

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-00875-5 - Above Politics: Bureaucratic Discretion and Credible Commitment

Gary J. Miller and Andrew B. Whitford

Excerpt

[More information](#)

I

Introduction

CONFRONTATION

Many public officials regard U.S. senators as powerful individuals – especially so mid-level bureaucrats whose agencies are subject to oversight by those senators. On April 9, 1987, when four bureaucrats from the Federal Home Loan Bank Board (FHLBB) were summoned from their San Francisco office to Washington, DC, to face five U.S. senators, it should have been a simple matter of those elected officials flexing their senatorial muscle. Once the senators made their wishes clear, they would obviously expect the bureaucrats to defer readily to their requests on behalf of a constituent.

Moreover, the FHLBB, responsible for regulating savings and loans, was in an especially vulnerable position as the scope of what came to be called the “savings and loan (S&L) crisis” became clearer. Ed Gray, chairman of the FHLBB and the boss of the four summoned bureaucrats, had shown a great deal of deference to the same group of U.S. senators during a meeting held a week earlier. When asked later why he had accommodated the senators by flying the bureaucrats across the country for a second meeting, Gray answered simply, “Because they were senators. And I considered senators to be pretty powerful people” (Goldin, 1990). A close examination of the context reveals numerous reasons for the bureaucrats to be at least as deferential as Gray had been.

CONGRESSIONAL WEAPONS

The congressional dominance approach assumes that congressmen – or, more specifically, particular congressmen on the relevant committees – possess sufficient rewards and sanctions to create agencies that pursue policies of interest to the current committee members; those agencies that fail to do so are confronted with sanctions.

– Weingast & Moran (1983, 768)

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-00875-5 - Above Politics: Bureaucratic Discretion and Credible Commitment

Gary J. Miller and Andrew B. Whitford

Excerpt

[More information](#)

First of all, the senators were in a position to control critical funding for the FHLBB. The agency had sought funds from Congress for recapitalization of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation; in the face of unprecedented thrift failures, the FHLBB would be hamstrung if Congress did not replenish the fund. To guarantee passage of the recapitalization bill, Chairman Gray had recently agreed to House Speaker Jim Wright's demands that Gray force beneficial S&L debt restructuring for a bankrupt borrower named Craig Hall. Gray acquiesced, and Wright, in return, allowed the recapitalization to come to a vote (Black, 2005, 96–97).

Funding limits could also prevent the FHLBB from hiring enough staffers to identify problem thrifts. Individual deposits at savings and loans, or thrifts, were federally insured up to \$100,000; if the agency could not hire enough bank examiners to find out which thrifts were going under, then the tax-paying public faced the real prospect of having to pay a huge bill to compensate depositors for the loss of those deposits as the thrifts went under. Yet neither the Reagan administration nor Congress had been responsive to what the FHLBB leaders saw as a crisis. Staffing was still short.

Through the confirmation process, the senators were in a position to have enormous influence over appointments to the three-person Bank Board, which ran the FHLBB. The senators could choose to approve board members who could make life miserable for the bureaucrats. This was not just a possibility; the most recent board appointee had been Lee Henkel, a business partner of Charles Keating Jr. Keating, the owner of Lincoln Savings and Loan, along with its parent company American Continental Corporation (a major development firm based in Ohio), was the constituent being discussed with the five senators, and he had used his political influence to obtain the appointment for Henkel. (In fact, just two days before the meeting with the bureaucrats, Henkel had been forced to resign when it became apparent that he had proposed rule changes to favor Keating.)

Furthermore, because Chairman Gray's term would be up in two months, the five U.S. senators would be in a position to influence the appointment of the bureaucrats' new boss. In fact, the Senate *did* later confirm someone who undermined the bureaucrats. The new head of the Bank Board as of two months after the meeting was Danny Wall, a "creature of the Senate" (Goldin, 1990) who had worked on the Senate Banking Committee. After being confirmed as chair, Wall proceeded to cut the San Francisco bureaucrats off from access to some of the cases of S&L fraud that most concerned them.

