencies, and obstruction of justice (324-334).

Barber's Active-Negative classification of Nixon fits well in his own character-based criteria of presidents. His paranoia and actions based off this paranoia help argue his lack of self-esteem and his need to make up for it. His Active-Negative classification may not be as clear cut in Maranell's category based more on flexibility. Having a Democrat controlled Congress during his whole presidency; there was some conflict in foreign policy issues, illustrated by the War Powers Act passed by Congress. However, he was pretty flexible in domestic policy, continuing Johnson's liberal policies and even expanding them. Thus, I would argue that if using Maranell's criteria, Nixon would be considered more Positive in domestic policy.

Nixon gets a similarly bad ranking from the Siena College poll. His dead last rankings in Integrity and Avoid Crucial Mistakes shows the major role Watergate played in ranking this president. His best ranking is in Foreign Policy Accomplishments (9) - a ranking Eland would most likely say is too high.

Gerald Ford

Eland's Ranking: 16, Poor

1974-1977 (Never Elected)

Siena College Poll Ranking: 26

Barber Classification: Active-Positive

Eland gives Ford a mixed review both overall and in the Peace category. He gives Ford credit for having a comparatively restrained foreign policy, peaceably recognizing Soviet control of Eastern Europe, and signing the Helsinki agreements which called for the respect of human rights throughout Europe. However, he is faulted for giving into

conservative pressure in not signing an arms control agreement with the Soviets, increasing Defense spending, and overreacting to the capture of the SS Mayaguez.

Although Eland is in favor of cutting inflation, he does not agree with Ford's tactic of passing a 5 percent surtax on incomes. He argues that his policies helped cause the deep recession and the stagflation that went along with it. Ford is also faulted for creating new public jobs, interfering with the oil market, and running a deficit. However, Eland gives him credit for rejecting excess spending that passed through the Democratic Congress through using the veto a record sixty-six times in eighteen months. As for Liberty, Eland strongly argues against Ford's pardon of Nixon since he had not been tried or convicted yet, thus making the action unconstitutional (335-343).

I would argue that Ford's character type is not easy to clearly define. Barber contends he was Active-Positive via his flexibility, openness, and decisive/vigorous actions (Barber 2009, 387). Although this argument may be valid regarding his foreign policy, his numerous vetoes of spending bills would paint a different picture. Although in many ways he just continued Johnson's and Nixon's domestic policies (passive-positive), he did hold his ground against the Democratic Congress in not passing further spending bills (passive-negative). Thus, adding up these different actions and characteristics, it's difficult to come up with one singular character type to define his presidency.

The Siena College poll ranks Ford low in categories Eland wouldn't use in his criteria such as Communication, Luck, Willing to Take Risks, Imagination, and Intelligence. However, his poor Handling of U.S. Economy does add up with Eland's assessment under Prosperity. Overall, Ford's low rankings in the categories stated above help give him a noticeably lower overall ranking than Eland's.

James Earl Carter

Eland's Ranking: 8, Good

1977-1981 (Elected Once)

Siena Poll Ranking: 30

Barber Classification: Active-Positive

Eland coins Carter as the “Best Modern President”. Much of his Good rating can be attributed from his restrained foreign policy. Eland credits him for attempting to retract U.S. commitments overseas to more manageable proportions, voiding military conflict with the Soviet Union in Latin America, and ending U.S. occupation of the Panama Canal Zone. He is also given credit for planning to pull U.S. troops out of South Korea, although he was eventually compelled by Congress not to do so. Eland does fault him, however, for funding the Afghan mujahideen in their fight against the Soviets and for continuing the policies of Nixon and Ford in Iran, which eventually led to the Iran hostage crisis.

In the Prosperity category, Eland applauds the appointment of Paul Volcker as Federal Reserve Chairman who administered a restrained monetary policy. Eland argues that his anti-inflationary tactics led to the prosperity during the Reagan administration. Carter was in favor of monetary and fiscal restraint in order to reduce the deficit rather than giving in to advisors who advocated increasing federal spending that may have improved the economy only temporarily. Eland also gives Carter credit for showing fiscal restraint in defense spending and for deregulating industries such as transportation, energy, and financial services. On the negative side, Carter lost Prosperity points for adopting voluntary wage and price controls and enlarging the federal bureaucracy through creating new agencies such as the Department of Energy and Department of

Education. He is also faulted for making Social Security only temporarily more solvent rather than privatizing the program. In the Liberty category, he is given credit for supporting the Equal Rights Amendment, pardoning draft-dodgers, and for his rhetorical protest (instead of using military force) of human rights violations around the world (Eland 2009, 344-358).

