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INTRODUCTION

All the world's a stage,
And all the men and women merely players;
They have their exits and their entrances;
And one man in his time plays many parts,...

Shakespeare As You Like It II.vii.139

Understanding of political life is rooted in its social setting. It must be viewed in terms of the people who give it substance. Political theory rests upon theories of man and society.

One of these theories is known as "role." The word, Webster informs us, means a character assigned or assumed; a part played by an actor or a singer.\(^1\) Obviously, then, the term is theatrical, and obviously, the theatrical and sociological use of the term is closely interrelated.

Politics is drama. It is played on a stage we call society. The particular theatre here is the Office of Governor of Ohio. The actors are men of varying backgrounds, interests, and temperaments, but all have at least one thing in common: each has played the stage of the theatre in question.

Erving Goffman offers us the concept of role in a manner appropriate to our subject:

The stage presents things that are make believe; presumably life presents things that are real and sometimes not well-rehearsed. More important, perhaps,
on the stage one player presents himself in the guise of a character to characters projected by other players; the audience constitutes a third party to the interaction--one that is essential and yet, if the stage performance were real, one that would not be there. In real life, the three parties are compressed into two; the part one individual plays is tailored to the parts played by others present, and yet these others also constitute the audience.

Thus, the role concept involves two basic interaction processes, role playing and role taking, and the two fit together reciprocally. If we conceive of the play of life as being presented on a societal stage, then each of us plays a role, or configuration of roles that is unique in the drama. And one behaves differently in different roles because one is expected to do so.

Glen Vernon tells us that role definitions provide us with the script that we, as actors, follow. Role definitions, he says, are a particular type of norm definitions, defined as plans of action or expected behavior patterns felt to be appropriate to a given situation. The role definition script thus specifies what should be done and how it should be accomplished. The distinctive characteristic of role definitions, as contrasted with norm definitions, is that these plans of action are associated with a particular position, or office.

If a role definition is the script that an actor follows in playing a role, then the script changes as he moves from one role to another. In changing, it calls for changes of vocabulary, costume, and emotional involvement. An actor behaves differently in different roles because he is expected to do so.
For every function performed in society there is a role, according to Joseph Bensman and Bernard Rosenberg. A role may be defined as "a socially defined or collective expectation." It consists of "the probable behavior that will be evoked in an individual by others under specified conditions." J. Milton Yinger offers us a similar view:

Role is that part of a full culture that is assigned as the appropriate rights and duties to those occupying a given position. These rights and duties usually interlock into a system with those of persons who occupy other positions. They are known to and accepted by all those who share the culture.

Yinger also warns us, however, that role may refer alternately to rights and duties prescribed for the occupants of a position or to individual performance of that position.

Here we have the concept of both role and structure. The term role will be used to refer to a cluster of related meanings and values that guide and direct an individual's behavior in a given social setting. The term structure will be used to refer to a cluster of related meanings and values that govern a given social setting, including the relationships of all the individual roles that are expected parts of it. A structure and the roles that are related to it "are two aspects of the same thing, one looked at from the standpoint of the individual, the other viewed from the standpoint of the social setting."

Talcott Parsons tells us that individuals in roles are organized to form what we call collectivities. "Both roles and collectivities, however, are subject to ordering and control by norms which are differentiated according to the functions of these units and to their
situations, and by values which define the desirable type of system of relationships.\textsuperscript{8}

We may view political actors as playing both primary and secondary roles. Primary roles are those learned by virtually all members of the society, such as son or daughter, husband or wife, father or mother.\textsuperscript{9} In each case, the actor not only learns the role he is likely to occupy, but the reciprocal role as well. "The learning of such roles constitutes the heart of what the sociologist terms socialization, the process whereby the individual learns those things which permit him to be a functioning part of his society."\textsuperscript{10}

James D. Thompson and Donald R. Van Houten remind us, however, that societies become more highly structured than this. Division of labor becomes necessary, and thus we find specialization of roles. It is at this point that some if not all individuals learn roles which are not taught to all. These specialized roles are regarded as secondary roles.\textsuperscript{11} Learning them involves two things, (1) technical content, and (2) social structure content, or role relationships. Secondary roles are specialized, thus providing important bases for differentiation among persons. For our purposes in this study, the foregoing needs the elaboration provided in Vernon's concepts of "ascribed" and "achieved" positions. Ascribed positions, he advises us, involve the necessary qualifications achieved through birth, conditions over which the individual has little, if any, influence, and which he is powerless to change. Achieved positions have the reverse characteristic of meeting certain established criteria. The individual may achieve the position.\textsuperscript{12} The position of Governor of Ohio is an achieved position.
Social scientists distinguish three basic types of role networks, (1) the dyad, (2) the group, and (3) the role-set. When only one other role is involved, we speak of the dyad. A governor and the chairman of his party, for example, would constitute a dyad. Repetitive dyads can be subject to heavy involvement of personalities, and while a governor may feel compelled by tradition, or his constituents' insistence, to maintain cordial relationships with a state chairman, personalities may be suppressed and role expectations strictly adhered to because there is potential volatility in the relationship.

Face-to-face groups, Thompson and Van Houten advise us, are more than a collection of dyads, and have distinctive characteristics of their own.

For one thing, third parties are built into relationships between any two members of the group, and can be either disruptive or facilitative. There are more observers of any individual's behavior and therefore the greater likelihood of insistence on his fulfillment of role obligations. At the same time, this means that there are more to insist that he receive his rewards. For both reasons, the face-to-face group can be less brittle than dyad.

The third of our role networks, the role-set, is a concept offered to us by Robert K. Merton. Roles usually cluster into positions, he says, and the person occupying a position is involved in reciprocal relations in several different directions and with several different role partners. This collection of roles reciprocal to a particular position has been called a role-set, so we may say that role-set focuses on one position and its reciprocating roles. The concept is important here, for example, in any discussion of a gubernatorial relationship with legislators, or officials of his political party.
Obviously the reciprocating roles in the dyad are part of the role-set, and the reciprocal roles in the group are part of the role-set. But in complicated structures, the role-set may include dyadic and group role relationships that are separated from each other.\textsuperscript{17}

The position of governor, for example, involves dyads with department heads, colleagues, and others, and none of these necessarily in interaction with each other. Many episodes unfold in dyads or groups, "but the notion of role-set reminds us that a man's episodic behavior may be constrained and supported by roles out of sight during the episode."\textsuperscript{18} A governor's behavior in office while playing any one gubernatorial role, for example, may be significantly influenced by his role relationships with legislators, administrators, or other members of his political party.

Governors are role players, and are often pictured by political scientists as moving in a cluster, or constellation of roles. Yet, these pictures are often more speculative than empirical, and few have asked governors themselves about the idea that a governor wears a number of hats. In fact, there is a dearth of material in the field of governors generally. This situation, alone, may be reason enough for undertaking a study of gubernatorial roles, but at least two other reasons for such a study present themselves. One is that the men who occupy the offices of governor do not seem to be moving from them to positions in national politics with as much ease as in years past. One thinks of the late Governor Thomas E. Dewey, in 1948; Governor Adlai E. Stevenson, in 1952 and 1956, and of other political arenas in which strong governors have had national political ambitions upset.\textsuperscript{19}
Another reason is that one can theorize that power is lodged in the manner in which a governor plays his roles. Perhaps it is the speed with which he can change role, or the manner in which he accommodates role-shift that is the source of power. Certainly, some governors demonstrate remarkable ability to achieve while remaining in office, and others do not. Is the manner in which the roles are played a factor? Is the manipulation of dyadic, group, or role-set relationships involved?

Yet another reason is the continuing dialogue which finds governors at the center. The argument centers in the question of whether or not the fifty states, as significant political entities in the federal system, are finished. Consider, for example, the remarks of television commentator David Brinkley:

States are pretty much disappearing as a political force. They're almost through. I think in another generation they will be, politically speaking, just about insignificant.20

The late Senator Everett M. Dirksen, of Illinois, once predicted that the way things are going, "The only people interested in state boundaries will be Rand McNally."21 And Robert A. Dahl has observed:

...the states do not stand out as important institutions of democratic self-government. They are too big to allow for much in the way of civic participation--think of California and New York, each about as large in population as Canada or Yugoslavia and each larger than 80% of the countries of the world. Yet an American State is infinitely less important to citizens of that state than any democratic nation-state is to its citizens. Consequently the average American is bound to be much less concerned about the affairs of his state than of his city or country. Too remote to stimulate much participation by their citizens, and too big to make extensive participation possible anyway, these units intermediate between city and nation are probably destined for a kind of limbo of quasi-democracy.22

Political reality suggests, in spite of these somber observations, that the states will abide. M. Kent Jennings and Harmon Ziegler, for
example, in examining the question of the relevance of state government and politics for inhabitants of a state, offer the counter-argument:

...it is apparent that the states still loom large in the perspectives of the American public. Any attempted juggling of political units involving the states would probably confront a reservoir of mass attachments to the states as political entities. Coupled with historic traditions, legal preserves, and political utility of the states, this salience helps assure the continued prominence of the several states within the federal system.23

At the center of the state system, and its chief proponent in the eyes of the people, is the governor.24 "The governor's prestige and his power to move people and ideas within his state are the strongest weapons in each state's arsenal," says Terry Sanford, former governor of North Carolina. "The future of the American system could well be determined by his performance."

In the opinion of many, this performance will be determined by how well the governors handle the script called for by their various roles.

Literature in the field of the study of governors offers us two major scholarly efforts, and a number of textbook judgments. Coleman B. Ransone, Jr., using data collected in interviews with governors, staff, legislators, state officials, politicians, and newsmen "in some 25 states," presented an interesting study in 1956.25 His major thesis was a description and analysis of the functions of the American governor, with the primary purpose of presenting "a clearer picture of the governor's role in the day-to-day conduct of the business of state government."26 While Ransone makes some attempt to "differentiate between the governor's role in legislative policy and his role in administrative
policy," he finds that governors are primarily concerned with three areas, (1) policy formation, (2) public relations, and (3) management.27

Seventeen years earlier, before World War II, Leslie Lipson produced a study based on three years of travel in the United States with specific attention to eleven states. The central theme of his study, which utilized written material, official documents, and oral interviews, is "the leadership of the governor in the executive and legislative branches."28 Although the study utilizes a heavy historical emphasis in tracing the rise of the American governor from figurehead to leader, Lipson emphasizes two major roles, (1) the governor as legislative leader, and (2) the governor as chief executive.

Textbooks tend to identify and enumerate many more gubernatorial roles. Charles R. Adrian offers us, for example, one of the most comprehensive role constellations for the office of governor.29 He identifies the roles as chief of state, the voice of the people, chief executive, commander-in-chief, chief legislator, and chief of his party. Adrian admittedly does some borrowing in this selection from Clinton Rossiter's study of the presidency.30 Duane Lockard includes chief of state, chief executive, chief legislator, and chief politician in his role cluster.31 The late Peter Odegard saw gubernatorial roles as a cluster including ceremonial head, legislator, and chief executive.32 A New York Times writer selects the roles of symbol and conscience of the state, court of last resort, chief social worker, financial expert, chief tub-thumper, party fund-raiser, and patronage dispenser. 33 Frank Bane suggests a prodigious cluster which he identifies as chief
legislator, popular leader, top bracket executive, top planner (budgeter), scholar, politician, his own man, governor of all the people, and a grower in office.\textsuperscript{34}

Governors themselves have not been so specific. Perhaps the most specific in recent times was Terry Sanford, former governor of North Carolina, who suggests a cluster of roles including ceremonial head political leader, manager, chief planner, opinion leader, and spokesman for all.\textsuperscript{35} Former Governor John Chafee, of Rhode Island, also singled out the roles of chief executive, chief legislator, party chief, and chief promoter of the state's economy during an interview for use in a casebook in public administration.\textsuperscript{36}

Theory and concepts of gubernatorial roles offered by the foregoing, and by others, will be examined in greater detail in the following chapters. Presently, we need no more than the summary. One thing we do need, however, is some kind of an a priori model for a study of gubernatorial role assessments as provided by five former Ohio governors. We have observed that understanding of political life is rooted in its social setting, and that it must be viewed in terms of the people who give it substance. We have also observed that these five former governors are men of varying backgrounds, interests, and temperaments, but all have at least one thing in common: they have played the roles of Governor of Ohio.

We are guided by the advice of Glen Vernon in this study. "In studying role definitions," he advises, "we must, one way or another, ask those involved what the definitions are." And he observes that other terms could be used to identify the same thing we are calling role definitions, including role expectations, role prescriptions, role meaning, and role blueprint, or script. An important characteristic of the plans of action that we call role is that they are definitely associated with the position or office, and not with the individual who may, at the moment, be playing the role, Vernon elaborates. Thus, each of our five former governors has had the opportunity, over varying lengths of time, to ponder the roles in which they moved as governor. We must assume that while role playing, these men conformed more or less to the prescribed plans of action, but the plans of action per se go with the office. Thus, how each played his role resulted in some revamping of the role definition, and the changes were incorporated into the overall configuration. Role definitions are constantly changing. Nonetheless, the role definition goes with the position, not the player.

What kind of an a priori model should we use, then, in order to provide something for the governors to ponder? What is suggested is a model representing some logical composite of the role clusters suggested in both research and textbook literature, as well as by journalists and other former governors. This might be called the reciprocating role-set experimental model, as pictured below:
Figure 1.---Gubernatorial Reciprocal Role-Set, Experimental Model, Governor of Ohio, 1939-1971.

The model has as its core the "self" as governor. Self-awareness is a constant human phenomenon, and we define ourselves in terms of how our "self" is related to others and various aspects of life. Role definitions are an important component of self definitions. The self is the ego, Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan inform us, and whatever identifies with that ego. An ego is an actor using symbols, with a symbol being whatever has meaning or significance in any sense.
So each of the five governors entered the political arena not as an ego, but as a self. This, then, must be the role core, and rank ordered number one.

The other interlocking, identified roles are indicated in an arbitrary rank order. The order is generally indicated by foregoing sources, but only Ransone and Lipson have tended to assign a specific ranking, and these rankings have been only in general terms.

