The Unitary Executive, Executive Overreach, and Legislative Abdication

Overview

The historical pattern in the United States is less one of legislative monarchy than of executive expansion combined with congressional retreat. The strongest practical objection to the modern unitary-executive project is therefore not merely theoretical; it is that the presidency has repeatedly become the institutional center of emergency power, secrecy, unilateral action, and abuse, while Congress has often delegated, delayed, or declined to defend its own prerogatives.[1][2][3]

This report examines that pattern in historical and contemporary perspective. It also explains why the claim that the executive can safely be unified because it is checked by elections, oversight, appropriations, impeachment, and judicial review is much weaker in practice than it appears in constitutional abstraction.[2][3][4]

The theory and its practical premise

Strong versions of unitary-executive theory maintain that Article II vests the whole of executive power in one president and therefore requires presidential control over subordinate officers, often including broad removal authority and close supervisory power.[5][6][7] Advocates pair that constitutional argument with a practical one: concentrated control is said to improve accountability because the public can identify one elected official as responsible for executive action, while Congress and the courts remain available as checks.[5][8]

That practical defense depends on a factual assumption about institutional behavior. It assumes that when presidents overreach, the other branches will be willing and able to respond with sufficient speed and force to prevent lasting damage. The American historical record gives substantial reasons to doubt that assumption.[1][2][3]

The historical record of executive overreach

Lincoln and emergency power

Abraham Lincoln claimed extraordinary powers at the outbreak of the Civil War, including calling up troops, ordering a blockade, and suspending habeas corpus before Congress had fully authorized those actions. Lincoln is often treated in the scholarship on unilateral presidential authority as a central example of how emergencies allow presidents to act first and force later institutional ratification or resistance.[1][2]

The importance of the episode lies not only in Lincoln's motives but in the structure of the office. Crisis conditions gave the presidency the ability to define the pace of events and place Congress in a reactive posture, demonstrating how executive power can become quasi-lawmaking power in moments of perceived necessity.[1][2]

Roosevelt and internment

President Franklin Roosevelt's Executive Order 9066 enabled the forced removal and internment of Japanese Americans and others on the West Coast during World War II. The internment episode illustrates a recurring failure mode in American constitutional practice: once the executive branch frames an issue as war or national security, Congress and the courts often defer instead of functioning as immediate, effective checks.[9][10]

That matters directly for unitary-executive theory. The existence of formal checks on paper did not prevent one of the gravest violations of civil liberty in American history, because the political and institutional environment favored executive judgment over adversarial review.[9][10]

Nixon and personalized executive abuse

The Nixon administration showed how centralized control of law enforcement, intelligence, secrecy, and personnel can be turned toward personal and political ends. Obstruction of justice, the use of agencies against perceived enemies, and sweeping assertions of executive privilege all demonstrated that the presidency can transform public power into an instrument of self-protection and retaliation.[9][11]

Congress eventually responded with investigation and reform, but the response came after substantial abuse had already occurred. The lesson is not that checks never work; it is that they often work late, after the president has already exploited the asymmetries of speed, secrecy, and control built into the office.[3][9]

The post-9/11 national-security presidency

After 9/11, the presidency expanded its reach through broad statutory interpretations, commander-in-chief claims, secret legal memoranda, surveillance programs, detention policies, and interrogation practices. Congress bears part of the responsibility because it enacted broad authorizations and often failed to narrow them later, but the decisive practical expansion was driven from inside the executive branch.[1][3][12]

This period is especially revealing because it shows how law, secrecy, and administration interact. The branch that controls intelligence, classification, and operational tempo enjoys a powerful advantage over the branch that must assemble coalitions, hold hearings, and legislate under conditions of incomplete information.[1][3][12]

The current administration

During Donald Trump's current administration, observers across the legal and journalistic spectrum have argued that the executive has repeatedly tested or bypassed congressional prerogatives in areas including staffing, tariffs, and foreign-affairs power. Reporting and analysis describe a pattern in which the administration acts first, creates facts on the ground, and relies on partisan loyalty or legislative inertia to blunt effective congressional resistance.[13][14][15]

The current administration has also intensified the push for stronger Article II control over agencies, civil servants, and independent officials. That matters because the weaker the internal constraints within the executive branch become, the more the entire constitutional system depends on external checks that have often proven unreliable in practice.[14][16][17]

Congress as abdicator rather than monarch

Why Congress often fails to check presidents

Congress possesses formidable formal tools: legislation, appropriations, oversight, subpoenas, confirmations, impeachment, and control over core Article I powers such as commerce and war. Yet modern scholarship and commentary repeatedly describe a legislature that has too often become an accomplice in the shrinking of its own authority, especially in foreign affairs and emergency governance.[3][12][14]