Barber contends that Carter's Active classification is clear cut in seeing how much Carter was actively involved as a President, while his Positive/Negative placement isn't as clear, although he does classify him as Positive. Barber argues that the Iran hostage crisis tested his character and that the flexibility and open-mindedness he showed during the situation indicate his Positive trait. Continuing the trend of the presidents of the latter half of the twentieth century, I would argue there may be a split in character types in this case. In particular, I would argue that his implementation of tight monetary and fiscal policies, despite the negative political consequences, appears to be closely linked to the Passive-Negative character type.

The low Siena College poll rankings in the categories of Party Leadership, Relationship with Congress, and Ability to Compromise tend to reflect the Passive-Negative character type that I just suggested. Similar to the situation of John Tyler, Carter had his own party in power in Congress, yet went against them on substantial issues. His low rating in several other categories, especially Handling of U.S. Economy shows that the poll puts much of the blame on Carter for the rough economic times, unlike Eland who blames the policies of Johnson, Nixon, and Ford before him for setting up that situation and gives credit to Carter for setting up policies of prosperity that occurred during the Reagan administration.

Ronald Reagan

Eland's ranking: 34, Bad

1981-1989 (Two terms)

Siena College Poll Ranking: 17

Barber Classification: Passive-Positive

Reagan's Bad rating comes from his poor showing in all three of Eland's categories. Under Peace, Eland does not credit Reagan for winning the Cold War, but instead blames the Soviet collapse the country's own overextension and poor economic performance. Eland condemns Reagan for greatly expanding the military budget, using military intervention in Lebanon, Granada, and Libya, and for covertly aiding Sadaam Hussein's government in Iraq after it attacked Iran.

Eland's disagreement with Reagan's fiscally conservative reputation is seen in his scathing reviews under Prosperity. Eland iterates how Reagan made deals with the Democratic Congress through agreeing for increased domestic spending in exchange for increased defense spending. In addition, Eland does not give Reagan credit for reducing "big government", but instead tributes Carter for initializing deregulation and reducing the number of antitrust cases against businesses. Even though Reagan presided over the largest tax cut in American history at that point, Eland contends that his tax cuts were essentially fake since they did not occur in tandem with spending decreases. He argues that when taxes are cut without spending cuts, deficits are created which will eventually have to lead to increased taxes later on or borrowing money, which creates an inflation tax. Eland attributes the prosperity that occurred during that time and the next decade from the tight-money monetary policies set forth by Paul Volcker and Alan Greenspan. As for Liberty, Reagan fares poorly for instigating the Iran-Contra affair, which he argues

was worse than Watergate since his administration attempted to usurp Congress's power of money appropriations through developing secret and illicit alternatives of funding (359-371).

In all, Reagan fits the Passive-Positive model well as Barber contends. As Eland describes, Reagan was flexible in his domestic policy, not holding firm to specifically conservative principles and in making deals with the Democratic Congress. Although he was active sometimes in foreign policy, his demeanor and character as a president was fairly passive.

Although the Siena College poll doesn't hold Reagan in as high regard as most Republicans do today, his middle ranking is still much better than Eland's. His decent ranking in Ability to Compromise and good ranking in Relationship with Congress help argue his Passive-Positive character categorization. Not surprisingly, the categories in which Reagan has his worst rankings, Background and Intelligence, and the categories he ranks towards the top such as Luck and Communication, would not be a determining ranking factor for Eland. In fact, I would contend that his number 3 ranking in Luck, which is probably partially related to economic prosperity, would not be considered luck by Eland, but instead a consequence of tight monetary policy.

George H. W. Bush

Eland's Ranking: 33, Bad

1989-1993 (Elected Once)

Siena College Poll Ranking: 21

Barber Classification: Active-Positive

Bush's foreign interventions attributed greatly to his Bad Eland ranking. Eland condemns his invasion of Panama to remove dictator Manuel Noriega, initiating the first Iraq war without Congressional approval, intervening in Somalia, and for not returning to a restrained foreign policy after the fall of the Soviet Union. He specifically disagrees with the rationale for the Persian Gulf War which included the need for jobs (which Eland contends really meant oil) and that Sadaam's aggression "[could] not stand" even though the United States had let aggression occur in other parts of the world without any military response.