Our reciprocal gubernatorial role-set, with self at center, thus provides an ordered ranking of Chief of State, Chief Executive, Chief Legislator, Party Chief, Chief Judge and Juror, and Commander-In-Chief. The model implies, as it should, that the roles are interlocking and reciprocating, and that the actions of a governor in any one may very well affect the script and performance in another. Our project, then, was to determine what a better than representative sampling of Ohio governors, serving in the office during all but two years of a 32-year period, would construct as their model. Would they change our experimental model? Would they reshuffle the rank order? Would they assign equal ranking, perhaps, to some roles? And how, in their performance on the gubernatorial stage in Ohio, did they read the script, and perhaps change it for a successor?

The questions bring us to the question of experimental procedure. This is suggested by the observation by Vernon which we previously cited. 41 "In studying role definitions," he said, "we must, one way or another, ask those involved what the definitions are." What is suggested, of course, is the interview as a research instrument.
Although the interview is the only feasible method for acquiring certain kinds of information, and although it is often the most effective method for gathering information that could also be acquired by other methods, it is only one of three commonly used. The other two are (1) observation, and (2) the use of documents. The selection of the interview as the author's method of collecting information was based on both objective assessment of these other methods that might be used, and a subjective preference for it. The objective assessment of the first alternative technique—observation—was rejected for realistic reasons. Obviously, that is not possible now. Objective assessment of the second alternative technique—the use of documents—was that documents, no matter how well preserved, could not yield a full perception of gubernatorial roles. What was needed in this study was an assessment of what happened in a situation in which the respondent was a role playing participant in the past.

The writer's subjective preference is rooted in the fact that for some 20 years he was a political reporter and editor. Thus, he reasoned that he would be familiar with the technique. It is obvious, also, that a prerequisite for any interview is that the respondents be willing to be interviewed. Each of the five former governors indicated such willingness, and subsequently spent three to four hours responding to questions geared directly to the role core, and roles indicated on the a priori model.

Once it was determined that the proprietors of the information sought would be willing to make it available to the investigator, criteria for selecting a method had to be considered. The criterion
of accessibility had already been met. Another criterion, however
is accuracy. "Error and distortion can occur in any method of data
gathering. The respondent may have a faulty memory; he may distort
unconsciously for a number of reasons; or he may deliberately mislead
the interviewer."43

Yet another criterion for selection of method is relevance.
Relevance of data obtained by interview has two separate aspects.44
First is the problem of separating useful from non-useful information.
It may be inherent in the method of collecting data. The second aspect
is related to the logic or design of the study as well as to the method
used. It was decided that content analysis of the literature would
provide information about gubernatorial roles generally. Additionally,
it was decided that the choice of significant variables could also be
hinged to general knowledge, insight, and logic, since the author did
serve in the office of Governor of Ohio for more than six years.45

The writer's own qualifications as the investigator also needed
to be considered. It should be apparent, as experts have pointed out,
that some characteristics of the investigator--his age, his sex, his
ethnic background, perhaps his personal values--may, in a specific
study, render interviewing either impossible or inordinately diffi-
cult.46 It might be difficult, for example, for a young woman to
interview soldiers about their off-duty recreational patterns without
risking distorted responses.

The author discarded this possibility as no detrimental risk to
the interview in his case. He has been acquainted with the five
former governors, primarily as a journalist, but also as the campaign
participant and employee of one, for a number of years. Further, to prevent the aggrandizement of preference, in the event that his personal values might interfere, he had available to him the schedule structured (sometimes called standardized) interview. This interview is used for many purposes, such as determining public opinion on a wide range of issues, or the popularity of candidates in elections. It has been used by the author many times.

Because the structured interview is designed to collect the same information from each respondent, the answers of all respondents must be comparable and classifiable. That is, they must deal with precisely the same subject matter—and differences or similarities between the responses must reflect actual differences or similarities between the respondents. Such differences must not be due to questions asked or to meanings attributed to the questions by the respondents.

For example, if one governor were to be asked, "Did you have daily contact with legislators?" and the other "Did you contact legislators at least seven times weekly?" the two sets of responses would not be comparable.

The procedures for schedule design and data collection and analysis for the structured interview have been very thoroughly worked out. The schedule structured interview was selected because that is the form most commonly used to obtain standardization. Wording and sequence of the questions were determined in advance, and a cross-checking of responses was structured by the insertion of the same question in different word order. This form was selected and the alternative of the nonschedule structured interview rejected, because the nonschedule form aims
at achieving standardization without the use of a prepared schedule of questions.

To judge by current practice, according to experts, "most investigators believe that standardization is most effectively achieved with the schedule interview. The interviewer asks each question in its prescribed sequence, and records the response on the schedule, either verbatim or in special pre-coded spaces." For this study, both precoded spaces and verbatim responses were used, the responses being taped.

If the respondent did not hear or understand the question, the interviewer repeated it without rephrasing it. Because the interviewer's task was to read the questions, and record responses, his behavior from one interview to the next was partly standardized. An introduction and statement of purpose also was utilized in detail in order to provide further standardization.

The purpose in holding at all costs to the more extreme type of schedule interview was to make clear the assumption underlying its use. That assumption is that the responses validly differentiated one respondent from another because the stimulus was identical.

The central aim of any data-gathering methodology is to improve both the reliability and the validity of the information obtained. By reliability is meant the degree to which a given observation or measurement could be repeated by an independent observer with the same result. By validity is meant the extent to which we are able to observe or measure that which we intend to observe or measure.

Raymond L. Gorden warns us that from the interviewer's point of view, there are two basic tasks to be accomplished:
The main one is to maximize the flow of relevant and valid information. As a means to this end, he must maintain optimal interpersonal relations between himself and the respondent. Unlike a social conversation, the task of maintaining optimal interpersonal relations is subordinated as a means to the end of maximizing flow of useful information.49

The schedule structured interview was organized into seven basic sections, each relating in content to the arbitrary rank order numbering of the a priori model (See Appendix A). Section I was structured to elicit observations from the respondents for the structuring of Chapter I, "Governor As Self." The schedule of questions were expected to produce data regarding primary role, socialization, and ascribed position, and secondary role, specialization, and achieved position.

Section II relates to Chapter II, "Chief of State," and was aimed at producing respondent assessments of the importance of that role, if any, and its position in the rank-ordered hierarchy. Sections III, IV, V, VI, and VII also relate, in order to chapters dealing similarly with the arbitrary experimental a priori gubernatorial role concepts of chief executive, chief legislator, party chief, chief judge and juror, and commander-in-chief.

A final section, Section VIII, aimed at eliciting information which might be helpful in a final assessment of a gubernatorial role model. It also sought to determine whether or not one such gubernatorial role might be termed "chief federalist," and whether or not the five former governors feel that states are failing as a political force in the federal system.

Finally, the last section of the schedule structured interview seeks a final rank ordering, again, by the respondent governors.
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CHAPTER I

GOVERNOR AS SELF

This above all: to thine own self be true,...

Shakespeare Hamlet I.iii.79

Thus did a father complete his words of advice to a departing son on how he ought to behave in a foreign land. In advising Laertes what should be done and how it should be accomplished, Polonius gave his son a role definition, a plan of action associated with the position of the son of a high government official. But what is "thine own self," and how is it applicable here?

We are looking at gubernatorial roles, and we have created an arbitrary a priori model which locates a man holding the office as a "self" at the core of the model. A self definition is a label that we place on ourselves. Such labels include conceptions about how "me" is related to others, and to various aspects of life, together with any value definitions attached to these conceptions. Role definitions are thus an important component of self definitions.¹

Ernest Becker reminds us that man is a historical actor.² "His conduct is steered by symbols rather than driven from below." But the personal values of a person are rarely purely idiosyncratic. "They are shaped by his total life experience; the totality of role he has occupied and continues to occupy."³
Harold Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan elaborate for us that the self is ego and whatever it identifies with that ego. "A man has as many different social selves as there are distinct groups of persons about whose opinion he cares." Man, the historical actor, generally shows a different side of himself in each of these different groups, the authors explain, and "the self as here defined is the set of these 'different sides' in their inter-relatedness." Thus:

The person is conceived by his circle as an organic and psychological entity who is a "self," conscious of his own existence as a body and soul and aware of how others regard him. If he is to be the kind of a person his social circle needs, his "self" must possess in the opinion of the circle certain qualities, physical and mental, and not possess certain other qualities.

The self, then, is the ego, and it is constituted of all the roles which the ego adopts. But what about this process of adoption? Is it possible that, in that adoptive process, some persons become more agile than others in learning their scripts for a variety of roles because circumstances confront them with such demands? We can theorize that if man, during his malleable years, is confronted with the necessity of adjusting to a wider variety of roles than usual, he may develop role-shift skill which becomes a source of power in society at a later time.

Some roles are learned by virtually all members of society. They are transmitted as basic parts of the culture. Such roles may be as son or daughter, or as husband or wife. These are primary roles, and in each case, the actor involved not only learns the role he is likely to occupy, but its reciprocal role as well. It is the learning of such roles that constitutes what sociologists call socialization,
the process by which an individual learns things which permit him to be a functioning part of our society.\textsuperscript{7}

The foregoing, in turn, points us to the concept of ascribed positions, qualifications achieved through birth over which the individual has little, if any influence, and which he is powerless to change.\textsuperscript{8}

The five Ohio governors who provide the data for this study were born to ascribed positions, and they learned primary roles, and the reciprocal roles as well, during their boyhoods. But they went on to learn certain skills, and become governors, which points us to the concepts of secondary roles, arising out of specialization, and achieved positions, in this case the office of governor. Specialized roles are not taught to all, and they "grow up around a set of highly-developed techniques. Learning them involves (1) technical content, and (2) social structure content, or role relationships.\textsuperscript{9} Thus, achieved positions have the reverse characteristic of ascribed positions in that they "meet certain established criteria and the individual may achieve or acquire the position."\textsuperscript{10}

The foregoing raises another question which is translatable into theory: is it possible that an individual, holding an ascribed position and involved in the socialization process during his early years, can develop role-maneuvering capabilities beyond the normal primary role learning process due to unusual circumstances? Our theory is that this can happen, and that when it does, it provides the actor with the kind of specialization usually associated with secondary role learning, and thus special adaptability to achieve.
In this connection, we are reminded by Fred I. Greenstein:

The preschool years and the early school years are a time of great plasticity and receptivity; nothing in later life can compare with this period for the sheer volume of learning that takes place. 11

Greenstein also observes that early learning takes place at a time when fundamental personality characteristics are being formed. "Social and political learning which takes place at this point can become a part of the individual's basic psychic equipment." Irvin Child offers us an observation which reinforces our theory, observing that "tendencies first acquired can shape later learning." 12 And O. J. Harvey and his associates suggest that this early learning, "serves as an experimental filter through which impinging events are screened, gauged, and evaluated, a process which determines in large part what responses can and will occur..." 13

We are looking at gubernatorial roles here through the eyes and by way of the memories of five of the six Ohio governors who held office from 1939 to 1971. Thomas J. Herbert, the one not interviewed, served a two-year term in 1947 and 1948. Technically, there was a seventh governor. Lieutenant Governor John W. Brown, served a ten-day interim term when Frank J. Lausche departed in 1957 for the United States Senate.

The governors who were sampled served by far the largest number of years. Lausche served a total of ten, and James A. Rhodes served two four-year terms. John W. Bricker served six years (three two-year terms), and Michael V. DiSalle served the first four-year term. C. William O'Neill served the last two-year term. Thus, we are covering 30 of 32 years in office.
At this point, it is appropriate to examine these men as "selves." Examination of the data offered by our respondents by way of the schedule structured interview technique includes description of both their ascribed positions and primary role learning, and their secondary role learning and achieved positions. We will take the cast in order of appearance.

John William Bricker and a twin sister were born September 6, 1893, in a country home at a 200-acre farm near Mt. Sterling, Ohio. The parents were Lemuel Spencer Bricker, whose ethnic background was German, and Laura King Bricker, a mixture of English and Scotch-Irish. They were strict, middle-income Methodists, and avid Republicans who discussed party politics and public policies "very often." Both had grade school educations.

Senator Bricker describes his relationship with both parents as "very close," and feels that they were the strongest influence in his life. He also enjoyed a close relationship with his father's five brothers and two sisters, all of whom were frequent visitors to the Bricker farm.

Bricker describes his boyhood as "joyous," and said he had "quite a few good friends" of the same general social position as himself. He was "one of the gang," he said, "a typical farm boy" up through Mt. Sterling High School, a one-room public school building. He recalls that several teachers influenced him strongly, as well as several church-affiliated persons at the Methodist Church, which he attended regularly.
Most farm boys in those days worked hard at "minding their chores," both early morning and late evening. Among the most pleasant ones was the chore of keeping the baseball diamond mowed. "I always liked competitive games," Bricker recalls.

There was one thing, he believes, that differentiated him from his boyhood friends:

I read more. A great deal more. I liked science books, although I read all of the books I could lay my hands on. It was good to read. Exciting. I read of distant places and things, and of men of power. Books were hard to get, and we didn't have many around the house, but I used to clean out the box of them that came around from the State Library. It was the reading that was different from the others, I believe. Yes, that was it. I didn't think about it at the time.

John Bricker says also that he "thought a lot." Among his thoughts was college. "I used to think about it while working around the farm, but I figured I would never go. The farm did well, but there were bills."

He taught school for a year, and made $500 doing it, he recalls, using the money to pay off a note on the farm. It was not long after he did that, one spring, that he looked up from his plowing and saw his father coming across the field toward him.

"John," he recalls his father saying, "how would you like to go to college at Ohio State, in Columbus?" John said he would, and Lemuel Spencer Bricker told him he'd earned it, paying off the note and working around the place so hard.

John Bricker earned his bachelor of arts and law degrees at The Ohio State University, passing the Ohio State Bar examination in his junior year. He continued to work on the farm, although his parents
helped him in college. His father died in 1916. World War I came along, and he dropped out of law school at the end of his second year to become an Army chaplain. He sat on Army court martial boards while awaiting commission as a chaplain, but the war ended and he returned to law school, borrowing money to complete his studies. While there, he met Harriet Day, and they were married September 4, 1920. The couple have one adopted son. They lost a ten-months-old daughter.