Several dynamics help explain this failure. Partisanship encourages legislators to protect presidents of their own party; collective-action problems make rapid institutional response difficult; and broad delegation allows members to avoid responsibility for politically costly decisions while still complaining about the consequences after the fact.[3][14][15]

Delegation and self-marginalization

One of the most important modern patterns is not congressional usurpation but legislative self-marginalization. Congress has delegated substantial authority over tariffs, emergencies, and the use of force, then often reacted weakly when presidents used that authority aggressively or opportunistically.[14][15][18]

This is the opposite of monarchy. It is a branch with enormous constitutional power choosing, again and again, not to use it effectively. That pattern weakens the core practical reassurance offered by unitary-executive theory, because the theory assumes a legislature that is institutionally ambitious enough to counterbalance a more unified presidency.[3][14]

The founders, anti-monarchical design, and the limits of the theory

Strong defenders of unitary-executive theory often rely on Article II, Hamilton's arguments about “energy in the executive,” and the idea that a single elected official is more accountable than a diffuse administrative apparatus.[5][8] But the broader founding record is far more ambivalent than that account suggests. Modern historical scholarship argues that the framers did not clearly endorse the strongest contemporary version of unitary-executive theory, and that the early constitutional tradition does not yield a simple answer in favor of plenary presidential control.[19][20]

The American constitutional project began as a revolt against concentrated personal rule. Founding-era anxieties about executive power, including fear of an "elected king," make it difficult to claim that the anti-monarchical spirit of the Constitution naturally points toward maximizing presidential control over the machinery of administration.[21][22][23]

Deep state, demagogic presidents, and the practical stakes

In the Trump era, unitary-executive arguments have frequently been paired with warnings about a "deep state." Scholarship on the subject describes the deep-state narrative and the unitary-executive theory as mutually reinforcing: bureaucratic resistance is treated as the principal danger, and presidential control is treated as the constitutional cure.[16][24][25]

Critics argue that this framing reverses the more historically grounded fear. A relatively autonomous bureaucracy, civil-service protections, inspectors general, and some independent agencies can function as constitutional speed bumps that restrain or refine the actions of a demagogic president who seeks to make the executive branch an instrument of personal power.[24][26]

This is one reason Trump functions as a hard test case for the theory. If the president is himself the embodiment of corruption, self-dealing, and contempt for institutional restraint, then weakening every internal constraint in the name of accountability can produce the opposite of accountability: a more personalized and less resistible executive.[16][17][24][26]

A comparative look at institutional risk

Question	Legislature	Presidency
Typical failure mode	Gridlock, delegation, delay, avoidance of responsibility[3][14]	Speed, secrecy, unilateral action, emergency claims[1][9]
Information advantage	Diffuse, fragmented, dependent on hearings and disclosures[3]	Centralized access to intelligence, enforcement, and classification[1][12]
Capacity for personal rule	Low because power is distributed among many members[8][23]	High because authority is concentrated in one office[1][11]

Common contemporary pathology	Abdication of enumerated powers[14][15][18]	Expansion through directives, removals, and control of administration[13][16][17]
Implication for unitary theory	Weakens the claim that Congress is a dependable external check[3][14]	Strengthens the case for preserving internal friction inside the executive[24][26]

Implications for the checking argument

The strongest practical objection to unitary-executive theory is therefore straightforward. The theory assumes a Madisonian world in which ambition reliably counters ambition, but the actual modern pattern is often one in which Congress delegates, delays, or declines to confront presidents of its own party, while courts move episodically and usually after the executive has already acted.[3][12][14]

Under those conditions, the claim that a more unified executive is safe because it is checked by other means becomes substantially less convincing. When external checks are unreliable, weakening internal checks does not produce a cleaner form of democratic accountability; it increases the risk that public power will become increasingly personal, retaliatory, and resistant to correction.[17][24][26]

Conclusion

The historical record does not suggest that the central institutional danger in the United States is a legislature that behaves like a monarch. The more common pattern is an executive that expands under the pressures of war, emergency, secrecy, and partisan loyalty, and a legislature that too often yields, ratifies, or arrives late.[1][3][14]

That history has direct consequences for the modern unitary-executive project. The weaker Congress becomes as an external check, the weaker the practical defense of concentrated presidential control becomes as well. If the constitutional system can no longer rely on timely, vigorous checking from outside the executive branch, then preserving internal friction and

structural independence inside the state looks less like bureaucratic pathology and more like constitutional self-defense.[14][24][26]

References

[1] James P. Pfiffner, *Unilateral Presidential Authority: Uses and Abuses*, PDF, George Mason University Schar School. Available at: http://pfiffner.schar.gmu.edu/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/Pfiffner-Unilateral-Presidential-Authority-Uses-and-Abuses.pdf

