COMMENTARY: Bureaucracy

Much is made today about rising taxes necessitated by increased public demands for governmental services. These in turn necessitate increased numbers of public employees whose salaries necessarily continue to increase so that increased government costs are built into the system. The increase in the number of government employees is in itself a matter of some concern, not only because of costs incurred but because of the proliferation of bureaucracy and the reduction in the number of people in the economically productive labor force. This development, in turn, is linked to a third problem, that of the increasing estrangement of the average citizen from the governmental processes as government grows bigger and more complex, and less open to those not professionally involved with it, whether as politicians or as administrators.

Moreover, there are additional consequences from the necessity for most persons to choose whether or not to be actively involved with government at the outset of their careers. Because government service is a lifetime career for most, it places a premium on "going along" for a person to successfully advance his own career within the large organizations that comprise government today. This commitment has the tendency to stifle initiative because nothing is to be gained in most organizations by "rocking the boat." Innovation to meet new situations or problems becomes increasingly difficult in the face of the large organizations with permanent staffs of career people who can protect themselves against what they perceive to be undue pressure from the outside.

While these developments have sharpened the divisions between governors and governed on the political front, great changes have been taking place in the structure of work and leisure on the social front. Individuals must work fewer hours per week to attain a desired standard of living. Now, even the hours of the work week are being restructured so that some people are working four or even three days a week rather than the five-day, 9-5 week that has been the norm for the last two generations. Thus, new problems and possibilities are opening up for the use of the citizenry's time.

Under these situations, would it not be possible to restructure the administrative systems of government to bring people into government on a part-time basis as part of their normal work-lives. Such a move would restore the best part of the Jacksonian ideal—namely the idea that most citizens were capable of taking on the tasks of governing and indeed, should do so for the health of the body politic. Thus, the Jacksonian ideal could be updated to link it in a useful way to current psychic and governmental needs.

The first step in that direction would be to redefine many positions in government to require no more time than is needed to complete the tasks assigned to them. Today, many tasks are expanded to require full-time (approximately 40 hours per week) service simply because that is how we presently organize work in our society. Many of the same tasks
could be performed by the same person in much less time. Some task are seasonal or require concentrated work at various times of the week or month. Others require more manpower at peak periods during the day and much less at others. Still other positions can be redefined so as to divide their tasks among several different people on a part-time basis.

If jobs were to be restructured in terms of the time actually required to perform the tasks at hand in each case, they could be manned on a part-time basis by people engaged in other activities as well. Under such an arrangement, minimum cadres of full-time employees would provide the framework within which part-time civil servants would, in effect, share their new-found free time with the body politic (either voluntarily or on a paid basis). Since there is no substitute for experience in learning to understand political life, this would add a new dimension to citizenship because it would afford citizens an opportunity to be part of the governmental process and thereby gain some insight into its operation. In addition, such an arrangement would help halt the spiralling costs of government and infuse insulated governmental agencies with new blood.

Part-time civil servants might even be compensated wholly or in part through tax reductions or credits—in effect providing payment in kind rather than cash. A system of this kind would open the doors of governmental service to include people of widely diverse talents and make available talents that might otherwise be inaccessible to governments. At the same time, it would restore some of the good elements of the Jacksonian approach to government, namely the direct involvement of the citizenry in the governmental process.

A system of this kind could be effectuated even under conventional administrative structures. Today, however, new forms of administrative control based on computer technology provide even greater opportunities for such arrangements. The use of computers would enable full-time civil servants to coordinate departments, tasks and abilities through even widely diffused organizational structures. Computers make possible unconventional—non-hierarchical—forms of organization without sacrificing efficiency. Indeed, the idea of using the communications matrix to manage complex organizations is the latest word among administrative theorists. Such a system converges nicely with the demand for greater equality in organization life.

The increasing skill levels of American workers at all job levels will create demands for higher levels of governmental services at the same time there are demands for participatory democracy and non-hierarchical organization. The evolution of public service suggested above can help solve these three needs in a satisfactory, serendipitous way.