Interested in party politics "as long as I can remember," John Bricker served as president of the Buckeye Republican Club in 1923, and became successively an attorney for the City of Grandview Heights, an assistant Ohio attorney general, and a member of the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio. His early interest in politics, he said, traces to going to county Republican political meetings with his father, and to a Republican National Convention, which he attended as a boy.

He did not plan a career of "stepping stones" to higher office, he said. It just worked out that way. He ran as the Republican candidate for attorney general and won election to the four-year term in 1931 and re-election in 1935. During that second term, he said, he decided to seek the office of governor, which he won in 1938 to end eight years of Democratic rule in the statehouse. He became the first Republican governor to serve three consecutive terms. His mother died while he was serving his second term.

In 1944, while serving his final term as governor, Bricker was a candidate for President, and subsequently was nominated by the Republican National Convention as the vice presidential candidate. While serving as governor, however, he had considered the United States
Senate, and was a successful candidate for that office in 1946. He was re-elected in 1952, but lost a bid for a third term in 1958.

John William Bricker took office as governor at the age of 45, and thought of himself at that time, he said, as middle class, "the same as always." His view of himself, he says, did not change, but his relationship with his family did. "I was gone too much."

Neither did John Bricker notice any change in the attitude of friends and acquaintances toward him after he became governor. Potential political enemies, however, commenced "bristling," he said.

He enjoyed the governorship years "tremendously," and, given the opportunity and circumstances again, would seek the office again. His view of the office today remains as it was then.

The approach to its responsibilities is just the same. Your knowledge doesn't become any greater. You're not annointed by any means. It's just a job to work at, and there's great honor connected with it, I assure you.

Following his defeat in 1958, Bricker returned to the Columbus law firm of Bricker, Evatt, Barton, and Eckler, on the 21st floor of 100 East Broad Street, overlooking the Ohio capitol building where he served as governor from 1939-1945.

Frank John Lausche was born November 14, 1895, at the home of his Slovenian immigrant parents in the steel mill district of Cleveland, Ohio. He was the third child of Louis Lausche and Francis Milavec Lausche. Six more were to follow him, four of whom died in infancy. His parents were middle income Roman Catholics and his father was a firm disciplinarian. His mother, he says, "commanded our obedience by leaving the impression with her children of wrong being perpetrated
upon her." Louis Lausche worked in a steel mill and then became a tavern operator, but he died in 1908, when Frank was 13. The family, the Senator says, was "close-knit."

His mother was a strong Democrat, but his father was a curious mixture. "He was of Republican persuasion, nationally, but Democratic at the state and local levels." Politics was a frequent topic at the Lausche home.

Louis Lausche came to the United States in 1889, an early Slovenian settler, and promptly obtained his citizenship. He then became an adviser for other Slovenians wishing to obtain citizenship papers, and while he did not have a political organization, "he was a political leader in Cleveland among the Slovenians."

Louis Lausche also served in local courts as a Slovenian interpreter, and often took young Frank with him when he did so. "I was fascinated by it," the Senator recalls, "and I decided to become a lawyer."

Young Frank attended church regularly, and developed a "deep affection" for Sister Manetta, who taught in the first grade of the Catholic school in the Slovenian neighborhood. "She lived many years after that," Lausche recalls, "and intermittently I would receive little notes from her with respect to the work I was doing as a judge, and a lawyer, and mayor, and governor, and senator."

Lausche's perception of himself as a young lad was that he was different from other students:
There were others who were more attentive to their studies. I had a faculty, however, of quickly absorbing what was being taught and studied, but I was indifferent to applying myself intensely to the assignments that were mine.

The family had been comfortably middle income until Louis Lausche died, but then, Lausche says, "the situation changed." An older brother died in 1910, and young Frank went to work, helping his mother operate a small restaurant and shop, selling newspapers, setting pins in a local bowling alley, and serving as a lamplighter for two dollars a week. "I would light the gas street lamps at dusk, and extinguish them at dawn."

Something else changed, too. "I began applying myself in school. Frank attended both public and parochial schools, and was graduated from Central Institute, a night high school. There he felt the influence of a Mr. Swanbeck, who taught Latin, and a Mr. Oldt, who taught chemistry and physics. "They were timber of the old school. They worked hard and expected students to apply themselves to their studies. They left an imprint on me."

It was after the death of his father that Lausche perceives that he changed greatly, and became "much different" from other youngsters. "It was my intensity in keeping occupied. I kept occupied either in athletics, or in study, or in work, and I've done that through my whole life." He describes his boyhood years of that period. "They were heavy, I would say, however, with periods of joy while playing baseball. I was destined to a baseball career."

Lausche played baseball with Duluth, of the Northern League, and was "let go after two months." In 1917, he was with Lawrence, Massa-
chusetts, in the Eastern League, and then joined the Army and rose to the rank of lieutenant. While with the service, he played third base on the Camp Gordon Team, and met a "Mr. Frank, who owned the Atlanta club of the Southern League." He signed a contract to report to Atlanta in March, 1919. His recollection of that period:

But I had returned to Cleveland, and through the persuasion of Cyrus Locher and Jesse Woods, entered the John Marshall School of Law. When March came, I had to decide to continue law school or report to Atlanta. How I did it I do not know, but I made the decision to stay in law school. I studied law at the night school and worked in the law office of Locher, Green and Woods during the day. I applied myself without limitation in the study of law. I gave it all of the time that was available. The result was that when I took the bar examination in December, 1920, I received a grade of 91.7. It was the second high in the state in that examination.

It was on the urging of Cyrus Locher, who became a United States Senator in 1928, that Lausche became a candidate for the Ohio House of Representatives. He was defeated in 1922, and for the Ohio Senate in 1924, but made a favorable impression on party leaders. Lausche gives major credit to Louis Pirc, editor of The American Home newspaper, for his interest in politics, however. He explains:

He acquired the newspaper through the efforts of my father, who organized a group of Slovenians to buy it in bankruptcy proceedings. Pirc was a scholar, a very brilliant and high-charactered individual who was next door. I ran a folding machine and did job printing for him, and spent hours in his office and his home. He was the undoubted formulator of voting policy among the Slovenians. They voted in bloc, which they no longer do. In my ward there were probably 500 votes, 490 of them Democratic. Because of my association with Mr. Pirc, I kept contact with the local politics of the city and state. I exercised a considerable degree of influence with Mr. Pirc in the selection of nominees that he would support.
In May, of 1928, at the age of 33, Frank Lausche took a bride. He married Jane Oram Sheal. The couple has no children.

He became connected with organized machine politics, he says, in 1931. The Democratic Organization supported Peter Witt for the office of mayor, and the leader of Lausche's ward, Adam Dam, supported Witt. County Prosecutor Ray T. Miller decided to oppose Witt, and asked Lausche to head operation for him in that ward. "I accepted, and that is where my organization politics began." The organization politics, he says, lasted for the period between Miller's announcement and his election, "and then I returned to my normal practice of law."

Lausche was offered the positions of Cleveland safety director, and public utilities director, both of which he declined. "I felt," he explains, "that I wanted to be attached to the law, and therefore refused to accept any offers that had no relationship to my profession."

His declared position in this regard apparently was observed by Governor George White, a Democrat who had taken office in 1931. He appointed Lausche to a Cleveland Municipal Court vacancy in 1932, and Judge Lausche won election in his own right two years later, the year that his mother died. It was his mother, he claims, who was the most influential person in his life.

There lives with me a deep affection for the suffering and sacrifices that my mother made for myself and my brothers and sisters. Her husband--my father--died in 1908, and she never remarried. She had boarders in the house, and with some help did the cooking and washing. She was a genuine sacrifice for the purpose of helping her children.

In 1936, Lausche ran for a Common Pleas Court judgeship, and won a six-year term. In spite of admonitions that it would offend powerful
political leaders and end him politically, Lausche opened a drive against gambling clubs in Cuyahoga County, and used his judicial powers to assemble evidence and have warrants sworn out for the arrest of the operators. He thus achieved a reputation as a courageous and non-political jurist. The clubs were closed, and in 1941, when Judge Lausche ran for mayor of Cleveland, he won handily. He claims, however, that he had not planned a political career using offices as stepping stones to higher offices, and says that he never did.

I had the good fortune of being politically at the proper place at the proper time. When I ran for mayor, Harold Burton had left and gone to the United States Senate. Thus I did not have to confront an incumbent with great strength. When I ran for the governorship in 1944, Governor Bricker had stepped out of office because he became a candidate for the vice presidency of the United States. We were in war, I was wartime mayor of Cleveland, and my activities gave me statewide prominence. In 1956, when I ran for the United States Senate, I had the good fortune of having been governor for five terms, and set me in an extraordinarily strong position to be elected to the senatorship.

At the time he became governor, Lausche viewed himself as "still in a low economic level. The fact was that when I became governor, I was on many notes and mortgages which were executed by me and my law partners back in the late 1920's in the purchase of land."

Nor did his view of himself change while he was in office.

I recognized that when one is vested with tremendous power, there is a grave danger of that one becoming tyrannical and corrupt. I tried to guard myself from becoming the victim of power that corrupts. It brought my wife and I closer together. She was a great help to me in the management of the Mansion. With my brothers and sisters, it did make the change that I no longer had the opportunity of being with them as frequently as I had been before I became governor.
Lausche said he noticed no change in the attitude of personal acquaintances after he became governor, but:

I did suffer the loss of support from many who wanted me to do things which I didn't believe I could morally and justifiably do. And I believe that was one of the reasons that I was eventually defeated at the primary.

(The latter reference was to his loss, while an incumbent, of the Democratic nomination for United States Senator candidate in 1968. His opponent, who lost the general election contest, is, at this writing, serving a four-year Ohio gubernatorial term he won in 1970.)

Lausche found the years as governor to be enjoyable ones. "I did not regret it," he said. "There were experiences of joy and experiences of sorrow. The sorrow came when powerful political organizations and economic groups sought through the threat of defeating me at politics to cause me to change my views on what was right for the state."

Did he notice any change in his political enemies? Lausche says he did:

The fact is that my strength grew throughout all of the years of my governorship. I was stronger when I left the governorship in 1956 than I was in 1944 when I was first elected. And many who were my enemies, originally, became my friends at the end of my incumbency.

If there was any change in his own attitudes, while governor, Lausche says, it was that he "might have become more conscious of the fact that the burden of the little individual providing the taxes with which to run the government was getting increasingly heavier."

How enjoyable were the gubernatorial years? "If I had to do it all over again, and if I were not of the age I now occupy, I would run again."
Would he run at the next gubernatorial election, in 1974? "If I were of the age that permitted me to carry the heavy burdens of office, yes."

Lausche now resides in Bethesda, Maryland, and practices law in Washington, D. C., and Cleveland, Ohio. He is associated with the Washington law firm of Frost and Towers.

"Both my experience as governor and senator helped me," he says. "The prestige which goes with these past offices is a help."

C. William O'Neill was born February 14, 1916, at the home of his parents in the historic Ohio River town of Marietta. He was given the name of William by his parents, Charles Thompson O'Neill, who had an Irish background, and Jessie Arnold O'Neill, who was of English ancestry. Both parents were Baptists. His mother had completed high school and his father was a law school graduate. Both were Republicans.

William's mother died when he was four years of age, following the birth of his younger brother, and a sister of his father "just came and took over. I became quite close to my aunt, who became the most influential person in my life."

Young O'Neill was raised in a world of Republican politics. Republican-oriented political discussions were held "every day" by his father and his aunt, and the home presented a parade of game wardens, police officers, and young couples getting married, because Charles O'Neill was a justice of the peace.

William O'Neill was a "happy, small town boy living in a heterogeneous neighborhood with quite a mix of races, creeds, colors, and
economic classes." He did not work as a boy, and played athletic sports "when I had a bat and ball. I was a very small boy."

The family was close, and the father and the aunt were disciplinarians. "No Sunday movies. No drinking or smoking, and we went to both Sunday School and Church regularly."

Young Bill O'Neill viewed himself as different from the other boys in several ways. In the first place, he was small. In the second place, he had an unusual interest in politics. In the third place, he had no "real close" boyhood friends, and in the fourth place, he "read a lot," and was a very industrious student. He maintained high grades in Marietta public schools, and turned to debating under the tutelage of a man who was to become one of the most influential persons in his life. Allen E. Rupp, an assistant principal, served as O'Neill's debate coach, "without credit and without pay," from the eighth grade on. O'Neill also credits the Rev. G. E. Bartlett, minister of the Baptist church, as having much influence on him.

It was Rupp, however, who got O'Neill actively involved in politics. While he was a junior in high school, he made his first political speech, and following that event, was asked to speak at local Republican meetings. He was 16.

Even though it was what the former governor identifies as "the bottom of the great depression," his way through college was paid by his father. An outstanding student, he was inducted into Phi Beta Kappa, served as editor of the school newspaper, president of his fraternity, and president of the student body. Still slight of build and
height, he managed to get into athletics by serving as coxswain for the college rowing team.

The years of 1934 and 1936 were campaign seasons for the Ohio Legislature, and Bill O'Neill used his speaking talents to campaign for Vern Metcalf from the back of a loudspeaker truck. It was Metcalf and Lou Harness, a reporter for *The Marietta Times*, who persuaded him to seek a seat in the Ohio House of Representatives. He won, and stayed out of college that year to serve in the House until the summer of 1939. He later entered The Ohio State University College of Law, and was graduated in 1942. He served with the U. S. Army Engineers from September, 1943, to February 10, 1946, and served six consecutive terms in the Ohio House, two of them as floor leader, and two as speaker.

Sometime prior to his formal entry into politics, O'Neill had adopted the first initial "C," and he recalls that Howard Thompson, a statehouse reporter for the now defunct *Ohio State Journal*, used to joke about it, calling him "C. (for nothing) William O'Neill."

On July 29, 1945, O'Neill married Betty Estelle Hewson, in a ceremony in his hometown church, where they met. The O'Neills have one son and one daughter.