[2] Grand Valley State University project, *Presidential power and its expanding influence: Suggestions on how to strengthen checks and balances*. Available at: https://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1727&context=honorsprojects

[3] William & Mary Law / related scholarship, *The Erosion of Congressional Checks on Presidential Power*. Available at: https://scholarship.law.wm.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1404&context=popular_media

[4] Federal Judicial Center, *Judicial Review of Executive Orders*. Available at: https://www.fjc.gov/history/administration/judicial-review-executive-orders

[5] Legal Information Institute, Cornell Law School, *Unitary Executive Theory (UET)*. Available at: https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/unitary_executive_theory_(uet)

[6] SCOTUSblog, *Morrison v. Olson and the triumph of the unitary executive theory*. Available at: https://www.scotusblog.com/2025/12/morrison-v-olson-and-the-triumph-of-the-unitary-executive-theory/

[7] Steven G. Calabresi and Christopher S. Yoo, *The Unitary Executive: Past, Present, Future*, The Supreme Court Review (2020). Available at: https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/10.1086/714860

[8] Congress.gov Constitution Annotated, *Early Perspectives on Executive Power*. Available at: https://constitution.congress.gov/browse/essay/artII-S1-C1-3/ALDE_00013792/

[9] University of Miami Law Review, *Abuses of Presidential Power: Impeachment as a Remedy*. Available at: https://repository.law.miami.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1285&context=umlr

[10] Federal Judicial Center, *Judicial Review of Executive Orders*. Available at: https://www.fjc.gov/history/administration/judicial-review-executive-orders

[11] Fiveable, *Executive Overreach and Abuse of Power*. Available at: https://fiveable.me/american-presidency/unit-13/executive-overreach-abuse-power/study-guide/1PPpoc6jxZ3Ax2N7

[12] Just Security, *Congress Shrinking from the World -- and Its Own Authority*. Available at: https://www.justsecurity.org/117559/congress-power-shrinking-trump/

[13] The Guardian, *How Trump has tried to undermine the powers of Congress: 'Violation of norms'*, January 20, 2026. Available at: https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/ng-interactive/2026/jan/20/trump-congress-government-powers-second-term

[14] Washington Post, *When Congress checks out, Americans pay the price,* May 11, 2026. Available at: https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/2026/05/11/war-tariffs-congress-abdication-hurts-americans/

[15] The American Prospect, *Checks and Imbalances*, April 4, 2011. Available at: https://prospect.org/2011/04/05/checks-imbalances/

[16] ABC News, *Trump and the 'unitary executive': The presidential power theory driving his 2nd term*, February 6, 2025. Available at: https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/trump-unitary-executive-presidential-power-theory-driving-2nd/story?id=118481290

[17] Vox, *The legal theory that would make Trump the most powerful president in US history*, February 4, 2025. Available at: https://www.vox.com/scotus/397729/supreme-court-unitary-executive-donald-trump

[18] Heritage Foundation, *How Congress Unleashed the Presidency*, October 31, 2024. Available at: https://www.heritage.org/american-history/commentary/how-congress-unleashed-the-presidency

[19] Christine Kexel Chabot, *Interring the Unitary Executive*, Notre Dame Law Review. Available at: https://ndlawreview.org/interring-the-unitary-executive/

[20] *The Originalist Myth of the Unitary Executive*, University of Pennsylvania scholarship PDF. Available at: https://scholarship.law.upenn.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1614&context=jcl

[21] New York Times, *A King? A Pawn? A Rogue? The Founders Could Barely Imagine a President.*, January 20, 2025. Available at: https://www.nytimes.com/2025/01/20/opinion/founding-fathers-constitution-president.html

[22] ABC News, *Nation's founders pushed against 'elected king' framing of presidential powers*, July 4, 2024. Available at: https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/nations-founders-pushed-elected-king-framing-presidential-powers/story?id=111621798

[23] Fiveable, *Founding Fathers' Vision of the Presidency*. Available at: https://fiveable.me/american-presidency/unit-3/founding-fathers-vision-presidency/study-guide/TVwhZYOv0jCYwDmK

[24] American Political Thought, *Thank God for the Deep State: Presidential Demagoguery and the "Unitary Executive"*. Available at: https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/abs/10.1086/723443

[25] Oxford Academic, *The Deep State and The Unitary Executive*. Available at: https://academic.oup.com/book/39684/chapter-abstract/339679000?redirectedFrom=fulltext

[26] Hastings Law Journal, *The Unitary Executive Theory in Comparative Context*. Available at: https://repository.uclawsf.edu/hastings_law_journal/vol72/iss1/1/