What is clear about this proposal is that it, like so many other potential solutions for our current problems can only be effectuated where there is a great deal of local control. Part-time civil servants in Washington organized to supervise other layers of civil servants would obviously have limited utility. Part-time talent employed by any governmental agency within a local community to undertake responsibilities for neighborhood service could make a great difference. The human dimension alone would encourage responsibility and proper levels of performance...just as such qualities are discouraged by the current system.
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**Howard Baker and Tennessee**

- "GOP Showed Maturity in Choice of Baker," by Jack W. Germond. Memphis Commercial Appeal, January 8, 1977. Writing on Sen. Howard Baker's election as GOP Senate minority leader, Germond says, "What was perhaps most striking about the whole thing, however, was that these were Republicans breaking form. Even in bad times they are usually ideological nitpickers, quick to divide into factions to quarrel over what constitutes party orthodoxy. But in this case, Baker had the support of many senators who are more liberal than he---and even a few who unquestionably have their notions about 1980 and were promoting a potential rival...But the selection of the articulate and ambitious Baker does change the face of the Republican Party in a way the routine elevation of Bob Griffin never would have done. For one thing, it makes the chairmanship far less important. Whoever finally gets that job can have no illusions that he will rival Baker as the leading voice of the party. In the same way, the White House plan for a new Republican 'advisory council' of old bulls ---Rockefeller, Reagan and the like ---suddenly seems less important. Political leaders whose future is behind them never get the attention of those with the potential for power."

- "Baker Sees Plenty of Bounce, Yet, in GOP," by Ted Knap. Memphis Press-Scimitar, January 8, 1977. "Although he's not coy about discussing it, Baker says he is not now thinking about the presidency and will not decide about running until after 1978, when he is up for reelection in Tennessee. The likelihood that President Carter will be hard to beat for a second term would not of itself deter Baker, he says. When he started campaigning for the Senate Republican leader he had only two sure votes, while Senate Republican Whip Robert Griffin was claiming 22."

- "GOP'S 1976 Platform Is Worth Refirming," by William A. Rusher. Human Events, January 22, 1977. "Certainly, [the GOP Platform] was conservative enough to suit the most demanding tastes. To cite just one example, Reagan's ally, Sen. Jesse Helms of North Carolina, insisted on amending the Ford-approved draft to include phraseology affirming that morality has a place in American foreign policy. Both Ford and Kissinger were strenuously against the amendment, interpreting it (correctly) as an implicit criticism of Kissinger's tendency to neutralism on moral questions. Helms, however, was adamant,"either I get that plank,' he warned Ford's platform..."
spokesman, 'or I go straight to Chicago' — meaning to the American Independent Party Convention, which was preparing to meet in Chicago a week later, and was ready to nominate any prominent conservative Republican who would run against Ford. Helms got his plan (and skipped Chicago).

"Nominee in Trouble," by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak. January 17, 1977. "The Republican Party's ideological split was vividly brought home to the party's new national chairman, William Brock, when Sen. Jesse Helms of North Carolina once again raised the incendiary issue of Panama Canal control. Helms proposed to Brock that Ronald Reagan represent the Republican Party nationally on the canal issue... Since Brock has no intention of reopening that struggle, he is not about to follow Helms' advice... Helms, who has emerged as an aggressive and influential figure on the Republican right, telephoned Brock shortly after his election to congratulate him for winning as a 'born-again conservative.' The phrase reveals the dubious but widely-held view by many conservatives that Brock lost his Senate seat in Tennessee last year by straying too far left and now has moved right again to be elected national chairman."

"Helms Is Out To Make An Unelectable Joke Out Of The GOP," by Ron Hendren. Arizona Republic, November 19, 1976. "Jesse Helms is a nobody. Worse than that, he is a sometime Democrat, a one-time television commentator who has never demonstrated more than a two-minute grasp of any issue. He is not a Barry Goldwater. He is not a Ronald Reagan. He is not even a Strom Thurmond. He is a joke. And the people of North Carolina will be quick to tell you that they are embarrassed that the Nixon landslide of 1972 swept Helms into office, the first Republican senator from the Tar-heel state since Reconstruction. He may well be the last, because his unseemly and thoroughly self-centered performance has disgusted the people who put him there. In short, two years hence, Jesse Helms is not going to have the people of North Carolina to kick around any more... He would do to the GOP what he has done to himself, render it an unfunny, unelectable joke. He would drive out the few remaining middle-of-the roaders in the Republican Party, and he would finish off what is left of the two-party system in Congress... We need a strong, effective voice of reason from the other side, not a motley rabble of lightweight, purer-than-thou extremists bent on having things their way, or no way at all, willing to destroy a great and once proud party for their own narrow end."

Democrats are, one supposes, entitled to a double standard. After all, the same criteria that were used to evaluate Harrold Carswell should not be used to evaluate Attorney General Griffin Bell. Nor should President Carter be held accountable for statements he made about taking the attorney general out of politics in the heat of campaign, it seems. There is, one supposes, a different perspective on things when a Democrat occupies the West Wing.