While serving in the Ohio legislature, O'Neill wanted to go to Congress, but the opportunity did not present itself. He decided, instead, to run for Ohio attorney general, which he viewed as a stepping stone to the governor's office, and he won the attorney generalship in 1950. Twice re-elected to two-year terms, he saw his opportunity in 1956, when Governor Frank J. Lausche decided to seek a seat in the United States Senate, and O'Neill ran for what was to be Ohio's
last two-year gubernatorial term. His Democratic opponent was Michael V. DiSalle, of Toledo, who lost the race, but was to thwart O'Neill's bid for the first four-year gubernatorial term two years later. In January, 1950, C. William O'Neill was sworn in as governor at the age of 40.

At the time he became governor, he says, he viewed himself as "an average, middle income professional man," a perception which he claims did not change during his tenure of office. Nor did his relationship with his family change.

During the six years that I was attorney general, I was gone three and four nights a week. My family was conditioned to it. At five or six in the evening I would leave the office and go out to talk to various groups, or meetings. But I always drove home--drove home every night. Sometimes it would be two in the morning. Then I would get back to my office at nine in the morning. But I always drove home.

When he became governor, O'Neill says, he perceived a change in the attitudes of both friends and opponents.

Well, I think a great many people's attitudes change. You know, people still hold that office in great reverence, I believe, and in great respect. And there are changes both ways. There are changes in envies and jealousies which you incite, and changes in friendships and loyalties that you create, and the opportunities to know people that pay no attention to other (state elective) offices at all. So I would have to say, yes, that most attitudes change to some degree. The most difficult times that you have in politics, as far as I'm concerned, are the tensions that are created with people who are your rivals. And you notice them in that kind of a job more than in any other.

O'Neill also observed changes in his own attitudes. "You do change somewhat," he says, "with all of that power and opportunities to do things, many of which you can do by just waving your hand, or dropping a word. It has some effect on you."
Nor is his view of the office the same at this writing. "I don't think you can really appreciate that office," he observes, "until you hold it. And also, just watching others hold it gives you a better grasp of it, particularly if you've been there. You know what they're up against. I think I have a much better perspective now than when I was holding it."

O'Neill was not particularly happy as governor, he says. "I enjoyed it the least of any job I've ever held." Neither would he like to be governor again. "Not at the moment. At the moment, I'm damn glad I'm not governor. I can honestly say that."

After his bid for re-election was turned aside in 1958, O'Neill resumed his practice of law, but felt himself too young to retire from politics. In 1960, he was elected to the unexpired term of the late Judge James Stewart, of the Ohio Supreme Court, and was re-elected to a six-year term in 1964. In April, 1970, he was appointed interim Chief Justice of the Ohio Supreme Court by then Governor James A. Rhodes, and won election to the unexpired term the following November.

Does he believe that his experiences as governor helped him in his present occupation?

Oh, without a doubt, without a doubt. There you get a grasp of the whole of state government from a position that you don't get anywhere else. Probably the closest place to it in my experience was the speakership and the service I put in on the House Finance Committee, where you found out everybody that was spending money in the whole state. But there isn't any question that it's the broad, overall view that you get from the governor's office that helps you in this office to understand government, which you need here, in my opinion, to have a broad grasp of the legal problems.
Michael Vincent DiSalle was born January 6, 1908, in the New York City home of his Italian immigrant parents, Anthony Charles DiSalle, and Assunta DeArchangelo DiSalle. He was the firstborn of his Roman Catholic parents. Three brothers and three sisters were to follow. One brother died. During his childhood, his family changed from lower income to middle income to upper income, he says, as his father switched from shoemaking to metal stamping, finally opening his own shop, which became "quite successful."

DiSalle's mother had six years of schooling in Italy, but his father had only three. Anthony DiSalle came to the United States at the age of 14. Both parents were strict disciplinarians, in the estimate of their oldest son, but the family was closeknit. As of this writing, both parents are still living in Toledo, Ohio, where Michael DiSalle spent most of his childhood. His parents were very interested in politics, he said, and "talked politics quite often." His father was an admirer of Teddy Roosevelt, he said, but switched to Woodrow Wilson, then to LaFollette in 1920, and Alfred E. Smith in 1924. All of that time, he adds, his mother remained firmly Democratic in her party loyalty.

While he views himself as being close to both parents, DiSalle also had a close relationship with Rose Carter, his third grade teacher at Toledo Jefferson School, and Sister Mary Patricia, another teacher.

I think one of the big influences might have been--I didn't realize it at the time--not a person, but an event. When I was brought to grade school, I was five years old, and I couldn't speak a word of English, though I had been born here. And the kids used to really beat the hell out of me. One, especially, used to do it every day; an Irish
kid down the street. But the fact that you were just so lost, you know. You go to school, you couldn't understand anything, but this other teacher from another classroom used to come in and sit and talk with me, and play with my hair. I wouldn't know one word she'd say, but I think this might be the reason I read so much, and tried to learn so much.

It was Rose Carter, the third grade teacher, who "used to catch me reading at school," DiSalle recalls. It intrigued her, and she kept young Mike after school.

Then she found out I'd never been to the country, never been to the zoo, never been anywhere. And she began to take me to those places. One time I wasn't reading for a period, and she wondered what was wrong. Well, I'd left my library book out on the steps one night and it got wet. It cost 79 cents, and I didn't have 79 cents, to get back in the library, and she took me down and got me reinstated.

DiSalle recalls his childhood as a happy one "in a neighborhood where everything happened. Race riots way back then. Nothing startling about them. Played with colored, Polish, German kids in the parks. Some of the kids I grew up with got to Columbus sooner than I did. They landed on Spring Street."

(DiSalle's reference here was to the ancient Ohio State Penitentiary.)

But Michael Vincent DiSalle regarded himself as quite different from his boyhood friends.

I read a lot. This was different. But you know it wasn't something that made you a bad guy with them. They kind of respected it, and they kind of asked you questions about things.

Like O'Neill, DiSalle was, and is slight of stature, but he played baseball, football, and basketball, nonetheless. And he always worked during the summers.
In those days the thing was you turned your paycheck over to the family. But I'll say they more than spent it after I started going to the university. But you know, a quarter to go to the show was about all you'd get out of it. I worked in the Toledo factories. I went to work right after the eighth grade, and I had to lie about my age to get the job. I was 14, and I worked until I was 16, at the Libby Glass Company, cleaning off blowpipes for the glass-blowers. I would go over to the ovens and get one, covered with molten glass, and take it over and clean it off. Chip it off. By the time you got home at night you were blistered all over from that. That's a lot of work.

Young Mike DiSalle "got by in school mostly from outside reading."
The summers in factories did not affect him as it did some of his friends. Most of them, as soon as they earned a little money, did not want to go back to school, DiSalle says, but, "I couldn't see that. September never came that I wasn't ready to go back."

DiSalle also worked at the Willys-Overland plant, in Toledo, and his father worked at a factory, too. He saw much union activity and heard much union talk.

My dad was a member of the shop committee, and walked the picket line. As I got out of law school, the place he worked closed up, and he opened up in the garage, back of the house, and he was lucky. A few months later, he was employing 50 to 60 people, and they formed a union of their own. And they would come in and make demands, and he'd get awfully mad, and I'd say Pa, weren't those the things you were asking for?

But one thing that stuck in my mind, and I got into his contract so quick, was then I used to go to work at Willys-Overland, in the summer, you'd have to be there at 7:06, and it meant two street cars. You'd get up at five, pack a lunch, and change street-cars. And you'd get there at 7:06 and they'd say, "No work." In the first contract I negotiated for my dad, the Union was asking for four hours of standby in case they were called to work. He didn't want it, but I said, "Look, I went through this. Put it in there, and then you'll be more careful to tell them at night if you have anything the next day." These things all have an influence on you.
In Toledo Central Catholic High School, Mike DiSalle was a busy student. He "always held class office," he recalls, and was business manager of the school paper for which he also wrote editorials. He also was advertising manager for the yearbook. Sometime during his high school years, it came to young DiSalle that he wanted to go to law school.

He went to Georgetown University, at Washington, D. C. including the law school, and his father paid his way except during the summers, until the last two years. By that time, DiSalle was operating a successful delivery business in the national capital and did not need financial assistance. While attending law school, he met and married Myrtle England. The couple has five children and 24 grandchildren.

DiSalle received his law degree from Georgetown in 1931. He had always assumed, he said, that he was going to be a Republican, in spite of his parents' preference for the Democratic Party. "But there was no place in the Republican Party in 1931 for anyone."

DiSalle had become interested in politics as a nine-year-old boy. In 1914, there was a student straw vote on the presidency at Toledo Jefferson grade school, he recalls. "I was the only one, along with my teachers, who voted for Hughes." Finding no haven for a young lawyer in the Republican ranks, DiSalle turned to the Democratic Party, and became affiliated with an anti-organization group. He served as assistant district counsel for the Homeowners' Loan Corporation in 1933 and 1934, resigning to seek a seat in the Ohio House of Representatives. That was in 1936. "I won, but I didn't have much to do with it," he says. "Roosevelt elected everybody that year."
DiSalle won the Democratic nomination as a candidate for the Ohio Senate in 1938, but lost in the general election. That same year, he was appointed assistant law director for Toledo, and held the position until 1943. He sought a city council seat, but was defeated. Two years later he won, and councilmen chose him as vice mayor. In 1948, he was elected mayor, an office he resigned in 1950 to accept appointment by President Harry S. Truman as Director of Price Stabilization.

In 1950, DiSalle ran his first statewide race, seeking the Democratic nomination as a candidate for United States Senator. He ran second to State Auditor Joseph T. Ferguson, a State House veteran, but won the nomination two years later to face Republican Senator John W. Bricker. Bricker won his second Senate term that year.

DiSalle says he had no advance plan of stepping stones to the office of governor. "I really had never decided, except when I declared." He declared in 1956, and won the nomination but lost in the general election to O'Neill. In 1958, he again won the nomination and defeated the incumbent Republican to win the first four-year term. When he was sworn into office, he was 51.

At the time of his election, he was a practicing attorney "with a pretty good practice." He considered himself "middle class, certainly not upper income. But I was doing well."

DiSalle, who'd been a grandfather for two years when he took office, feels that his view of himself did not change while holding it. Neither did his relationship with his family. "I have been in public life anyway." He enjoyed being governor "tremendously," he says, but while he would like to be governor again, it would be "only if I did not have to
run for it." He says he quickly felt the impact of attitudinal change by acquaintances:

Not all of them, but many of them felt that I didn't do everything I could for them; should have done for them. Many of them thought I'd changed. Actually, it wasn't a case of changing. I just didn't have the time. Especially people from your home town. You know, you like them. I cared for them a lot, but instead of dealing with people from one city, I had a whole state to deal with, and they didn't realize it, and of course I can understand that they didn't realize it, but it makes a lot of difference in your life.

Since losing his re-election bid to Republican James A. Rhodes in 1962, DiSalle has changed his view of the office of governor.

If I had it to do over again, I'd do it differently. I paid too much attention to the technical part, and too little to the political. I just didn't do the political things I should have been doing. The four years came and were gone before I knew it. I really was immersed in the operations of the governor's office. If I had known then what I know now, I would have run for attorney general, and then the United States Senate. I would have skipped the governor's job, because, physically, the governor's job today is the toughest job there is. It has changed from the 20's and the 30's because of the new responsibilities that the state has taken over. It's a job that can be done, but you need some experience to do it.

DiSalle believes that the experience as governor has been of no particular help to him. "It's an experience that you have a tough time using unless you're governor again." I not only enjoyed it, but felt some good was done. Having had the experience, I think more could be done. But it is something you can't pass on to others, actually."

DiSalle is now a practicing attorney with the firm of Chapman, DiSalle, and Friedman in Washington, D. C.
James Allen Rhodes was born September 13, 1907, in a frame house at Coalton, Ohio, the son of James Rhodes and Susan Howe Rhodes, both of Welsh ancestry. He followed an older brother and sister, and a younger sister would follow him.

His parents were middle income Methodists. His mother was a high school graduate, and his father, who was the superintendent of a coal mine, was a business college graduate. The family was close-knit, Rhodes says, and both parents were "strict." Both were Republicans, with his father being a Republican precinct committeeman. Thus, politics was often the subject of family discussions. Rhodes says he felt very close to both parents. He remembers his father, although the elder Rhodes died when James was nine years old. He describes him as "Republican for a cause," explaining:

It came from John L. Lewis of the Mine Workers. My father belonged to the United Mine Workers before he was in the managerial side of the coal mine. Lewis was fighting for free school books, and Lewis was a Republican. So my folks followed him. They were Republicans for a cause.

After the elder Rhodes died, "we had a different status in life," Rhodes recalls of the abrupt transition. "We were on the giving end before, helping a lot of people, and then we were on the receiving end." He recalls the time vividly:

When my father passed away, my mother called all three in the night before Christmas, and presented some fruit and nuts, and said: This is a family. Divide it up. We divided it up, and she said: There's no Santa Claus, and we're together against the world. My mother said, when you leave this door, all your loved ones are in this house. Now if you get hit by a car, the only people who will comfort you are here. That was her devotion as far as principle was concerned.

So James Allen Rhodes went to work at the age of nine years, and says he has "never known not to have a job." He carried newspapers,
caddied, cut grass, cycled, ran errands, delivered groceries, picked berries, helped move families, and anything else he could find "to make a nickel." His boyhood, he says, was "excellent, and I wouldn't want to change it. I fished, hunted, caught water moccasins, and sold crawdads, twelve for a nickel. I had every business there was. Trapped muskrats and got 40 cents a pelt. I had everything there was in the way of a boyhood."

But James A. Rhodes saw himself as different from other lads of his age.

I had probably the most enlightening boyhood of any boy. I had a mother that believed in discipline and obedience. My mother had one thing she taught us all. It was to pray every morning and every night, and the prayer was this: Oh God, help me be somebody. That was her whole theme, that anybody can be what they want to be if they work at it.

Jim Rhodes was also "always in something competitive. I respected good competitors." He describes himself as being "as active as three boys" during his years of schooling in the Jackson, Ohio, and Springfield, Ohio, public schools. He played every sport, and was "in everything. Sold all the suits, ties, and shirts for the senior class graduations. Booked bands in senior high school; ran dances as a junior. Had five people working for me passing papers. Was assistant caddy master."

It was all of this, Rhodes believes, that differentiated him from others of his age.