As members of Congress, the senators at the April 9 meeting also had the authority to call any of the bureaucrats to testify in hearings. Bill Black, one of the four bureaucrats, frequently testified before Congress about the actions of the FHLBB. Black's relationship with Speaker Wright had deteriorated; in the preceding February, Black and others were called to a meeting with Wright about the FHLBB's investigations of Texas thrifts. This meeting had ended with Wright calling Black a liar and screaming profanities

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-00875-5 - Above Politics: Bureaucratic Discretion and Credible Commitment

Gary J. Miller and Andrew B. Whitford

Excerpt

[More information](#)*Introduction*

3

(Black, 2005, 128–129; Riccucci, 1995, 40). A summons to Congress could be a painful experience.

Nor were the senators at the April 9 meeting there simply as individual legislators; several held key committee positions that came with official oversight for the FHLBB. Political scientists argue that members of senate oversight committees have more influence, compared to committee non-members, on bureaucratic behavior. “The congressional committee system provides the key institutional link between interest groups and the provision of benefits. Committees and subcommittees dominate policymaking” (Barry, 1989, 149). The senators at the April 9 meeting had the committee connections to expect deference from the FHLBB bureaucrats. Both Alan Cranston (D-CA) and Don Riegle (D-MI) had seniority on the Senate Banking Committee, and Riegle was soon to become its chair

Ultimately, of course, the senators were also in a position to legislate a change in the statutory authority of the FHLBB. In fact, that was in the cards as well: the FHLBB was eliminated by an act of Congress within a few years and its responsibilities given to the newly created Office of Thrift Supervision (OTS). In contrast to the FHLBB, the OTS was located within the Department of the Treasury, thereby decreasing its political independence.

So all of the weapons that the U.S. Senate could hold over federal bureaucrats – budget, staffing, leadership, statutory authority, and committee power – were very much in play at the meeting in 1987. The senators had a few tasty carrots and many painful sticks with which to induce the bureaucrats to give them what they wanted. And what the five senators wanted was fairly simple: they wanted the four bureaucrats to back off in their investigation of a constituent – Charles Keating Jr. – in exchange for Keating’s promise not to engage in further wrongdoing.

CHARLES KEATING PULLS A “FIRE ALARM”

One question, among many raised in recent weeks, had to do with whether my financial support in any way influenced several political figures to take up my cause. I want to say in the most forceful way I can: I certainly hope so.

– Charles Keating, Jr. (quoted in Goldin, 1990)

The legislators requested that meeting with the bureaucrats in response to what McCubbins and Schwartz would characterize as a “fire alarm” from Keating (McCubbins & Schwartz, 1984). “Fire alarm” oversight consists of legislators waiting for constituents – like Keating – to vocalize concerns about the actions of bureaucrats. It contrasts with “police patrol” oversight, in which legislators actively spend resources to find bureaucratic practices that they find objectionable and wish to change. The latter type of oversight is costly indeed; that kind of close scrutiny requires that more congressional staff be devoted to oversight than Congress could possibly afford. “Fire alarm” oversight, in contrast, allows

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-00875-5 - Above Politics: Bureaucratic Discretion and Credible Commitment

Gary J. Miller and Andrew B. Whitford

Excerpt

[More information](#)

legislators to respond directly to expressions of concerns from constituents, thereby building support for reelection without the expense of close monitoring. The possibility of effective fire alarms supports the case made by congressional scholars that legislators have the capacity, as well as the motivation, to shape bureaucratic decisions to enhance their own reelection chances (Weingast, 1984).

Keating's was a classic case of "fire alarm" oversight. He had brought his own case to the attention of the senators – and the senators were in a position to reap significant electoral benefit by responding favorably to him. Charles Keating argued that the FHLBB was harassing him and threatening actions that could bankrupt his companies.

In particular, Keating was trying to get the FHLBB to change a rule, called the *direct investment rule*, which it had promulgated in the face of excessively risky investments from S&Ls across the country. In the wake of the deregulation of the S&L industry in the early 1980s, more and more S&Ls were putting more and more of their depositors' money directly into risky investments such as shopping malls and hotels, rather than loaning it out in the form of safe, 30-year mortgages. Because the depositors' money was federally insured, this strategy put the taxpayers at risk; in response, the direct investment rule required S&Ls to constrain the proportion of their funds put at risk in this way so as to forestall bankruptcies and reduce taxpayer expense. In search of the greatest possible profits, the financial institutions that Keating controlled had far exceeded the limit of risky investments as specified by the rule.