Had the Democratic members of the Senate applied the same criteria to the Bell nomination as were used to defeat Carswell, Bell would not have been confirmed by a lopsided 75-21 vote and Sen. Birch Bayh(D-Ind.) would not have found himself leading Bell's defense. In an editorial in the January 15 FORUM, Ripon suggested Democrats ought not to apply a double standard. Such vision and foresight was apparently beyond all but five Senate Democrats. They joined sixteen Senate Republicans to vote against Bell.
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In New Jersey gubernatorial politics, the names change a little every four years, but the issues are quadrennially constant: the income tax and government malpractice. Four years ago, the Democrats brought a "clean," apolitical judge off the state bench to defeat the GOP which was beset by income tax and corruption difficulties. It is the Republicans' fondest hope that the Democrats will renominate Gov. Brendan Byrne.

Byrne's vulnerability is attested to by the long lines of would-be successors in both the Democratic and Republican Party. Although Byrne himself has not announced his reelection intentions, his behavior has left little doubt that he intends to fight for his job. The once almost anti-political governor seems to have adopted a distinctly political style. He's parceling out patronage jobs with the aplomb of a Jersey City ward boss and using his appointees to spearhead criticism of gubernatorial aspirants. He has attempted to shore up relations with the legislature and key counties by appointing legislators to key posts in his administration. Labor has been assiduously courted—despite the strong opposition of state construction union leaders—by Byrne's backing for completion of I-95. His willingness to repudiate past positions is quickly becoming legendary...reaching even life and death proportions in Byrne's reversal of his position on signing a death penalty bill. Writing in the New Jersey edition of the New York Daily News, John McLaughlin said:

This is the same Brendan Byrne, who, as a Superior Court judge, wrote the opinion setting aside New Jersey's old capital punishment law as unconstitutional.

The same man, who, when running for the governorship, said he was 'philosophically opposed' to executions and that he would stay that way until somebody convinced him that killing a murderer would help stop murders.

But three three years in office have taught the governor the wisdom of philosophical opposition to unpopular positions.

The capital punishment issue is only one of the issues on which Byrne has moved right in order to gain political advantage. His state of the state message had a distinctly conservative tone to it this year on issues like welfare, crime, and state spending. Emphasizing the posterior, Byrne at one point said:"As long as there is honest productive work to be done, nobody who is capable of doing it should be able to sit on his duff and draw welfare checks." Byrne's budget message—delivered in a sweater—was sufficiently conservative that Republican critics were hard up for criticism. He attempted to finesse the income tax issue by packaging in reform wrappings and announcing property tax rebates this spring.

Another area in which the governor that backed right is suburban, low-income housing. Realizing that the legislature would not move on the issue, Byrne appointed a task force to come with proposals for executive action. The group's proposals for numerical quotas for each locality were swiftly put in the deep freeze. Meanwhile, New Jersey's cold weather has allowed the governor to appear more gubernatorial than usual. He has excelled at the ceremonial functions of his office—particularly riding in helicopters. The state's natural gas problems have allowed him to act more officious than usual. Still, his executive orders limiting thermostat settings and store hours have not endeared him to the small business community—a constituency somewhat larger than that for helicopter pilots and manufacturers.

Byrne's basic problem, however, is the income tax. New Jersey voters have a pronounced preference for "clean" anti-tax candidates. That preference was clearly indicated by the near-upset of a Democratic legislative leader in last fall's congressional election by a Republican nobody. Byrne is clearly tagged as the income tax man in the state and though he considers the tax to be a major accomplishment, the voters are less inclined to be so charitable. Imposition of the tax severely strained Byrne's relations with his own party; State Democratic Chairman James P. Dugan has said Byrne is sure to lose his reelection attempt. Regardless of political affiliation, gubernatorial candidates will run against the state income tax while remaining purposefully vague about new
sources of state revenue. That is the New Jersey way...that is the Byrne way. During his own campaign in 1973, Byrne said:"There's no need for an income tax in the foreseeable future."