I had to work and I knew it, and it made me stand apart in any group. I was probably the only one making any money in the crowd, and helping support a family. I gave my mother every cent I earned. I was always looking for a job; something to do; something to make money. And I always had great respect for older people. I was taught that. I think from your parents comes the path that you are going to follow.
When the elder Rhodes died, James A. Rhodes assumed a new role. Susan Rhodes was the head of the family now, but her son was the breadwinner. And the proud and stubborn mother would not turn to any level of government for help.

The county people came out to our house to get the kids, to take us to a home. My mother grabbed a broom and chased those people clear out through the front gate. She shook that broom at them, and told them not to come back; never to come back, that this was a family, and by God it was going to stay a family. So we moved away from there, and went to Springfield, and I was hustling all kinds of jobs. And we never looked back, and we never had any aid--any level of support at all--from any government.

Working five jobs, and playing varsity basketball at Springfield High School, young Jim Rhodes increasingly learned a variety of skills, including "selling, promotion, booking bands, newspapering, and business management." He had no particular desire to go to college, but he was graduated with a basketball scholarship. Restlessly, he tried the University of Kansas, at Lawrence, "a prep school outside of Chicago, and finally Wittenberg, back at Springfield." Nothing was working out, he says, and the family moved to Columbus, near The Ohio State University. There, young Rhodes saw an opportunity to obtain a college education while working. He enrolled and commenced playing freshman basketball.

I had about five jobs. I was booking bands, selling blotters, ran an employment agency, and was a distributor of four magazines. These were the depression days, and money was scarce. I also owned part of a north side newspaper. I had all of these things going, and was trying to go to school and play basketball, and I asked the coach to find me one job, because I did not want my mother to have to work. Well, the coach offered me a job waiting tables at the fraternity house where I was pledged, and I was the only one paying dues! In those days, everybody was on credit. So I handed that basketball to the coach, and I said, if this is what athletics leads to, here. And I walked away from it.
Cancer struck Susan Howe Rhodes that spring, as Rhodes was finishing his first quarter at Ohio State. He summarizes his dilemma:

I had to make a choice. This was my mother, and this was my family. It costs a lot of money to fight cancer, and there wasn't any Medicare, or Social Security then. I made up my mind that education was status, but this was my mother, and I was going to take care of her. She took care of me. The education I was getting was not meaningful, in my evaluation. I'm not anti-education, but it just didn't mean that much then. It would help me in status, but it couldn't help my mother.

Rhodes expanded his line of operations, and became known around the campus as one of the few persons with money in his pocket. Living near the campus, he began attending classes without paying tuition. "Everybody knew me--the president, the vice president, the deans, and the professors. I would just go from class to class, especially law classes, and sit in," he says.

In 1932, Rhodes became interested in active politics through the influence of his mother. He became president of The Ohio State University Republican Club, and organized a campus committee for Clarence Brown for Governor.

My mother wanted me to run for ward committeeman, and in 1934 she put up six dollars. I bought six dollars worth of campaign cards and I walked every street in the ward, and knocked on every door. I defeated a man who had been committeeman for sixteen years. And when I got into politics, I decided that I would become governor of Ohio one day, so I might as well start planning for it. And I did. What it was, I got a look at some of the people running things. I'm talking about administrative ability. So I picked a path.

Rhodes began by running for the Columbus Board of Education, and won a four-year term. In 1939, he ran for Columbus auditor, and won election. He was re-elected in 1941. With the outbreak of World
War II on December 7 he tried to enlist in each of the armed services, "but they don't take people with one lung." Rhodes had a lung removed during a serious illness as a child.

On December 18, 1941, Rhodes married Helen Rawling, a childhood sweetheart, and the couple has three daughters.

From the auditor's office, Rhodes vaulted into the Columbus mayor's office. He was elected in 1943, and re-elected in 1947 and 1951. During his second term as mayor, however, he decided to "get statewide exposure, and learn the rounds." He ran for the Republican gubernatorial nomination, finishing second in a field of four candidates behind State Treasurer Don H. Ebright, who subsequently lost his bid to unseat Governor Frank J. Lausche.

It was a troubled year for James A. Rhodes, however. Cancer had stricken his mother again, and this time, he was told, it was terminal. "She suffered," he said, "but she never said anything about it. I knew it was only a matter of time." On November 18, 1950, Susan Howe Rhodes died, and her son was at her bedside. He returned to the mayor's office that morning, and called city hall reporters in to make the announcement. He says he told them: "It was cancer. You tell them that."

Since that time, James Rhodes has given his name and his energies to The American Cancer Society.

What was the "tremendous" influence that Susan Howe Rhodes had on her son? James A. Rhodes says:

Society is based on family, school, and church. These are the component parts. When you devise any system that leads a father away from the home to shirk his responsibility,
the school work goes, and the church loses members. In children, it is all the parents. You have no trouble when you see parents taking their youngsters to ball games, or fishing, or something like that. That's family. The ones you have trouble with are those kids who run by themselves because they have no one who cares for them. They do not understand family, and love, and consideration, and they grow incapable of respect to older people. Family just has to be.

In May, 1952, Rhodes decided to seek what he calls "the catbird seat" in the State House. He was unopposed for the Republican nomination for auditor of state, and in November he defeated Joseph T. Ferguson, a veteran Democratic incumbent.

Auditor Rhodes promptly set out to win his goal. He was unopposed for the Republican nomination for governor in 1954. "Who wanted to go against Big Frank?" he says with a grin. Lausche, seeking an unprecedented fifth term--fourth consecutive one--defeated Rhodes by more than 200,000 votes in a hard-fought campaign, and Rhodes retired to the auditor's office to ponder.

I liked Frank Lausche, and I didn't like my campaign. It wasn't like me. The thing that people want is answers. They know the questions. So I set out to find some answers, and to really study the governor's job. And I did.

Rhodes won re-election as auditor in 1956, and passed up the gubernatorial race that year in favor of Republican Attorney General C. William O'Neill, a friend. John Bricker says a strong behind-the-scenes effort was made to get O'Neill to seek an open U. S. Senate seat, which Lausche had opted to run for, "but Bill (O'Neill) wanted to go for governor, and that was that. Otherwise, Jim Rhodes would have won it in 1956, and he'd have kept it, too."19 This is confirmed by O'Neill.20
At that time, the auditor of state's term was four years, and the governor's two, so that in 1958, O'Neill had to run again. Halfway through his second term as auditor, Rhodes sat on the sidelines and watched the struggle for what would be the first four-year gubernatorial term in Ohio. O'Neill, the Republican incumbent, went down to defeat in a campaign lost, according to Bricker, "on the saliency of the right-to-work issue, which I did not favor injecting into the campaign." Senator Bricker's re-election bid fell with the Republican state campaign, and the Democrats returned to power in the State House with Governor Michael V. DiSalle leading the parade.

Rhodes was re-elected to a third term as auditor in 1960, this one a two-year stint, provided so that all elected state executive officers would serve four-year terms commencing in 1963. In 1962, Rhodes won the Republican gubernatorial nomination and defeated Governor DiSalle's re-election effort.

At the age of 55, almost 30 years after he commenced planning for it, James A. Rhodes was sworn in as Ohio's 61st chief executive. In 1966, he won re-election by more than 700,000 votes.

Rhodes says he noticed a change in the attitude of his friends, after becoming governor, but not in himself.

I played golf with the same people, and ran around with the same people, and did the same things at home that I've done since I was a boy, like making vegetable soup, and potato soup, and messing around in the kitchen. And I got up at the same time, and got into the office at 7:30. I hustled, like always. But your friends change. They hold the office of governor in great reverence, and so do I. There's been so few governors. Only 61 then, since 1803.
He perceives that there were differing reactions from his political enemies. "Some became vindictive and miserable. Others were quite friendly. You know, the Republicans do not have a monopoly on talent, and there were talented and sincere Democrats willing to work for the public good, so I put them to work, and they did very competent jobs."

Jim Rhodes enjoyed being governor "like no other job I had ever had." His view was that he had a job to do, and it was one for which he had trained. As auditor of state, he says, "I knew who was working, and who wasn't. I felt I had some answers for Ohio's problems. To me, the office had a very familiar feel."

Neither did the governorship affect his relationship with his family. He became a grandfather thrice, while governor, "and I let the whole wide world know how great it was," he says. "The governorship pulled us closer together, if that was possible. This is a family."

Nor have his views of the office changed since he left it in January, 1971. "It's a tough and challenging job, but I'd take it again in a minute. It is rewarding to work a job like that one."

James Allen Rhodes wanted to go to the United States Senate from the Ohio governor's office, as Bricker and Lausche had done. It was not to be. In spite of efforts by three good friends--Bricker, Lausche, and O'Neill--to convince Congressman Robert M. Taft, Jr., that he ought to run for governor and let Jim Rhodes run for the Senate, Taft elected to seek the job once held by his father.22 Taft narrowly defeated Rhodes in the Republican primary of 1970, and won the November general election contest.
Rhodes has formed James A. Rhodes & Associates, a land development company with offices on the 17th floor of the Leveque-Lincoln Tower, 50 West Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio. He says he does not miss public office.

I enjoy living. I do what I want to do. I don't miss it at all. I learned a long time ago never to look back. I'm accomplishing things. The secret of living is something to go to the next day. Longevity is part of the game.

He says that his experiences in the governor's office have helped him.

In meeting people, it does. In business, it is money management, and in government, it is money management. This is the key to success. All of my experiences have helped me. I commenced training as a boy. I'm busy doing, and fulfilling. I come to work at 7:30 in the morning, and people just can't believe that a governor goes to work at 7:30. I ride up on the elevator with them, and they can't believe it. People are wonderful to me. They come way out of their way on the street to stop me, and talk with me.

Prominently displayed in his new office, as in every other one he has held, is the familiar picture of Susan Howe Rhodes. Inscribed on it is a caption that Rhodes says he had put there after she died in November, 1950.

It reads: "This is a family."

The road to adulthood is a channeled experience in every society. Societies generally contain several subcultures, each of which serves as a channel, but individuals are not equally exposed to them. Thus, each reaches maturity with goals, norms, and beliefs about reality and causation which are characteristic of his starting channel. But in periods of rapid change, the channel may branch while the individual is developing.
In his transactions with his environment, an individual acquires a distinctiveness which others recognize as a personality, and which he recognizes as his "self." Man's concept of himself thus guides his interaction with the environment, making for continuity and orderly development in spite of changes forced by physiological and social life cycles. It has been suggested, as a guiding principle, that "man maneuvers in his environment to get the best self-conception he believes possible." 24

Governors Bricker, Lausche, and Rhodes have more in common than the fact that they all served as governors of Ohio. Of our five, these three were re-elected. And of the five, these three were called upon to maneuver in their environment, and to confront a branching starting channel at ages earlier than the other two. Though he lost his mother at the age of 4, O'Neill had a quick replacement in the person of the aunt who took his mother's place. And the O'Neill family remained comfortably middle income through the difficult depression years. DiSalle's family socioeconomic situation changed from low income, to middle income, to upper income, in Michael DiSalle's own estimation, and that is all of the estimation that is needed. It is how he saw himself.

John Bricker's family was middle income, by his estimation, but he helped maintain it by working on the farm, and by working other jobs, and giving his earnings from them to pay off the mortgage. He had an additional role as a boy--the role of at least part breadwinner.

Lausch's loss of his father and an older brother in a two-year period confronted him with a branching channel, too. In his estimation,
the family dropped from comfortable middle income to low income status, and he assumed the role of breadwinner. Rhodes had a remarkably similar experience. And all three of these men were driven, additionally, by an emphasized concept of family, religious norms, and ethnicity because of the threatened loss of them all through loss of family identity. Each of the three were required to maneuver in their environment more than is usual for a young person, and maneuver they did.

The self is the core of the personality. It is a force for coherence and stability, and it becomes particularly important in a highly differentiated or fluctuating environment, or when an individual is in a development channel that is being rerouted. All three men, as boys, were exposed unusually early to cross-cutting patterns of interaction due to new channels of communication, exposing them to atypical reference groups. They had more standards for comparison, more targets for aspiration to membership, and more sources of perspective.

Channeling aspects of development are reinforced by reference groups which are consistent and compatible with the structures we occupy and the cognitive content we acquire. It is not frequent for atypical reference groups to displace the expected ones. With Bricker, Lausche, and Rhodes, the opposite was true. The change was frequent. And when that happens, if the atypical reference group is to perform a channel-switching function for the developing person, he must imagine himself living or behaving or thinking as he believes members of that reference group do so. His self conception must be expanded, and he must believe that he can do things to achieve such a result.
We have seen that roles usually cluster into positions, and that the person occupying a position is involved in reciprocal relations in several different directions and with several different role partners. This collection of roles reciprocal to a particular position is called a role-set. 27 Role-set focuses on one position and its reciprocating roles. This concept, too, points to Bricker, Lausche, and Rhodes. They were called upon at early ages to fashion a substantially expanded role-set, and they did it. O'Neill and DiSalle were not called upon to do so.

Role-taking is a process of devising and discovering consistent patterns of action which can be identified with types of actors. It thus suggests that whenever the social structure is such that an actor must, he acts from the perspective of several given roles simultaneously. There then tends to emerge a single role which encompasses the action. 28 The single role may result from a merger process, each role absorbing the other, or from the development and recognition of another role, which is specifically the pattern viewed as consistent when both roles might be applicable. "The politician role exemplifies the second tendency, providing a distinct perspective from which the individual may act who otherwise would be acting simultaneously as a party functionary and as a government official." 29 What would constitute a role conflict from the latter point of view, then, is susceptible of treatment as a consistent pattern from the point of view of the politician role.

We will argue here that the unusual socialization of a young man, wherein he must adapt to a much larger role-set than is usual, and where he is required to achieve either a convergence of roles, or role-
shift compatibility to maintain management of his environment, tends to prepare him more thoroughly for management of a similar action sphere in an achieved position, such as governor. And we will argue that, as governors of Ohio, our five respondents reflected their role-set management capabilities which they were required to develop as growing boys.
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CHAPTER II

CHIEF OF STATE

Oh wad some power the giftie gie us
To see ourselves as others see us!

