

sion of the American spirit . . . For most people now, the Declaration means what Lincoln told us it means," which he did in order "to

correct the Constitution without overthrowing it." Because of his speech at Gettysburg, Wills concludes, "we live in a different America."

### *Bureaucracy: Grow It Must*

"The Shrink-Proof Bureaucracy" by Jonathan Walters, in *Governing* (Mar. 1992), 2300 N St. N.W., Ste. 760, Washington, D.C. 20037.

Politicians with their eyes on the mayor's office or the governor's mansion often promise to cut overgrown governments down to size. For all such campaign talk, however, state and local government employment—which now stands at more than 15 million—has risen by about 20 percent over the last dozen years. [The ranks of the 3.1 million federal civilian employees, by contrast, increased by only 0.6 percent in 1980–89.] During the '80s, such state and local growth outstripped population gains by two-to-one; in fact, in some big cities, such as Washington, D.C., public employment increased even though population was *declining*.

It is easy to see why the public payroll is such a tempting target for budget-minded politicians, observes *Governing* staff writer Jonathan Walters. According to an analysis by the Tax-Free Municipal Bond division of Dean Witter Reynolds, states would have saved \$12 billion had their personnel growth in 1980–89 only kept pace with population growth. New York State alone would have saved \$2.7 billion—more than three times its current projected deficit. Municipal finance specialist Phil Dearborn, executive director of the Washington Research Center, estimates that the state and local "bloat," nationwide, averages 5–10 percent of total payroll. So what makes it so difficult for mayors and governors to eliminate it?

To begin with, Walters points out, there are often political complications. "A huge proportion of middle managers in any city government have politically influential allies willing to go to bat for them; that is one reason they got to be managers."

Then there are the civil-service complications. When New Jersey Governor Jim Florio took office in early 1990, he thought it would

be possible, in a state work force of more than 100,000, to find 1,000 people who would not be missed. "But it turned out not to be that simple," Walters writes. "Eliminating any position, even a superfluous one, can trigger an intricate chain of civil service 'bumping,' the process by which more senior staff move down to force out less senior staff as positions are eliminated. In order to fire 1,000 people, Florio learned, he would have to send notices to 20,000 people that their jobs might be affected." Legislatures could change such rules, of course, but somehow they are never eager to do so.

Supposing the would-be bloat-buster surmounts the political and civil-service hurdles, there is still another obstacle: sheer resistance from the affected public servants. In New Jersey, for example, Walters says, some agencies "have simply ignored" Florio's latest request to identify jobs that can be eliminated. Often, the officials out to get rid of the bloat antagonize the very people they need to help them do it. "The more talk from mayors and governors of cleaning out the deadweight with shovels, the fiercer the [bureaucracy's] resistance to change," Walters notes.

Yet, despite all the obstacles, some governments do manage to trim the payroll. In New Orleans, for example, municipal employment has plummeted in the last 10 years from 12,000 to 6,000. Mayor Sidney J. Barthelemy, elected in 1986, simply had no choice: He faced a \$30 million budget deficit. Such "truly horrendous fiscal problems," Walters says, are apparently the only force strong enough "to restrain or bust bloated bureaucracy . . . Only when budgets have to be cut drastically do bureaucracies feel the bite." Otherwise, he concludes, "bloat is inevitable."

### *Ike's Hidden Hand On Civil Rights*

"Shattering the Myth About President Eisenhower's Supreme Court Appointments" by Michael A. Kahn, in *Presidential Studies Quarterly* (Winter 1992), 208 East 75th St., New York, N.Y. 10021.

President Dwight D. Eisenhower is often portrayed as having been unsympathetic to civil

rights and disappointed by the rulings of his Supreme Court appointees, particularly Chief Jus-