He fares just as poorly in the Prosperity category for going against his promise to not raise taxes, bailing out banks, spending billions of dollars on the war on drugs, and increasing federal regulations through the Clean Air Act and Americans with Disabilities Act. As for Liberty, Bush lost points for letting the FBI cover up federal misconduct in the shooting of residents in Idaho at Ruby Ridge and for pardoning officials from the Reagan administration who were involved in the Iran-Contra scandal (372-381).

Barber's Active-Positive classification of George H. W. Bush is not as clear-cut as his other classifications. Barber "tentatively" gives him this classification through his energy and optimism as a president (Barber 2009, 457). Explanation for his Positive character can also be seen in Barber's explanation of Bush's "fuzzy world view" as it pertains to war (481). Eland's explanation of Bush partially argues for this Active-

Positive classification. Eland contends he was clearly active in foreign policy and also active in domestic policy through increasing taxes, bailouts, and passing new regulations. His Positive aspect could be argued through the fact that even though he had a Democratic Congress, he compromised through these tax increases to pay for domestic spending. However, I would argue that negative (inflexible) aspects are seen in his foreign policy as he went to war with direct Congressional opposition (Eland 2009, 374).

Bush's average rankings throughout the twenty categories in the Siena College poll help give him his average overall ranking. However, his comparatively decent ranking in Ability to Compromise helps argue his Positive character, while his decent ranking in Foreign Policy Achievements again shows the contrast in criteria from Eland as it pertains to the role of the president in foreign policy.

William Clinton

(Not calculated in BEM score)

Eland Ranking: 11

1993-2001 (Elected Twice)

Siena College Poll Ranking: 13

Projected Classification: Active-Positive

(Not Classified by Barber or Maranell)

Before getting into major criteria, Eland only slightly condemns Clinton's lying in the Monica Lewinski scandal and argues that he probably shouldn't have been impeached. This scandal is largely disregarded by Eland compared to other scandals since the scandal didn't impose a direct threat to checks and balances or the democratic system at large.

Regarding Peace, I would argue that Eland's explanation of Clinton in foreign policy does not reflect his relatively high Peace score (14/20). Eland tokens Clinton as the "Post-World War II King of Overseas Military Interventions" (Eland 2009, 384). Eland condemns his intervention in Bosnia, Serbia, Kosovo, Iraq, and Afghanistan. Eland also faults Clinton for threatening war with North Korea after the country threatened to withdraw from the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

Most of Eland's props to Clinton come in the category of Prosperity. Eland applauds Clinton's political courage in reducing the deficit through controlling federal spending. Eland argues that this creation of a federal surplus helped boost overall economic expansion in the United States. Clinton is also credited for supporting welfare reform and advocating free-trade through the creation of NAFTA and WTO. However, Eland does note that Clinton was conservative only to a certain point, which can be exhibited by his attempt to pass his health care proposal which would have expanded federal power and the bureaucracy. Under Liberty, Clinton is faulted for overseeing the AFT raid of the Branch Davidian Christian complex and for increasing government surveillance of Americans and eroding civil liberties in reaction to the World Trade Center and Oklahoma City bombings (382-400).

Using the criteria of both Barber and Maranell, I would contend that Clinton best fits the Active-Positive category. Clinton was active in both foreign and domestic policy with his foreign interventions, welfare reform, and attempt to pass a large health-care overhaul. While some could argue that Clinton was more of a Passive president since he wasn't as active in passing domestic legislation as many Democrats may have wanted, I would argue that this would instead be evidence of his Positive character. While

presiding over a Republican Congress, he was able to negotiate and find middle ground in passing welfare reform and balancing the budget. This would show his flexibility as a president, which would translate to Pederson's Positive translation. It could also be argued that Clinton's enjoyment of the presidency helps argue Barber's specific characterization of Positive presidents as well.

Clinton's fairly good overall ranking by the Siena College poll is accompanied by a very high ranking in Ability to Compromise, which further helps to argue for his Positive classification. His very high ranking in Handling of U.S. Economy seems to go along with Eland's assessment of Prosperity. This similarity of rankings and explanation between the two rankers regarding the U.S. economy is very rare. However, I would argue that the Siena College poll ranked him highly in this category since the overall economy fared well during his tenure, while Eland's high ranking is attributed specifically to his reduction in spending, welfare reform, and deficit reduction. Clinton's low rankings in Integrity and Avoid Crucial Mistakes are most likely based on the Lewinski scandal and wouldn't be a major factor for Eland.