Robert Burns, "To A Louse," Stanza 8

There is a role for every function performed in society, and the manner in which an actor is expected to act is called role expectancy. The response to this expectancy may be called role fulfillment or role performance.¹

A conception basic to sociology holds that individuals have multiple social roles and tend to organize their behavior in terms of the structurally defined expectations assigned to each role.² Important characteristic of the plans of action that we call role is that they are definitely associated with the position, or office, and not with any actor who may be, at the moment, playing the role.³ In studying the office of governor of Ohio, we must look at the role definitions of the political actors who have held it. These role definitions are what we have called the "script." And if we are to look at the script, Vernon reminds us, we must ask those involved what the script is.⁴ We may expect that while playing their roles, the governors conformed more or less to the prescribed plans of action. But the plans of action go with the office, and not with the individual. Nevertheless, how each played his role resulted in some revamping of
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the role definition, and these changes became incorporated into the overall role configuration of the office. That is to say, they tend to become the expected behavior of anyone who subsequently played the role. Role definitions are constantly changing, but the definitions go with the position, and not with the actor. Every social role presupposes that there is a common bond between the individual and a set of persons who participate in his performance. This common bond is a complex set of values which all of them appreciate. In the case of a politician, these are political values. In the case of a governor of Ohio, the persons participating in his performance are, more or less, his constituents, but:

An official is, by definition, distinguished from the public he deals with. He is recruited, too, according to a defined criteria which, negatively sets him off from the "public," and positively, link him with particular extra-official groups and milieux: a class, an educational category, an ethnic division, etc. Norms imported from the social background still affect him even in his official role.

A governor, then, has a many-sided role set attached to his office, and each relationship in this set affects his behavior. We have said that a role definition is a script for a certain part, but what if there are several scripts for the same part? This is the dilemma confronting man in a complex society. The easy integrity of role performance that existed in simpler, more homogeneous societies has been lost. Additionally, another kind of splintering confronts the political actor.

It is this heterogeneity of performance. In simpler societies, the public's view of a gubernatorial actor would be more homogeneous, and people would tend to share scripts of role performances. But in our modern society, many contradictory perspectives are brought to
bear on the gubernatorial role, depending on who is looking at it.
"Thus, modern man has to adjust his vocabulary to his interlocutor, and
change it each time." He may not use the same script in talking about
a subject to a friend as he does to a foe, or even his own wife. The

problem:

There is no consistent self-image reflected in the many
perspectives, and the individual's real self tends to be­
come inextricably lost in vocabularies and sub-vocabularies.
Religion, business, family—all tear in different directions.
Innumerable and interchangeable perspectives for self­
justification undermine a firm identity.

Talcott Parsons reminds us that elaborate role definitions are trans­
mittted both formally and informally. "They are inherent in the hierarchy
in elaborate job descriptions, but are also symbolically represented
through dress, physical location, and other status attributes, including
age and sex." Seymour Lieberman has tested the hypothesis that people
who are placed in a role will tend to take on or develop attitudes that
are congruent with the expectations associated with that role, and his
data tend to support the hypothesis. The problem for governors, how­
ever is one of what expectations are associated with the role?

In this chapter, we are looking at the theoretical role of "chief
of state." How others see the governor is very much involved here, for
that is the script which governors write and perform if they are to be
successful. We have mentioned that the literature of the office of
governor is filled with references to the role. Charles R. Adrian,
for example, terms a governor "the living symbol of the state," and
"representative of all the people." Though much of the work involved
with the chief of state role can be handled by the gubernatorial staff,
Adrian asserts, "the rituals both sacred and profane which the governor is expected to take part in require much of his personal time. He avoids them at genuine peril to his political career."

Duane Lockard suggests that "the best test of whether or not this is what apparently is desired is the extent to which governors obviously try to fit themselves to this model. Even casual observation suggests that they do." The late Peter Odegard declared simply that, "He is the ceremonial head of state." Thomas C. Desmond, a journalist, sees the chief of state role this way:

He is the symbol and conscience of the state. As such he must fulfill a role that calls upon him to visit the sick, the lonely, the aged, and to pat on the back an underpaid mental hospital attendant. He must be the state's chief tub-thumper, a one-man chamber of commerce, heralding the glories of his state's valleys, mountains, rivers, farmers, laborers, women, manufacturers and agricultural products.

Leslie Lipson, who spent three years of residence and travel in the United States before World War II, found in the 11 states that he studied:

His duties in the area involve many personal interviews, voluminous correspondence, numerous phone calls, and a large number of public speeches, radio addresses and personal appearances. So great, indeed, is the drain on governors' time occasioned by excessive demands in this field that most governors find this function interfering with their efforts at policy formation and encroaching upon the time which they might otherwise devote to management.

Terry Sanford, a former governor of North Carolina, claims that a governor, by his very office embodies his state.

He stands alone at his inauguration as the spokesman for all the people. His presence at the peak of the system is unique, for he must represent the slum and the suburbs, his concerns must span rural poverty and urban blight.
Of the five Ohio governors whose perceptions of gubernatorial roles we have examined, three ascribe little or no validity to the chief of state role. Each governor refers to the "reverence" in which the office is held, but only two identify Chief of State as a clear-cut role. C. William O'Neill gives it a definite assignment in the role-set of the office of governor in Ohio.\(^\text{19}\) Michael V. DiSalle says that it is "one of the roles, and maybe one I neglected," but that "it is not a legitimate function of the governor."\(^\text{20}\)

The other three governors admit to the pressure for the kind of activity which the literature ascribes to the role, but do not separate it and give it position in the gubernatorial role cluster. Instead, they locate it within the core role of "governor as self." Of the chief of state concept, John W. Bricker says:

> I never thought of it in that light at all. Of course, I was never very much for pomp and circumstance. I even took the siren off the automobile. A governor is a governor. That's where it is, and it is all in how you as an individual, do that job.\(^\text{21}\)

Governor Bricker says he shunned as many of the rituals that a governor is called upon to perform as he could. He sent Lieutenant Governor Paul M. Herbert, or "appropriate department heads," instead.

Frank J. Lausche maintains that while, "From the standpoint of esteem, the governor occupies as much loftier position than the United States Senators," he does so as governor, and not chief of state.

People are proud to have the governor come to their functions. They are proud to meet him, and are disposed to meet him with the finest of grace, even though the may not be politically in accord with his views. I think the function is a very important one, and it demands rectitude on the part of the governor, so that when
he goes to a county fair, or to a patriotic assembly, the symbol which the public has of a governor is, in fact, fulfilled by the governor's conduct.22

But Lausche, like Bricker emphasizes the role of governor as self. He says no governor can afford to avoid the rituals excessively "without peril to his political career," but points, in the statement, to his use of the officeholder's attraction: "He must keep in contact with the public. Contact through the media is not adequate."

Lausche thus used the ceremonial role of a governor as a communication device. He wanted face-to-face interaction with his publics, he says, and the ability of the office of governor to draw a crowd gave him that opportunity.

James A. Rhodes rejects chief of state as a valid role. Nor does he think that a governor is "the living symbol of the state." He says:

It is in the governor himself. We've had bad governors in good times, and good governors in bad times. I think people move as a force. I think that the governor must think as the people think. I think that the average person is concerned with the future of his family, and I think that the economy must be in such a condition that he can advance, and make more money.23

Rhodes says that ribbon-cutting and ground-breaking "is not the governor as chief of state, or ceremonial head. I think that every time we went to a ceremony, we left a message."

Rhodes obviously adopted Lausche's use of the attraction of the office of governor for communication. He says:

We saw more people than any other governor. Every time we went to a ceremony, we left a message. If it was a highway, we left a message that this was constructed for a reason, to bring products in, and raw materials in, and ship products out to create jobs and employment. If I cut meat from a prize steer, or went fishing in Lake Erie, or camping
in a state park, my object was to communicate to everybody I could the importance of all of these functions to our economy, and to jobs. Part of the job of being governor is to understand the system, and our system is the profit system. It's not ceremony; it's selling, and that's a governor's role, as an individual.

If we begin to construct a reciprocal role-set model of the office of governor in Ohio, then, and we deal first with the concept of chief of state, we find three governors who overwhelmed the role with their "selves," and maintained their identity as individuals. We find two others. One played the role as such, to the hilt. The other shunned the role, although recognizing it, and now believes that to have been a mistake. We are thus confronted with the beginning of two different models, the O'Neill-DiSalle Reciprocal Role-Set Model, and the Bricker-Lausche-Rhodes Reciprocal Role-Set Model, as pictured below:

![Diagram](image_url)

**Figure 2.**—O'Neill-DiSalle Reciprocal Role-Set Model, Chief of State.
Figure 3.--Bricker-LaSche-Rhodes Reciprocal Role-Set Model, Chief of State.

We have said that o'Neill ascribed the chief of state role to the gubernatorial constellation, and played it to the hilt. It took "an awful lot of your time," he says, but he did not know how to avoid it. As a matter of fact, if DiSalle's assessment that he underplayed the role is correct, O'Neill's is that he overplayed it. Furthermore, playing the role often angered him.

The thing that bothered me most about it was that frequently I found that somebody who had worked like hell for me, or maybe somebody who'd raised money for the party and for the campaign--fine people, highly respected in their community--would insist you come somewhere to play that role. And when you'd get there--it used to make me angry inside, but you couldn't say a word about it--it would appear to you that they were just proving to the community that by God they could get the Governor there. And they were nice about it, and they entertained you royally, but you had so much to do and so many demands on your time, that it was easy to get angry about that when it happened to you.
DiSalle, while crediting chief of state as one of the roles, said that "the time will come when people will grow up and realize that this isn't a legitimate function of the office." He perceived that "people like to see the governor in the role of actually administering the affairs of state, but they still like to see him in this role as a ribbon cutter." He now sees the chief of state role-playing as "one of the political necessities of the job," and explains:

This is one of the mistakes I made: I didn't do enough of it. It all depends on whom the invitations come from. I remember two invitations that had a very definite impact. Ben Maidenburg of the Akron Beacon Journal asked me to come up to the Soap Box Derby, and I'd made a commitment that I wouldn't leave Columbus while the legislature was in session, hoping to get the legislative program passed out of the way. I'm sure this affected him. And Louis Seltzer asked me up to cut a ribbon at a new shopping center, and I turned him down for the same reason. Now these are two men in the state that have a great deal to do with public opinion.

DiSalle says that if he had taken all of the invitations he received he would have had trouble doing anything else. "I regard it as a role, certainly, but I think that the role I envisioned is a need for awakening people to the needs of the state."

O'Neill discovered precisely what DiSalle suggested, that playing the chief of state role as one of the outside cluster does not leave much time for other matters.

The biggest thing I missed in the governor's office was really the opportunity to think. To have time to think. Sometimes you are called upon to make so many speeches that I would occasionally feel like I didn't have anything left to say. I was just pumped dry. I needed to be rejuvenated, and get some rest, and think. There isn't much time.

Bricker played the role as a sub-role of the office of governor, he says, "and played it down," at that. A governor must be the
representative of all of the people, he agrees, but believes that participating extensively in ribbon cuttings, dedications, and welcoming speeches is "neither necessary, nor wise unless you have a legitimate reason, such as selling an idea, or yourself as governor."

Lausche's basic position is that since the governor of Ohio is held up as the symbol of the state, he ought to make use of it. It enables a governor to represent himself as a governor of all of the people, regardless of party, he says, and needs not interfere with "his managerial responsibilities." It also enables the governor to set an example for state employees:

Throughout my whole political career, I have been of the opinion that the example set by the governor is the example set by those who labor under him in whatever capacity it might be. When the governor's conduct is bad; when he perpetrates acts that are not in accord with good conscience, it becomes an inducement to others beneath him to follow the same course.

A governor cannot, Lausche says, fulfill a role that calls upon him to visit the sick, the lonely, and the aged, as Desmond suggested, nor can he possibly see all callers who come into the office. Both O'Neill and DiSalle said they tried to do that.

It is impossible. I would try to find out what the problem was and if I thought it was one that I ought to attend to, I would see them. I would see the person, but then make arrangements for him to contact the department or bureau head. Standing out conspicuously in my mind, however, was the fact that many citizens, especially those with mental disorders, who could not find relief anywhere else, felt now I must go to the governor. They were matters in which the governor could not be of help, and I am convinced that when they found out that the governor could not help, they wanted to go to the President of the United States.

Rhodes obviously used the ascribed role as another gubernatorial program tool.
It all worked to jobs and employment. It fit into the system. We tried to get industry in for jobs. A boy doesn't steal a pocketbook to outrun a policeman to make a track team. He's trying to get money, and that's a substitute for a job. We have 89,000 young people coming into our labor market every year. Under our constitution, the governor is the head of the government. The governor's job, in the main, is programs to help the work force of Ohio. Being the head of government does not make you live in a state of ego day in and day out. The head of the government must govern. He is not the central figure of government. He spreads the responsibility, he delegates, and he manages to get the job done that way.

O'Neill treated the chief of state concept as a role which had to be given much attention, and it took most of his time. DiSalle saw it as a role, and like O'Neill, was not fond of it, but unlike O'Neill, chose to ignore it. Politically, he says, that was an error. Neither DiSalle nor O'Neill won re-election.

Bricker played the role as a sub-role, and let others read his script. Lausche used it as a communication device, and to set an example to both his public and state employees. And Rhodes used it as another tool in his gubernatorial efforts to sell both legislative and administrative programs. But always, Bricker, Lausche, and Rhodes were themselves. DiSalle, bound to Columbus by a pledge he now regards as a mistake, was neither himself, nor chief of state. O'Neill was chief of state to such a degree that he could not be himself.

We have observed that all of these men have one thing in common: they all served as governor of Ohio. We also have observed that three of them—Bricker, Lausche, and Rhodes—have something else in common. All were re-elected. Now we find that these three have a third thing in common: they all suppressed the concept of chief of state, pushing it down and out of a full blown gubernatorial role to another utilitarian
function in the role of a governor as himself. While role playing, these three conformed more or less to the prescribed plans of action, as they went with the office. But how each played his role resulted in some revamping of the role definitions, and these changes were incorporated into the overall configuration.