Keating not only alerted the senators to his problems but he also emphasized the economic significance of the case by making large campaign contributions. One of the five senators at the April 1987 meeting was Alan Cranston (D-CA), who had been a party whip since 1977. He could claim Keating as a constituent because of the California location of Lincoln Savings. He had met with Charles Keating 12 times and had received from him campaign contributions of \$889,000 (Pizzo, Fricker, & Muolo, 1989, 290).

Both senators from Arizona – Democrat Dennis DeConcini and Republican John McCain – were in the meeting room. Keating was a constituent of theirs as well, because American Continental Corporation, the parent company of Lincoln Savings, was developing "The Phoenician" – a luxury resort of unprecedented cost in the Phoenix region. DeConcini and McCain had received campaign contributions of \$55,000 and \$112,000, respectively, from Keating (Pizzo et al., 1989, 290).

The American Continental Corporation was originally based in Ohio, which explained the presence of yet another senator, John Glenn (D-OH), who had received \$200,000 in contributions from Keating. Keating also owned the Hotel Pontchartrain in downtown Detroit; hence the presence of Don Riegle (D-MI).

According to an influential theory of congressional-bureaucratic interactions, generally referred to as "congressional dominance," the senators in this

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-00875-5 - Above Politics: Bureaucratic Discretion and Credible Commitment

Gary J. Miller and Andrew B. Whitford

Excerpt

[More information](#)*Introduction*

5

case should have had, through fire alarms, the information necessary to alert them to a constituent-serving opportunity, and they should have had both the motivation and the means to set the FHLBB bureaucrats straight on the subject of Charles Keating and enforcement of the direct investment rule. As Weingast and Moran point out in a landmark first paper on the subject, congressional oversight is of interest to members of Congress because of their reelection motivation: they can enhance their reelection goals by the efficient shaping of bureaucratic behavior. “The congressional dominance approach assumes that congressmen – or, more specifically, particular congressmen on the relevant committees – possess sufficient rewards and sanctions to create agencies that pursue policies of interest to the current committee members; those agencies that fail to do so are confronted with sanctions” (Weingast & Moran, 1983, 768). The confrontation with the Keating Five (as they came to be known) should have been an easy test of congressional dominance and a lopsided success for the senators.

The Nature of the Meeting

The only thing we have as regulators is our credibility. We have to preserve it.

– Michael Patriarca (quoted in Pizzo et al., 1989, 520)

The bureaucrats at the April 9 meeting included James Cirona, president of the Federal Home Loan Bank of San Francisco, which had been investigating Lincoln Savings and Loan. With him were Michael Patriarca and Richard Sanchez from the FHLBB, who had been supervising the investigation, and William Black, general counsel for the San Francisco Home Loan Bank.

The senators’ position at the meeting was that Keating’s hard work and entrepreneurship had transformed Lincoln Savings into a huge success by. Now, Keating was complaining that he could not execute his business plan as he wanted, because of prolonged and hostile investigations from the FHLBB. The senators wanted to know why Keating was being investigated and why the investigation was going on so long.

After listening to the senators, Cirona began his response with a mild question about the propriety of having the meeting at all: “This meeting is very unusual. To discuss a particular company.” Senator DeConcini responded, “It’s very unusual for us to have a company that could be put out of business by its regulators” (Pizzo et al., 1989, 517). The senators were clearly determined to get an explanation on behalf of Keating, no matter how unorthodox the meeting was.

Cirona and his team then explained to the senators that the investigation was motivated by more than a difference of opinion about the evaluation of a few pieces of property. The FHLBB’s examiners had documented that Lincoln was not doing the required underwriting of its loans, was getting bad appraisals of its projects, was recording false profits, and was extending too much credit

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-00875-5 - Above Politics: Bureaucratic Discretion and Credible Commitment

Gary J. Miller and Andrew B. Whitford

Excerpt

[More information](#)

to particular favorites. They had found that Lincoln had no credit reports for any of the 52 people in the 52 files they examined.