George W. Bush

(Not Calculated in BEM Score)

Eland Ranking: 36

2001-2009 (Elected Twice)

Siena College Poll Ranking: 36

Projected Classification: Active-Negative

(Not Classified by Barber or Maranell)

Bush's 0 out of 20 score in Eland's Peace category is attributed the president's actions regarding the war in Iraq. Eland condemns Bush's grounds for war which included the "weapons of mass destruction" argument, the notion that terrorism was directly related to Sadaam Hussein, and the idea that Sadaam was "evil". Included in this argument is the fact that there was no declaration of war from Congress. Furthermore, the near decade long occupation of Iraq and Bush's overly "rabid" pro-Israel stance were reasons contributing to Eland's assessment.

As for Prosperity, Bush is faulted for increasing government spending and federal budget deficits. Eland argues that not only did Bush increase defense spending, but that domestic discretionary spending increased a total of 35 percent over his first six years as president. In addition, Eland condemns the expansion of federal power associated with the passage of the No Child Left Behind Act, increased agriculture subsidies, bailouts of financial institutions, and imposing higher tariffs.

Under liberty, Bush fares very poorly according to Eland for falsely selling the war to the public, using the war to expand presidential power, and "assaulting" civil liberties. Eland argues that the administration undermined civil liberties through the increase in civilian surveillance under the PATRIOT Act, the unconstitutional suspension

of the Writ of Habeas Corpus, and the implementation of the Guantanamo Bay detention facility (401-426).

My implication that Bush was an Active-Negative president closely follows the arguments made by lawyer and former counsel to President Nixon, John W. Dean. He argues that Bush exhibited Active-Negative characteristics quoted straight from Barber including a “compulsive quality, as if ... trying to make up for something or escape from anxiety in hard work [and being] ambitious, striving upward and seeking power” (Dean 2004). I would contend, as does Dean, that the inflexibility exhibited in the handling of the Iraq war and his increase and use of presidential power fit both Active and Negative categories.

George W. Bush is the only president ranked the same by both Eland and the Siena College poll, and for mostly the same reasons. Bush is ranked towards the very bottom in every category except Party Leadership, Luck (Ironically, the 9/11 attacks helped boost presidential ratings), and Willing to Take Risks, which he ranks towards the middle. Their equally poor assessment of Bush’s foreign policy is also rare, being most similar to Lyndon Johnson’s assessment via the Vietnam War.

Barack Obama

(Not Calculated in BEM Score)

Projected Eland Rating: 35 (Bad)

2009-Present

Siena College Poll Ranking: 15

Projected Classification: Active-Positive

(Not Classified by Barber or Maranell)

Since Eland's book was published in 2009, he did not rank Barack Obama who began his presidency in January of that year. However, I was able to have a phone interview with Dr. Eland and was able to gather his thoughts on Obama's presidency thus far. Eland stated that he would rate Obama as a Bad president and rank him just higher than George W. Bush. From what I gathered from Dr. Eland, I can give a projection of what his explanations would be regarding the three categories.

In the Prosperity category, Obama would do poorly for largely continuing the foreign policies of Bush. This would include increasing troop deployment in Afghanistan, using American troops in the NATO intervention in Libya, and using unmanned drones to attack targets in Pakistan and surrounding countries. He would only fare a little better than Bush for drawing out troops from Iraq, although the draw-down was already projected to happen.

Under Prosperity, he would do even worse for increasing federal deficits and the national debt through bail-outs and the "stimulus" package. Eland would also fault Obama for the Affordable Healthcare Act for America (ObamaCare) which expanded federal authority through implementing an "individual mandate" to own health insurance. As for Peace, although Eland admits Obama is somewhat better than Bush as civil liberties are concerned, he would still fare poorly in this category for continuing the

policies under the PATRIOT Act, keeping Guantanamo Bay open, and maintaining the “war on drugs” (Eland, Expanding on Recarving Rushmore 2012).

It is difficult to classify Obama as a certain character type since he has not yet completed a whole term; however, I would argue that he best fits the Active-Positive type thus far. He has been active in both domestic and foreign policy with the passage of the stimulus package, bail-outs, the passage of his healthcare legislation and the continued foreign intervention policies. As for his Positive classification, although he was outspoken against Bush’s foreign interventions and Guantanamo Bay, he continued these policies once he was president, implying that he was flexible in implementing policy. Further flexibility was shown in giving up a “public option” that he wanted in his healthcare legislation in order to get it passed.