Bricker, Lausche, and Rhodes rewrote the script--the role definition--chief of state. They downgraded the script, and enlarged the role of governor as self. Whenever the social structure is such that individuals characteristically act from the perspective of several roles, there tends to emerge a single role which encompasses the action. This single role may result from absorption of one role into another, but the absorption must be into a compatible role. If the merging is into the conflicting role, loss of identity occurs. If the absorption is into the compatible role, both internal and external validation of the absorbed role is achieved. In our case, a governor does not find himself in several different structures imposing incompatible demands upon him. Conflicts between the scripts of the two roles are thus avoided.

Role-set consists of roles reciprocal to a given position. Each of these imposes a set of demands on the person occupying the position. In complicated and dynamic role-sets, such as the office of governor, it is not unusual for some of these demands to be incompatible and conflicting. In our modern society, it is highly unlikely that any governor can persistently escape the costs of conflict associated with role networks. None of our five respondents thinks so. But as we have seen, a governor can and has employed restructuring of role network in
order to alleviate conflicting demands. And in so doing, they have moved to increase gubernatorial power.

Bricker, Lausche, and Rhodes took the position, as governor, that they had presented themselves to the voters of Ohio as identifiable persons, or as "selves." And it was this "self" that was elected. So when each one chose to rewrite the role of chief of state to a minor part, and to enlarge the role of governor as self accordingly, each took the advice of Polonius to his departing son: "To thine own self be true..." To paraphrase the poet, Burns, they sought to be themselves as others saw them.
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22. Frank J. Lausche, private interview at Cleveland, Ohio, April 9, 1971.

23. James A. Rhodes, private interview at Columbus, Ohio, April 6, 1971.

24. Louis B. Seltzer was editor of The Cleveland Press at that time.

CHAPTER III

CHIEF EXECUTIVE

He that would govern others, first should be
Master of himself.

Philip Massinger, The Bondsman I.iii

"The concept of the governor being primarily responsible for the management of the executive branch has not yet gained a firm foothold in most states in spite of some rather substantial reorganizations."
That was the finding of Coleman B. Ransone, Jr., in interviews with governors, their staffs, legislators, state officials, politicians, and newsmen in 25 states in the mid-1950's.¹

This finding does not square with the perceptions of those who governed Ohio for 30 of the 32 years from 1939 to 1971. Five of the six men who governed during that period identify "chief executive" as a clear-cut role of an Ohio governor, and the five agree that its primary meaning to them is management. Furthermore, the five governors indicate quite clearly by their responses to identical questions in identical sequence in a structure scheduled interview that the role has increased in importance since 1939. In fact, a study of the governors in the order of their succession through the 32-year period indicates that the role has been separated from the gubernatorial legislative role, and has been assigned the number one rank order in any gubernatorial role-set which clusters about governor as self. That is the ranking
of the last three governors, C. William O'Neill, Michael V. DiSalle, and James A. Rhodes, as seen by them while serving, and as seen by them as of the dates of their interviews. And that is the ranking of the first two--John W. Bricker and Frank J. Lausche--as of this writing. Management is the term common to each of the five governors' evaluation of the role. Not only did they accept and agree to the term as suggested, but they suggested it prior to its appearance in the schedule structured interview.

"Management is his ultimate responsibility," says John W. Bricker. "That's the way it was then, and that is the way it is now." Bricker governed from 1939 to 1945.


"Well, you obviously have the first role of executing the laws, organizing the departments, laying down the policy guidelines--the frame of reference in which the departments shall operate," says C. William O'Neill, 1957-1959. "It is a management function."

"His administrative role as chief executive is the role of top manager," says Michael V. DiSalle, 1959-1963. "It is the current operating technique."

"When the people elect a governor, they elect and expect management," says James A. Rhodes, 1963-1971. "A governor tries to do the job better than his predecessor. His management performance is uppermost in his mind."
Among questions put to the five governor respondents, in the same order, was this one: Were you really interested as governor in managing? Their verbatim replies were:

Bricker--That's your first responsibility, because you're dealing in trust funds; you're dealing in people's money. It is the responsibility of the governor to keep the finances in shape.

Lausche--I was interested to the point where I recognized that I would not be in direct contact with all that went on, but I felt that my primary responsibility was to keep my eyes and my ears open, so as to detect any signal of impropriety. And when I appointed a person, I said, you will not be interfered with by me, except that if I get a signal that things go wrong.

O'Neill--I think that's the difference between the legislative and the administrative role. Yes, I was interested in certain departments that I thought were the key. The Highway Department was, and I felt that we established it there. And in Mental Hygiene, but we did not get the guy we wanted.

DiSalle--Leadership is important, and I had a good working knowledge of each department. Leadership is management.

Rhodes--The governor can make himself felt in any field he wants to, but management isn't just the governor. We had good people. You appoint qualified people that assume responsibility, and your worries are over.

The five governors also were in agreement that "the essential role of the governor in regard to management is the control of the policies of the agencies under his supervision." Rhodes voiced the sense of the responses of all of them by saying, "It gets back to whether a governor pays attention to what is going on in his state."

But can an Ohio Governor successfully coordinate the activities of 50 or more separate agencies? An authority in the field of public administration says he cannot.
The myth that an executive can successfully coordinate the activities of 50 or more separate agencies, each theoretically reporting directly to him, has been thoroughly exploded. The whole organization of the machinery of state administration, so far as it is dealt with in the state constitution, needs to be completely revised and reworked by the constitution-makers so that it will square with sound theory and experience in management.10

Bricker maintains that it is a difficult job, but it can be done if you have the proper help. Lausche says he thinks a governor can do it. O'Neill disagrees. "There are a lot of them that you just can't get around to controlling." DiSalle says a governor can coordinate, but, "Of course, there has to be delegation along the line. All 50 can't be reporting to him." Rhodes sees it as "not that difficult," but, like DiSalle, suggests that delegation is the key.

The series of questions led to a surprising discovery as concerns the findings of other students of governors. The discovery is that in Ohio, governors have tended to use their cabinets extensively in the administrative process. Indeed, they have increasingly tended to consider their cabinet officers as part of their executive staff, and have used them in that manner. Vesitigal elements of such an attitude appear in the Bricker responses, grow stronger in Lausche's, and yet stronger in O'Neill's. In DiSalle's responses, full-blown usage of the cabinet is indicated, and in Rhodes' responses, the concept of cabinet as part of gubernatorial staff is clearly introduced.

The discovery recalls the plaintive questions by Leslie Lipson: "Why is the governor's cabinet vanishing? Is there no place for it in state government?"11
In Ohio, the gubernatorial cabinets have been alive and well for 32 years. Indeed, the concept of using cabinet officers as top administrators, with the delegation of both responsibility and power was raised by the governors in response to open-ended questions before the section on gubernatorial cabinets was reached in the schedule structured interview. As a matter of fact, their comments were so extensive that when the cabinet section of the interview was reached, initial responses to many of the questions were, "I have already answered that." Thus, the governors had to be prodded to reply again. One such latter question was: "Is the governor's cabinet useful and effective as an administration tool?" 12

Bricker's response was that, "anyone who overlooks using the cabinet overlooks the need to maintain a manageable span of control." Lausche "most emphatically" agreed to the usefulness of cabinet members in administration. O'Neill responded, "Yes," and DiSalle said, "Sure it is." Rhodes summarized the concept, and elaborated:

I think twelve strong men are better than eleven weak ones and one strong one. I never mistrusted my cabinet members. I believed in them and gave them responsibility and authority. They were espousing their programs, holding press conferences, merchandising, marketing, doing what they believed in to help the department, and managing.

Nor do the five governors believe that the governor's cabinet is vanishing. All said they worked with their cabinets very closely. Bricker met with his cabinet once weekly, as did Lausche and O'Neill. They also indicated that they met with individual members at times other than the weekly sessions. DiSalle found it necessary, he said, to hold weekly meetings of the cabinet, and to see each other socially,
as well. Rhodes, the last in calendar order of our governors, found twice weekly meetings were needed.

We met at least twice a week, formally, in the cabinet room, for coordination and administration. And I met with them separately as the occasion demanded, usually several times a week. I picked them as administrators with expertise in their respective fields, and I used them that way. I think the man who is director of agriculture, for example, should run the agricultural program in Ohio."

The key to how the concept of cabinet usage in the management side of government has grown in Ohio, however, is found in a remote question toward the end of the interview. The question had to do with the extent of the office organization of each governor, and was phrased: "Will you describe the extent of your staff organization?" 13

Bricker said he had a dozen people, including two administrative assistants, a press secretary, and stenographers. Lausche had a dozen, too, but had only two administrative assistants, a private secretary, and nine stenographers. O'Neill found it necessary to enlarge the gubernatorial staff to include three administrative assistants, several aides, a press secretary, and ten stenographers. DiSalle had "eight top staff men, and 15 stenographers," he said, "and the cabinet." And Rhodes had three top aides, four lesser ones, two private secretaries, two clerks, and six stenographers, "plus the cabinet."

Perceiving the use of the cabinet in administration and management by their predecessors, DiSalle and Rhodes enlarged the cabinet's administrative role, they believe, by functionally, if not physically, moving the cabinet into the governor's office. "There has to be
delegation in management," DiSalle says. "A governor today has to use his cabinet."

"I picked professional administrators," Rhodes said, "and I used them as such. "We had cabinet meetings and laid the law down that you will all get along, and manage, and work for each other. Many said we had probably the most coordinated cabinet in the history of Ohio."

Ransone offers us a concept of the governor's role in management. It is, he says, "That of establishing the policies which govern the day-to-day operations of the executive branch, of securing policy coordination among the agencies which make up the executive branch..." And Lipson tells us that, "It is for the governor as chief executive to supervise and coordinate the operating agencies. This he cannot do without the assistance of the staff and control divisions."

How does a governor obtain the assistance of the staff and control divisions? Ohio's five governors have answered: By using the cabinet. Governors must delegate by specific objective in order to maintain a manageable span of control, and the logical delegation is to cabinet members who are administrators capable of managing.

Former Governor Terry Sanford suggests another problem which, he says, impinges upon the role of a governor as chief executive. A governor "needs to have brought back to him the slices of executive authority which have been handed other elected officials." Ransone touches on the alleged dilemma, noting that, "While the governor is supposed to be the state's chief executive, he is actually the chief executive only in the sense that he is the first among several executives."
Ransone's argument is that the other executive officers who are elected "are on the same level with the governor and draw their authority from the same source." Indeed, the late President Woodrow Wilson, himself a former governor, alluded to such officials as "colleagues of the governor."\textsuperscript{18} The late Peter Odegard also took up the cry. "In most states," he said, "the governor is but one among a number of independently elected executive officers."\textsuperscript{19} Thus, Odegard reasoned, "tidy, centralized control...over the heads of executive departments and agencies is denied to the governor."

Herbert Jacob claims that the governor is "only one of many executives." As a consequence, he says, "a large number of agencies lead their own lives beyond the pale of effective gubernatorial direction or control."\textsuperscript{20} Robert H. Simmons, indeed, finds a plural executive system in the State of Washington. "Power, responsibility, and function are not fused," he says, "and are far more than divided. They are, rather, diffused throughout the entire fragmented executive system."\textsuperscript{21}

In Ohio, the other elected officers are the lieutenant governor, attorney general, auditor of state, treasurer of state, and secretary of state. Four of the five governors interviewed felt that the presence of these independent elected executives does not limit the chief executive's power.\textsuperscript{22} In fact, says John W. Bricker, their presence helped. Lausche said he felt their presence does limit a chief executive, but O'Neill, Rhodes, and DiSalle did not believe so.

However, from that point the governors followed diverging paths. Bricker, O'Neill, and Rhodes tend to favor continuation of the other
executive offices as elective ones. Lausche and DiSalle favor abolishing all of them except auditor, and making them subject to appointment by the governor. There is a variable here, however, which is inescapable, and which correlates highly with the attitudes of these men.

Governors Bricker, O'Neill, and Rhodes each held one of those lesser elective executive offices. Bricker and O'Neill served as attorneys general. Rhodes served as state auditor. Lausche came to the governor's office from the Cleveland mayor's office, and DiSalle from private life.

Rhodes and Bricker are strongest in their arguments for retaining the offices as elective ones. Bricker says he favors continuing to elect the officers "as simply a personal feeling." O'Neill has no strong feeling about it, he says, while Rhodes has:

I think there ought to be the check and balance that they provide. There is provision for a spread of responsibility, and that is good. A governor cannot handle all of those phases—the ministerial duties, the legal duties, the auditing, the collecting and banking of money, and writing the checks—without an inevitable conflict. I believe in the system of checks and balances. I do believe, however, that the most powerful agency in the State of Ohio is the Bureau of Inspection and Supervision of Public Offices, and that it ought to be removed from politics. Some people try to play politics with it. This is a real close watcher of the taxpayer's dollar.

The Bureau of Inspection and Supervision of Public Offices is within the Auditor of State's Office at the present time. Its duties are the post audit of all levels of government, from state departments down. Rhodes favors a constitutional amendment, he says, providing for an independent audit agency with members having a 20-year term. "They should pay them enough that they don't care what
the law is, and handle the taxpayer's dollar. They would save millions and millions of dollars."

Lausche, O'Neill and DiSalle would prefer to see the lieutenant governor and the governor elected as a team. Bricker rejects the idea, and Rhodes says it is not important, "a matter of philosophy." Lausche and DiSalle favor appointment of all by the governor, except the lieutenant governor and auditor, and O'Neill feels the same way, except he also believes the attorney general should be elective.

Lausche summarizes the position of all of them with regard to the auditor of state:

The office of the auditor should be elective. The auditor examines the books and the finances of the governor, and therefore the governor ought not to appoint his own auditor.

The position is not in conflict with Rhodes. His reference to BISPO did not include the rest of the office of auditor of state. Thus, a majority of the governors interviewed favored doing away with the other elected executive offices, except that of auditor of state, but the most recent of the five sees no problem. He favors continuation of what he views as "the check and balance system."