When Sen. DeConcini heard this, he said, “I have trouble with this discussion. Are you saying that their underwriting practices were illegal or just not the best practice?” (Pizzo et al., 1989, 518). At this point, the regulators reminded the senators that Keating was not merely exercising bad judgment with his own money – he was also misusing federally insured deposits. They made it clear that Lincoln Savings was in great danger of becoming another very large expense to the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation (FSLIC), and thus one that the increasingly unhappy American taxpayer would have to bear. When pressed, the regulators revealed that they were also referring the case to the Department of Justice for criminal prosecution.

During the meeting the senators were clearly struggling to readjust their view of Keating and Lincoln Savings. They had come to the meeting prepared to defend the property rights of a constituent who was evidently providing jobs and paying taxes in their respective states. Now they were being asked to see Keating as a crook and the bureaucrats as the defenders of property rights and sound business practice. The senators referred to a letter in support of Keating by noted economist Alan Greenspan, later chairman of the Federal Reserve System of the United States from 1987 to 2006. They also referred to a letter from the major accounting firm Arthur Young, which Keating had passed around the Senate, claiming that the FHLBB’s examination was “inordinately long and bordered on harassment” (Pizzo et al., 1989, 519). In response, in an exchange that seems prescient in view of the Enron/Anderson accounting scandals a dozen years later, Patriarca pointed out cases of manipulation and deception in Lincoln’s books, and said, “Now I don’t care how many accountants they get to say that’s right. It’s wrong. The only thing we have as regulators is our credibility. We have to preserve it.” (520).

In reply, DeConcini asked, “Why would Arthur Young say these things? They have to guard their credibility too. They put the firm’s neck out with this letter.”

PATRIARCA: “They have a client.”

DECONCINI: “You believe they’d prostitute themselves for a client?”

PATRIARCA: “Absolutely. It happens all the time” (Pizzo et al., 1989, 520).

The meeting ended with the FHLBB bureaucrats reminding the U.S. senators that the criminal referral was confidential information and warning them that the Department of Justice would view leakage of this possibility with hostility. They made it clear that Lincoln would either have to change its practices or it would go bankrupt. The senators, except DeConcini, seemed to have a dawning awareness that they, not the bureaucrats, were the ones who had put themselves at risk by attending the meeting. The bureaucrats seemed to have more independence than the senators had thought. In a meeting between the

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-00875-5 - Above Politics: Bureaucratic Discretion and Credible Commitment

Gary J. Miller and Andrew B. Whitford

Excerpt

[More information](#)*Introduction*

7

political masters and the bureaucratic servants, it was the servants who were setting things straight.

WHEN BUREAUCRATS ACT INDEPENDENTLY

Bureaucracy is not an obstacle to democracy but an inevitable complement to it.

– Joseph Schumpeter (1950, 206)

Governments all around the world, democratic as well as dictatorial, naturally regard the control of bureaucrats as an important aspect of effective governance. This conception is mirrored in political science and public administration, where bureaucratic “accountability” is taken as the ultimate standard of democratic administration and “accountability” refers to bureaucratic responsiveness to political figures. Yet here was a case in which bureaucrats confronted five U.S. senators head-on and let them know that they were going to proceed in a way that was exactly the opposite of what the senators had in mind. Where did the bureaucrats from the FHLBB get the nerve to defy the senators?

The case of the FHLBB bureaucrats is especially dramatic, but it illustrates a much larger question – under what circumstances do bureaucrats act independently of their political masters? In what ways do bureaucrats seek to exercise independence, and what resources do they rely on to guard their independence? And perhaps most provocatively, why do elected officials sometimes tolerate or even encourage bureaucratic independence?

Clearly, one of the resources that bureaucrats have is expertise. Even in a Weberian bureaucracy, the political master appears as a “dilettante” before the expertise of the bureaucrat. This was especially true in the Keating case. The U.S. senators did not have their own staff with them at the Keating meeting, and their lack of knowledge about banking, accounting, the practices of the FHLBB, and the Keating case in particular was apparent.

When Cirona began his remarks, he asked, “How long do we have to speak to you? A half-hour? An hour?” (Pizzo et al., 1989, 517). By the way he asked the question, it is apparent that he knew that his team had the answers to the questions the senators had raised in their opening remarks and could give them, if the senators would allow them enough time to respond. And Cirona was correct. With each passing stage of the meeting, as the transcripts show, the senators had fewer and shorter remarks, whereas the bureaucrats provided longer and more detailed declamations on the shortcomings of Keating and Lincoln Savings. When challenged, the senators, who had been confident enough to appear without the support of committee staff, could not match the expertise of the bureaucrats.