Although the Siena College poll came out less than two years into Obama’s presidency, they still gave him a ranking, a decent one at that. Because there hadn’t been much time to see Obama’s policy outcomes, he was ranked towards the middle in most categories. However, he ranked highly in categories that don’t require actual policies to assess, including Communication, Imagination, and Intelligence. Conversely, he ranked rather poorly in Background. Again, these categories would be rather meaningless using Eland’s criteria.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

Of the several primary and secondary investigations in this study, there are a few main conclusions to point out. Pederson's conversion of Maranell's "flexible/inflexible" classification study into Barber's "Positive-Negative" characterizations proved to be sufficient and helpful in investigating relationships between Eland's rankings and Barber's character categories. My hypotheses that Passive-Negative presidents would be associated with higher Eland rankings while Active presidents would be associated with lower Eland rankings were proven to be correct. Eland's criteria clearly favored presidents who were less active in foreign and domestic policy and showed disdain for presidents who were active in foreign policy and in expanding federal domestic power.

Major differences were shown between the rankings of Eland and the Siena College Poll, given the negative relationship between the two. The clear differences in criteria led to the clear differences in presidential rankings. The tendency of Active-Positive presidents to be ranked higher on the Siena College poll shows the similarity between James Barber and that poll in holding the Active-Positive presidents in high regard.

The secondary question with the biggest implication regarding Eland's rankings and Barber's character types was the one regarding divided government. Presidents who

presided over a more divided government had better Eland rankings and tended to have a Negative classification when compared to presidents who served with a Congress who had their same party in power. Because of this, two questions are raised: Is a president's ranking on Eland's list based solely on the actions (or inactions) of the president or does divided/undivided government play a role in this ranking? Are Barber's classifications of presidents based solely on their character or does an opposing or supporting Congress inadvertently play a role in Barber's character classification?

For the first question, I would argue that divided government definitely plays a role in ranking the presidents for Eland. His explanation of John Quincy Adams helps argue this point. Eland was very much against Quincy Adam's "Antebellum New Deal" which would have expanded federal funding on several projects. However, Eland notes that Congress was correct in disapproving of most of this funding and that hardly anything Quincy Adams proposed got enacted. Because these items he proposed didn't get enacted, he received a decent 12 ranking from Eland. If his legislation would have been passed, he would have arguably had a much lower ranking. As seen in the presidential profiles, other instances such as this occurred during other presidencies. Thus, I would argue that Eland's presidential rankings aren't totally based on the presidents' ideals and actions themselves, and that the party in control of Congress does have an impact in his presidential rankings.

As for the second question, I would argue that divided government plays a similar role in presidential character classification, especially when using the flexibility/inflexibility translation to Positive/Negative classifications. Several examples can be seen in the presidential profiles where I argue that the Positive/Negative

classification is influenced by divided/undivided government. For example, a Democrat with a Democratic Congress may be perceived as flexible, since he is more likely to agree with the types of legislation passed through Congress. There is not necessarily a way of knowing whether or not he would have been perceived as flexible if he had a Republican Congress.

Although Barber's specific criteria of Positive/Negative classifications are slightly different than Pederson's, I would argue that divided/undivided government still is a factor in determining classification. For example, a president may be perceived as having a positive attitude towards the presidency when his same party is in power in Congress since there is less conflict. When having the opposing party in control of Congress, the president may be perceived as having a more negative attitude since he has to deal with the conflicting views and agendas of Congress.

I would also argue that divided/undivided government can have an impact on a president's Active/Passive classification. A president may be perceived as passive just because he isn't able to get legislation passed through an opposing Congress. However, a president could also be perceived as passive during undivided government when Congress passes legislation and the president just goes along with the legislation. On the other hand, a president with an opposing Congress may be perceived as active since he has to actively go against the policies Congress is trying to pass. If that same president presided during undivided government, he may just as well be perceived as passive since he just would be going along with what Congress wants to pass.

Given these observations, I would conclude that while a president's actions and character do of course play a major role in Eland's rankings and Barber's classifications,

there are still other influences, such as divided government, not stated in their individual explanations of criteria, that have an impact on their rankings and classifications.

Although the comparison between Eland's rankings and the Siena College poll rankings was a secondary relationship study, it could have just as well been a primary relationship. The vast differences between their rankings show the complete contrast in the criteria they use to rank the presidents. As noted, there are several categories used by the Siena College poll that Eland would consider arbitrary, and there are categories that would be perceived differently from Eland, given his version of originalism criteria.