It is characteristic of New Jersey that the strongest candidates for governor are non-legislative---e.g., they do not have income tax records. It is far easier to obfuscate from the safe vantage point of Capitol hill or a court bench. Byrne's predecessor, Gov. William Cahill, also got in trouble on the income tax issue, but he first go elected from his congressional office. Two possible Democratic opponents of Byrne are U.S.Reps Robert A. Roe of Wayne and James J. Florio of Camden. Both men have increased their public visibility in recent months. Florio has the advantage of an Italian name combined with a strong base in traditionally Republican South Jersey. He isn't specifically critical of Byrne, however: "I agree with many of the things the things the governor is doing. I just don't think he can win."

State Sen. Frank Dodd, who recently took himself 6ut of the gubernatorial race, has been less reticent about criticizing the governor:"The people of New Jersey have not had a genuine Democratic governor---a man who accurately represented the views of the overwhelming majority of the citizens of this state---since 1969."

If Democrats eventually favor a North Jersey candidate, the leading possibility is Jersey City Mayor Paul Jordan. Although Dr. Jordan can count on the Hudson County organization's support, the Hudson County organization isn't what it used to be. Indeed, all county organizations aren't what they used to be and that is why New Jersey's gubernatorial politics is so confusing. County organizations, once preeminent in the state, would now have trouble delivering mail, let alone votes. Primary politics used to revolve on the ability of candidates to secure organizational backing in key counties. And though the "organization line" is still important, organization backing is a euphemism in the state's increasingly factionalized politics. The result is a proliferation of candidates. Other Democratic candidates (announced variety) include State Assemblyman Charles B. Yates, former Labor and Industry Commissioner Joseph A. Hoffman, and former gubernatorial aide Jeffery Ketterson. Meanwhile, Jordan's gubernatorial campaign has temporarily stalled. An attempt by allies to preempt the field with phone calls---"The train is pulling out of the station. Better get on board"---failed. And though Jordan himself is a "clean," reform candidate, there is still a certain stigma attached to Hudson County politicians as a result of Jersey City's corrupt past. (Jordan's predecessor went to jail rather than Trenton.)

The GOP's field is almost as varied and complex as the Democrats'. There are two major announced candidates: former State Senate president Raymond H. Bateman of Somerset and former Assembly Minority Leader Thomas Kean of Livingston. Both represent the moderate-progressive wing of the GOP, both oppose the current income tax and both have trouble with the issue because of previous pro-tax votes in the legislature. Bateman tried the Jordan maneuver by announcing in December in an attempt to block Kean. A public relations executive, Bateman's backers read like a who's who of GOP money. Bateman suffers several handicaps, however. He was considered the GOP frontrunner in 1969, but backed out in favor of Cahill. He perhaps could have persuaded Cahill to back out in 1973, but instead became his campaign manager. Although he is now running as an anti-tax can-
didate, he was a backer of Cahill's income tax. Furthermore, Bateman's attempts to secure organization support have attracted supporters like Bergen County's former GOP Chairman Anthony Statile who are likely to cost him allies there and elsewhere.

The revelation that former Secretary of State Paul Sherwin is advising Bateman also hurts the Somerset County legislator. Sherwin was convicted in a bribery-extortion conspiracy during Gov. Cahill's administration. Byrne may have been spared some embarrassment by the decision of his secretary of state, Edward Crabel, to resign. Crabel had been suspended from his post when he was indicted on a bid-rigging charge, but was reinstated when the judge ruled that the statute of limitations had elapsed.

Kean also has problems. First, he draws from the same electoral base as Bateman—and Bateman got there first. Second, he has lost the influence of two men who might have been counted on to generate support—President Gerald Ford and Ford campaign manager James Baker III. Had Ford been elected President or Baker elected GOP national chairman, they might have been in a position to reward Kean for his service as Ford campaign manager in the state. Although Kean lacks Bateman's well-heeled backers, he is considerably better off than his poorly-dressed image would indicate. Indeed, Newark Star-Ledger columnist Fred Hillman half-jokingly attributed Kean's switch to more stylish apparel as an indication of his elective seriousness. The advantages of Kean's own wealth are coupled with the edge he gains in his choice of campaign consultants—the Washington-based firm of Bailey, Deardourff, and Eyre which has a nearly legendary record of success with moderate Republican candidates. (Bateman applied too late for their services). Like Bateman, Kean opposes the current income tax and has pledged to let it expire. He has refused, however, to rule out the possibility of another income tax, saying, "The concept of an income tax is not the issue. It is the way this tax was imposed and the fact people no longer believe us as a result."

Bateman and Kean recently held their first debate, but both acknowledge they agree on more than they disagree. David A. Maraniss of the Trenton Sunday Times Advertiser wrote recently:

The substantive differences between Kean and Bateman, in fact, only indirectly touch upon concerns of New Jersey voters. They have more to do with the Republican Party—what is wrong with it and what can be done about it.