Furthermore, the bureaucrats’ professional standing reinforced their bureaucratic expertise. The bureaucrats did not just happen to know a great deal about the Keating case; they did not just happen to have strong opinions. The four bureaucrats at the meeting were trained as lawyers and accountants and acted

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-00875-5 - Above Politics: Bureaucratic Discretion and Credible Commitment

Gary J. Miller and Andrew B. Whitford

Excerpt

[More information](#)

with the assurance that any professional of good standing would see the facts largely as they did. They also knew that other professionals would offer them a degree of encouragement and protection, as long as they maintained appropriate standing as professionals – and that their standing would be at risk if they perverted professional standards in the face of political pressure.

This nexus of expertise and professionalism was supplemented by a second important combination of factors: the law itself supported bureaucratic independence at the FHLBB. The FHLBB was not acting outside of the law in investigating Charles Keating and Lincoln Savings. On the contrary, it was acting pursuant to a charge in the statutes that the senators had themselves voted on. Under the statutes, the FHLBB had the authority to pass rules with the power of law, and the direct investment rule being flaunted by Keating was one such rule. It was the FHLBB's expertise, in combination with the dawning recognition that their constituent might be on the wrong side of the law, that gave the senators pause.

The force of law worked together with public support for the agency. In general, the public views bureaucrats in a strongly negative light. References to “bureaucrats” in the media are largely critical and often hostile. Members of Congress and even presidents are able to win election based in part on denunciations of “Washington bureaucracy” and on their avowed intention to represent their constituents in battle with those bureaucrats. This was a major theme of the successful campaigns of Jimmy Carter, Ronald Reagan, and George W. Bush. It was also a theme that Keating himself expressed quite clearly in his own defense, claiming to be persecuted by “faceless bureaucrats” who demonstrated their typical antipathy toward true-blue American entrepreneurs. When the news media picked up on the meeting with the Keating Five, Cranston took aim at the bureaucrats as well; he said that his only message to the FHLBB officials had been, “Don't keep Keating twisting in the limbo of your bureaucrats' malicious indecision” (Adams, 1989, 254).

The public distaste for bureaucrats only goes so far, however. The public also holds politicians in some contempt – especially politicians who intervene on behalf of privileged constituents and at the expense of taxpayers. Bureaucrats who can claim that they are “above politics” – that is, uninfluenced by the partisan considerations that drive their political masters – can use that claim to gain leverage. Even bureaucrats who are quite politically savvy and strategic – such as Robert Moses of the Triborough Bridge Authority (Caro, 1974), J. Edgar Hoover of the FBI, and Admiral Rickover, the advocate of the nuclear submarine (E. Lewis, 1980), to name just a few – often make the claim of being “above politics,” and the credibility of that claim is one of their most successful political stratagems. These bureaucrats were all quite aware of the advantages of claiming to be “above politics,” and they knew that this claim of political neutrality was itself a foundation for their political influence (Safire, 2008, 4).

That is just what happened in the case of Lincoln Savings. One of the bureaucrats leaked news – and detailed notes – of the meeting to the press. Subsequent

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-00875-5 - Above Politics: Bureaucratic Discretion and Credible Commitment

Gary J. Miller and Andrew B. Whitford

Excerpt

[More information](#)*Introduction*

9

newspaper editorials focused on the link between Keating's campaign contributions and the senators' efforts on his behalf, casting the meeting as improper political interference with the actions of bureaucratic experts trying to protect the public interest. As the cost of the S&L bailout ballooned with each passing month, the public was sympathetic to the bureaucrats, seeing them as trying to protect taxpayer money. By 1995 almost 50% of the thrifts (1,645) had been closed, most with evidence of criminal wrongdoing. The assets lost in the thrift failures totaled \$150–\$175 billion (Black, 2005, 62). The single most expensive thrift failure was Keating's Lincoln Savings, which cost taxpayers \$3.4 billion when it was finally taken over two years after the meeting with the Keating Five. Citizens increasingly realized that, even though their individual deposits were safe, they faced risks in the form of higher taxes or deficits – risks imposed in part by legislative unwillingness to confront the Keatings of the thrift industry.

