Q: Executive orders are attractive but potentially impermanent policy solutions. Why are they attractive to presidents? (Give at least two reasons.) Why are they impermanent? (Give at least one reason.) Answer in one or two paragraphs.

A:

Executive orders have no specific definition in the Constitution but as explained in the video lecture, an executive order is a directive from the President that has much of the same power as a federal law. Basically, the president cannot take over the law-making power of Congress but under certain circumstances an executive order can have the same effect as a law passed by Congress.

The executive orders are attractive to presidents because by signing the executive orders the presidents can make and fulfil their demands or pass a law that only they think is beneficial, either for their administration or the country. The reason for passing an executive order is only if a policy is not passed or approved by Congress. This can happen for a verity of reasons and if a policy that the president might like is not approved by the Congress then by signing an executive order the president can get what they want in the form of that order or policy. The executive orders also help the president establish and remind congressmen of their authorities, thus, by signing an executive order presidents can outline strategies pursuant to their authority, which is the second reason why it is attractive to the presidents. Recently, we saw that President Trump signed an executive order to direct his administration to develop a strategy to defeat ISIS. In a nutshell, the two benefits are fulfilling their demands and outline a strategy of their desire.

It is impermanent because executive orders are unilaterally written by the president which means they can be taken out of force by the next president which is the main reason why it is not permanent. An example of this is the case of DACA which was an executive order signed by President Obama which was rescinded by President Trump.