Many of Bateman's followers tend to believe the resurgence of the Republican Party is all but inevitable, that it merely awaits the results of the election next November. Kean shows more concern than that, at least outwardly. He believes the party must be rejuvenated from top to bottom.

"I'm just not comfortable with the shape of the Republican Party in this state, and I don't see how anyone could," Kean said. "Fewer than 20 percent of the people are willing to associate themselves with us—one of the two major parties. We have consistently discouraged young people from participating. We have more consistently discouraged black people from participating.

Because Kean and Bateman have both attempted to edge rightward, particularly on the income tax issue, they have limited the maneuvering room available to more conservative Republicans. Former Treasury Secretary William Simon has already taken himself out of the race. State Sen. James H. Wallwork would cut into Kean's Essex County base, but one associate commented after Kean's anti-tax statement, "It was a bit more than we expected." Wallwork has a mixed image as a somewhat demagogic reformer who would still be a natural heir to the conservative GOP constituency of former Republican gubernatorial candidate Sandman (who is backing Bateman). Wallwork's abrasive nature has alienated many of his legislative colleagues, however.

If Wallwork were to enter the GOP race, Bateman and Kean would probably hope that State Assemblyman Francis X. McDermott would join as well, thus McDermott would join as well, thus splitting the conservative vote. McDermott, however, has been vocally urging U.S. Rep. Matthew Rinaldo (R) to enter the race. Rinaldo has sounded like a potential candidate recently, calling for elimination of the constitutional requirement for a "thorough and effi-
cient" educational system that was used by courts to demand new state aid and thereby the income tax. Although Rinaldo has made the requisite bows against the state income tax, he is considered unlikely to enter the gubernatorial race unless he has a clear and free shot at the nomination. Unfettered by a recent legislative record and with a strong Union County base, Rinaldo would probably be the GOP favorite if he entered the race.

Two other names are also prominently mentioned: Bergen County prosecutor Joseph Woodcock, who has received widespread exposure in several sensational cases, and U.S. District Court Judge Frederick Lacey. Woodcock would appeal to the same voter base as Kean and Bateman, but his candidacy is more viable than Lacey's. New Jersey voters have been burned once by an Irish judge, it is argued. Lacey would probably have to be drafted to run, and with the GOP's large stable of candidates, that is unlikely. Statile's backing of Bateman may have spurred the interest in Lacey of Statile's Bergen rival, County Republican Chairman Richard J. Vander Plaats. But, as the Newark Star-Ledger's Fred Hillman has pointed out...

Republican organizational types aren't volunteering their support because, as one long-time Lacey watcher puts it, many of them really don't know him.

As politicians, they'd like to know what kind of politician he'll be. They'd like to know what kind of governor he aspires to be. And, being a nervous breed at heart, some of them would also like to be sure if Lacey runs on a plank to throw the rascals out, they aren't the rascals he has in mind.

The situation in Bergen County was complicated by Woodcock's decision to resign as prosecutor March 1. Perhaps hoping to see Republicans concentrate on cutting each other up, Gov. Byrne accepted Woodcock's resignation immediately. Although Woodcock won't officially enter the race until after March 1, he's said that "if I were a betting man, I would say I'm in." Like Bateman, and unlike Kean, Woodcock is a proponent of the death penalty. He also voted for the income tax before his defeat in 1973. He's also taken the unauthorized approach toward funding his office of suing the County Board of Freeholders for additional money. Not once but three times.

Meanwhile, the Newark Star-Ledger revealed that Byrne's daughter has been using a state car and state credit card while attending college in Washington D.C. When questioned, Byrne denied any knowledge of the arrangement---saying his wife takes care of the state cars. Undoubtedly, many Republicans borrowed a line from Byrne's budget message earlier that week and told each other, "...and that's something worth cheering about."

Regardless of the primary outcomes, Jersey voters will probably have one additional choice in November. State Sen. Anthony Imperiale(Ind-Newark) could cut votes from both parties. He leaves little confusion where he stands on any issue. In October's Columbus Day parade, he wore only a barrel to symbolize his opposition to the income tax. His championship of white ethnics in Newark has been amply chronicled in the press. He runs a detective agency, is followed by a bodyguard, once taught karate, carries a gun "in performance of my work as an investigator," and clearly is a man on whom Jersey politicians should turn their backs with care.
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