While Eland's criteria are vastly different from that of the more mainstream ranking systems, I would argue that his criteria are just as legitimate as that of the Siena College poll. Either case essentially just comes down to a value judgment. What should the role of the president be? What type of actions should the president take? How much power should the president have? These are just a few questions that would be answered completely differently depending on one's particular views. Not only are there questions about the roles of the president, but also about the roles of the federal government. The president plays a key role in determining the overall role of the federal government in both foreign and domestic policy.

In order to make Eland's criteria be perceived as more legitimate, there should be a poll of other presidential historians using the same criteria Eland uses regarding Peace, Prosperity, and Liberty. Although most would likely agree with the general direction in the rankings of the presidents, there would of course be discrepancies in the findings between the different historians, just as there are in the Siena College poll.

In conclusion, there seems to be a battle between Eland's restrained Passive-Negative presidents vs. the mainstream historians' Active-Positive presidents. Going forward, it will be interesting to see if the trend of Active presidents continues, or if the public decides they want to move back towards a more restrained presidency. Currently while writing this, of the five remaining possible candidates for president, Barack Obama, Mitt Romney, Rick Santorum, Newt Gingrich, and Ron Paul, I would predict that Ron Paul would be the only Passive-Negative president. As for the others, I'd predict Romney to be Passive-Positive, Santorum to be Active-Negative, and Newt Gingrich to be Active-Positive. Eland would most likely give Ron Paul a high ranking, while giving the others Poor or Bad ratings. In the end, it will be up to the public to decide and up to the historians and political scientists to closely evaluate who they choose. How they evaluate these presidents, as I've shown, is another hotly debated issue on its own.

REFERENCES

- Barber, James D. *The Presidential Character: Predicting Performance in the White House, Fourth Edition*. Longman: Pearson Education, Inc., 2009.
- Dean, John W. "Predicting Presidential Performance: Is George W. Bush An Active/Negative President Like Nixon, LBJ, Hoover and Wilson?" *FindLaw*. May 1, 2004. <http://writ.news.findlaw.com/dean/20040521.html> (accessed February 27, 2012).
- Eland, Ivan, interview by Dillon Jones. *Expanding on Recarving Rushmore* (January 26, 2012).
- . *Recarving Rushmore: Ranking the Presidents on Peace, Prosperity, and Liberty*. Oakland: The Independent Institute, 2009.
- Maranell, Gary M. "The Evaluation of Presidents: an Extension of the Schlesinger Polls." *The Journal of American History*, Vol. 57, No. 1, 1970: 104-113.
- Office of the Clerk. *Party Divisions of the House of Representatives (1789 to Present)*. 2012. http://artandhistory.house.gov/house_history/partyDiv.aspx (accessed January 28, 2012).
- Pederson, William D. "Amnesty and Presidential Behavior: A "Barberian" Test." *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 7, No. 4, 1977: 175-183.
- Senate Historical Office. *Party Division in the Senate 1789-Present*. 2012. http://www.senate.gov/pagelayout/history/one_item_and_tasers/partydiv.htm (accessed January 28, 2012).

Siena Research Institute. *Presidents 2010 Rank by Category*. 2010. (accessed November 5, 2011).

Siena Research Institute. *2010 Presidential Expert Poll: FAQ*. 2010.

<http://www.siena.edu/pages/1158.asp> (accessed January 25, 2012).

"United States Constitution." 1787.

White House. *Presidents*. 2012. <http://www.whitehouse.gov/about/presidents> (accessed January 5, 2012).

Whittington, Keith E. *Constitutional Interpretation: Textual Meaning, Original Intent, and Judicial Review*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1999.

VITA

Dillon Tyler Jones was born in Nacogdoches, Texas, on July 19, 1988, the son of Lisa Jane Jones and John Michael Jones. After completing his work at Port Aransas High School in 2006, he entered Texas State University-San Marcos. He graduated magna cum laude in May 2010 with the degree of Bachelor of Arts in Political Science. He entered the Political Science Graduate program at Texas State the following semester. He has worked as a Graduate Assistant since January 2011 and as a Teaching Assistant since August 2011. As a Teacher of Record for the Fall 2011 and Spring 2012 semester, he instructed the courses of Functions of American Government and Principles of American Government.

Permanent Email: dillontjones43@gmail.com

This thesis was typed by Dillon T. Jones