The confrontation between five senators and four mid-level bureaucrats turned out quite differently than the senators ever could have imagined. The actions of the bureaucrats, in defying the senators and in leaking the transcript of the meeting, had real, negative effects on the reelection goals of the senators involved. All of them felt intense pressure. The senators were soundly pilloried, and their political careers threatened with a sudden end. Some of the senators apologized publicly. Senator Cranston chose to retire in 1990 after his approval rating plunged to a record low. DeConcini and Riegle did not run for reelection. Senator McCain felt that the publicity surrounding his participation was more painful than his years of torture in a North Vietnamese prison camp (M. Lewis, 1997), and he rebuilt his political career around campaign finance reform. The meeting with the FHLBB bureaucrats had changed all these senators' lives.

THE STRUCTURE OF BUREAUCRATIC INDEPENDENCE

In addition to these two factors – having expert professionals and public support for a legal obligation – the most surprising source of bureaucratic independence from elected politicians is a set of institutions for which elected politicians are themselves responsible. Like many other agencies created throughout the 20th century, the FHLBB was established in such a way as to protect the professional staff from immediate political pressure. It was an example of an “independent regulatory commission.” Such multi-headed commissions are assumed to be more difficult to control than single-headed commissions (D. E. Lewis, 2003; Seidman, 1970). Furthermore, the Bank Board, by law, had to be bipartisan: the three board members could not all be from the same party. As a result of the decision in *Humphrey's Executor v. United States* (1935) 295 U.S. 602, commissioners such as Gray from the FHLBB could not be fired at the whim of the president or anyone else: they served for fixed five-year rotating terms.

In 1985 and 1986, because Gray could not be fired, both Keating and Treasury Secretary Regan applied pressure to get him to quit the Federal Home Loan

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-00875-5 - Above Politics: Bureaucratic Discretion and Credible Commitment

Gary J. Miller and Andrew B. Whitford

Excerpt

[More information](#)

Bank Board. Keating disparaged his abilities and then offered him a job in his own bank at an exorbitant salary. Nevertheless, nothing could move Gray until his term ran out, shortly after the meeting with the Keating Five.

The FHLBB was also structurally independent, in that it reported to no administrative organization above the Bank Board. In fact, it was even more independent than other independent commissions because it supervised 12 regional Federal Home Loan Banks, themselves privately capitalized and acting as banks. Further, because it was an independent agency, only Bank Board chair Edwin Gray could fire its staff (including the four bureaucrats meeting with the Keating Five). Despite bitter denunciations from members of Congress, Gray refused to fire his regulators.

The point is that, when it created the FHLBB in 1934, Congress built structural features into the agency that ultimately enabled its bureaucratic defiance toward five powerful U.S. Senators. This case is multiplied many times over, because there are many independent agencies in the federal and state governments. The FHLBB is just one of numerous agencies created in the image of a reform model developed as part of a Progressive Era recipe for change.

Progressivism was a response to the hierarchical partisan politics at the turn of the 20th century, in which the abuses of state and local party “bosses” were apparent to any newspaper reader and were especially hated by professionals, the middle class, and small business operators. These groups avidly supported the crusades of such doughty Progressive leaders as Robert M. LaFollette of Wisconsin, George W. Norris of Nebraska, and especially Teddy Roosevelt. Whereas Progressive reforms such as primary elections and stricter registration requirements were directed at reducing the electoral influence of party machines, other reforms were designed to give a larger role to professional experts. Although the Progressive movement ended with World War I, bureaucracies maintained their structures of bipartisan commissions, fixed terms of office, professional staffs, and a charge to regulate “in the public interest,” the vagueness of which served to establish an expectation of independence.

BAD BUREAUCRATS?

On the one hand, granting bureaucrats independence increases their capacity to make welfare-improving decisions. On the other hand, that independence gives them opportunities to act without regard to the public’s preferences. Politicians could limit that independence by imposing tighter accountability standards. An alternative is that bureaucrats would be responsive to internal checks that would guide them like a lodestar away from narrow interests to the broader public good.

And this alternative is what we argue happened with the FHLBB’s San Francisco bureaucrats. Bill Black and his fellow bureaucrats stood up to politicians in a way that limited political control but improved policy outcomes. In this