Literature on the governors also levels some heavy blows at the existence of independent boards, commissions, and agencies. Governor Sanford, for example, in talking with other governors, found that they see, among other problems, "too many boards and commissions..." Lipson makes brief reference to the problem. Duane Lockard sees them as a gubernatorial problem. Odegard saw the governor as "shackled with ancient managerial handcuffs that most businessmen would find intolerable," and referred specifically to "well-meaning reform groups
that want to keep education or recreation or conservation or public health independent and 'free of politics' "..." 26

One thing there is, however, that leavens this gubernatorial misery, according to Fred Gantt:

Regardless of the legal independence they enjoy, however most members and executive directors of independent establishments apparently are desirous of cooperating with the current administration, whoever the governor might be at that time. As one official phrased it, "Even if they don't respect the governor, they respect the office of governor and generally try to get along." 27

Bricker, Lausche, and Rhodes claim they had no difficulty with such independent boards, commissions, and agencies. O'Neill and DiSalle recall that they did, but four of the five governors claim that they showed a desire to cooperate with their administration. 28

John Bricker recalls:

I never had any difficulties. I may have given them freer rein than most people do, and let them get the full credit for it, but with that I found there was closer cooperation, and they conferred with me more often than maybe they would have otherwise.

Lausche saw them as no administrative problem, but deplores the proliferation of them:

They are not an administrative problem except that they have been created with increased frequency by different professions wanting to be licensed and thus create a closed shop with respect to their occupation. The governor appoints the members of those commissions, of those agencies, and they are increasing all the time. He does have the power in Ohio to remove for misfeasance, malfeasance, or nonfeasance. I am of the belief that too many of them have been created without justification, and without benefit to the general public, however.

Rhodes' position is the "strong governor" posture of Lausche. "It's the people you select. You can hire them, and you can fire them."
Most students of gubernatorial roles make some effort, at least, to differentiate the role of "chief executive" and the role of "chief legislator." Ransone differentiates between the governor's role in legislative policy and his role in administrative policy, for example. But he says that the governor, in forming and implementing policy in three areas, finds himself playing a triple role "as legislative leader, administrative chief, and head of his political party..."

For the moment, we will disregard the legislative leader and head of party roles. They are treated in following chapters.

Lipson, also, has as the central theme of his work "the leadership of the governor in the executive and legislative branches." And he finds that in both spheres, "the four decades of the Twentieth Century have witnessed an unprecedented development of his leadership." But government is a single continuous process, Lipson argues, and the legislating and administrative phases are "merged together and at certain points become indistinguishable." This merging was observed by Ransone seventeen years later. "Politics and administration...seems to be part of a continuous flow process."

What the study of five Ohio governors who have been in the office during all but two years since 1939 indicates is that Lipson's thesis applied in Ohio then, and that Ransone's thesis came at the end of the blending of the roles as chief executive and chief legislator. The finding is rooted in a variety of questions put to the governors in the schedule structured interview, but the responses are drawn together under one: "Can you differentiate between the governor's role in legislative policy and administrative policy?"
In a nutshell, Bricker and Lausche say they could not. "No clear difference," Bricker declares. "No, I can't differentiate between the two," Lausche responds. But C. William O'Neill says he things he can. DiSalle sees "a real distinction there," and Rhodes says. "They are not one and the same. They are different." If we utilize a time continuum, then, we can provide an illustration of the separation of the role of chief executive and the role of chief legislator onto two separate roles in the reciprocating gubernatorial role-set thus:

![Figure 4. Separation and Specialization of Executive and Legislative Roles, Governor of Ohio, 1939-1971](image-url)
We are now prepared to argue that these data, thus far, indicate a revised model is emerging for our reciprocal role-set.

Figure 5. Revised Emerging Gubernatorial Reciprocal Role-Set Model, Ohio Governor, 1939-1971.

The revised, and emerging gubernatorial role set in Ohio now definitely identifies two roles, and strongly suggests a third. The two are Governor as Self, with the Chief of State function embedded within that ego-directed role as a sub-role, and Chief Executive, emerging since 1957 as a role interlocking with Governor as Self, but not therein embedded, and distinctly separate from Governor as Chief Legislator. The latter role is only suggested at this point, however, and must be dealt with in the following chapter.
The five men who have held the office of governor in Ohio for 30 of the past 32 years make it eminently clear that they consider the role of Chief Executive as a valid one, and separate and distinct from any other. But while wearing that hat, they emphasize, and following that role definition, they are using the head of Governor as Self.

"You've got to be your own boss," says John W. Bricker.

"You've got to have one head," says Frank J. Lausche. "The Lord, in creating man, didn't put two heads on his shoulders."

"A governor has to try to maintain his identity at all times," says C. William O'Neill.

"It depends a great deal on the governor and his willingness to work at it how much he can achieve," says Michael V. DiSalle. "I think Ohio governors have the tools. It depends a great deal on how they, as individuals, use them."

"I think a governor can make himself felt in any field he wants to," declares James A. Rhodes.

The message is clear: "He that would govern others, first should be Master of himself."
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Leslie Lipson completed his sturdy historical analysis of the rise of the American governor from figurehead to leader in 1939, the year that John W. Bricker began serving the first of three two-year terms in Ohio. Lipson's central theme was leadership of the governor in the executive and legislative branches.¹

Seventeen years later, as Frank J. Lausche was completing his fifth, and last two-year term, Coleman B. Ransone, Jr., in a study devoted to description and analysis of the functions of the American governor, found that governors are concerned with three broad areas of operations.² He identified them as policy formation, public relations, and management. And a governor's principal role, he declared, "seems to be that of policy formation, since, the compelling force of policy considerations runs like a thread through the governor's other functions."³

Both scholars assigned the governor a role as Chief Legislator, but like John W. Bricker and Frank J. Lausche, they were troubled by the apparent overlap of that role with the role of Chief Executive. As we observed in the last chapter, Bricker and Lausche found the limits of the two roles nearly coterminous. Ransone found little
distinction between politics and administration at the state level. And Lipson noted that a governor makes policy by the manner in which he administers, as well as in recommending and lobbying in the legislative process.

The distinction, or lack of it, suggests that perhaps the problem is conceptual. There are, in fact, two concepts involved. One concerns the nature of policy. The other concerns the nature of the man who is governor, or, as we have indicated, the nature of the governor as "self."

The extent of gubernatorial leadership in either the administrative or legislative fields is directly concerned with how the Governor As Self mobilizes and uses power derived from position, competence, and personal charisma. How does the nature of public policy, and the nature of Governor as Self, fit into role portrayal of Governor as Chief Legislator?

We can commence with two questions: What is the good life? What kind of goals ought we seek?

An honest response to those questions by anyone--governors included--would indicate the range of his value preferences, and the rank order he assigns to each. Thus, man has a rank order of conceptions as to what is desirable, and not only does he alter that rank order from time to time, but his judgment of priorities differs from others. Different persons assign different priorities. The rank order of the value preferences of a nun, for example, would hardly be the same as those of an industrial tycoon.
Values must be authoritatively allocated by any society. It is a minimum prerequisite of society. In our political system, our base values are found in the formal language of constitutions, statutes, and ordinances. However, these are not the only values that are authoritatively allocated. If a policy is authoritative when there is a prevailing feeling that it ought to be obeyed, then it follows that values can be authoritatively allocated by means other than government decision or legal pronouncement. The authoritative allocation of values results from the development of social policy by whatever policy-making process has been selected on the basis of a consensus of preference on it.

The need for social policy stems from the very character of society. Such policy seeks to solve problems associated with survival, and the perpetuation of the group. Policymaking occurs in an arena with actors representing partisan interests, shared attitude values, or value preferences of the various public. Since the range and priority of values involved can be reduced to a pattern of emotional responses conditioned by life's total experiences, then the emotional responses are to a state of real or presumed facts.

Society is a special kind of human grouping with continually interacting members. It can be defined as the broadest grouping of human beings who live together and collectively undertake to satisfy the minimum prerequisites of group life. Policy which anchors to base values covers production and exchange, maintenance of order, the inculcation of a sense of common purpose, destiny, and defense, and the dissemination and communication of knowledge. Thus, public policy
suggests a term characteristic of a whole group, or class, and embraces all responses by government to its environment. Persons active in the policy-making arena make demands for values on themselves and others, on the basis of various expectations. Their values are goal events. If John Doe feels strongly enough about the question of teaching sex education in the public schools, he may form a group, or join one already formed by others whose attitude he shares, which has as a goal event the abolishment of such teaching. This is an act of valuing called valuation. The concept of valuation leads us to the notion that values are conflicting, facilitative, or compatible. Thus, a demand statement is one expressing a valuation. The symbol of demand is one used in demand statements to refer to value.

A good beginning for the discussion of policy is suggested by Richard N. Goodwin. He sees "two mingled aspects of public policy: content and technique. And though they are ultimately inseparable, each has effects of its own." There is no such thing, Goodwin contends, as a non-ideological society, and so the content of public policy in any society is dictated by ideology. The question, of course, becomes one of whose ideology prevails, and it returns us to ideas and values. Goodwin observes:

Ours is one of the most ideological nations of all. The very absence of serious and widespread public debate proves how successfully ideas have been woven into our national life. They almost seem part of the nature of things rather than what they are: human choices among a great variety of possibilities. There are many ways to resolve difficulties, but only ideology can reveal that a difficulty is.
Lasswell and Kaplan offer the same notion in different terms. They observe that "policy is a projected program of goal values and practices." This led Austin Ranney to offer what he termed "a modest elaboration" of the Lasswell-Kaplan concept of policy contents:

- **A particular object or set of objects**—some designated part of the environment (an aspect of the society or physical world) which is intended to be affected.

- **A desired course of events**—a particular sequence of behavior desired in the particular object or set of objects.

- **A selected line of action**—a particular set of actions chosen to bring about the desired course of events; in other words, not merely whatever the society happens to be doing toward the set of objects at the moment, but a deliberate selection of one line of action from among several possible lines.

- **A declaration of intent**—whether broadcast publicly to all who will listen or communicated secretly to a special few, some statement by the policy-makers as to what they intend to do, how, and why.

- **An implementation of intent**—the actions actually undertaken vis-a-vis the particular set of objects in pursuance of the choices and declaration.

Public policy also includes in its content an element of pragmatism, but pragmatic action, as Goodwin observes, "moves carefully within a tightly confined ideological space," because "we need and we have a mixed array of beliefs, values, and ideas to serve as reference points.

If policy has an ideological content, then it becomes important to consider elements of the ideology of the political system under consideration. Goodwin identifies the elements of the American political system as nationalism and the democratic process, concepts of individual liberty and obedience to law, faith in technology and the
pursuit of invention, the virtue of rising national wealth, the willingness to reward production more than teaching, or acting more than contemplation, and the conviction that problems can be solved.\textsuperscript{21}

Policy also has innovative and creative elements. Karl Mannheim suggests, for example, that "policy is a process that begins where precedent ends." \textsuperscript{22} It is precedent, combining elements of both fact and value, and aims to transmute value into fact—a judgment of what ought to be into reality.

Louis W. Koenig suggests that policy can be expressed in a variety of ways, including statute, resolution, executive order, regulation, conversation, letter, gesture, and mood. And he says it can be arranged hierarchically according to its importance.\textsuperscript{23} It may represent the official will, but not the real will of the political branches making it, he continues, observing that an administration may have a grand design and that policies are developed to fit that design's framework.

One must distinguish between innovative and adaptive policy. Adaptive policy, say Koenig, is "the adjustment of existing policy to changing circumstances, or to new problems, without a change in its vital substance." \textsuperscript{24} At this point, Koenig also draws a distinction between behavioral and verbal responses in the policy field. "Policy must also be distinguished between word and deed, between what is said and what is done."

Richard E. Neustadt offers us a normative theory of policy content. He calls it "viability." \textsuperscript{25} Such viability must have three ingredients, he claims, including (1) a purpose that moves with the grain of history, (2) an operation manageable to those who administer it, acceptable to
those who support it, and tolerable to those who must put up with it, and (3) "proper timing."

Walter Lippmann has pointed with journalistic bluntness to the nature of the partisan content of public policy, a subject to be explored at greater length in the following chapter. He cites the "hard" and the "soft" choices which confront policymakers, defining "soft" as the "easier side" reflecting our desires, and the "hard" as "what is needed in order to satisfy the desire." He also notes that "all but the most exceptional leaders prefer policies in which the costs are as far as possible indirect. They do not like direct taxation. They do not like pay as they go."26

Another aspect of policy content is what David Easton describes as its extension and denial features. "The essence of a policy," he observes, "lies in the fact that through it certain things are denied to some people and made accessible to others."28

Public administration scholars tend to view policy as "government's long-range plans and values, and the principles and practices that should be adopted in various fields of national life." But as Easton contends, in the effective phase of policy, a decision "is expressed or interpreted in a series of actions and narrower decisions which may in effect establish new policy." Thus, policy has the aspect of dynamic capability in its content. This is given to it by the breadth of the prescription. Malleable policy is that which is rarely fixed. If, however, the prescribers produce a highly specific policy measure, it is less malleable because it is less subject to administrative alteration.
Policy is usually divisible, as R. L. Curry, Jr., and L. L. Wade suggest. They perceive that policies are rarely permanent, so that "one may have more or less than whatever it is that current policy does in the way of allocating things people want."\textsuperscript{31} This divisibility of policies, the two writers elaborate, enables one to develop the notion of policy units, and to think of public policies as continuous variables "that can continuously take on new values."\textsuperscript{32}

Policy may also have in its content those fatal seeds which might be called non-authoritativeness. That is, policy may represent a value given official government voice, but not enjoying legitimacy. People will not accept it. It is non-authoritative because there is not a prevailing feeling that it ought to be obeyed. The so-called "blue laws" prohibiting Sunday sales in Ohio are a good example, but the Volstead Act is probably a better one.

We must argue, therefore, that the content of policy may be either authoritative or non-authoritative. The question of which is decided after the move from what Easton calls the formal phase to the effective phase.\textsuperscript{33}

The foregoing suggests the policy content viewpoints of Thomas R. Dye and Yeheskel Dror. Dye sees policy as "outcomes" of a system which "expresses the value allocations of a society, and these allocations are the chief output of the society's political system."\textsuperscript{34} Policy represents outcomes shaped by social, economic and political conditions, he elaborates, and are viewed by him as value commitments of the political system. As such, they are the chief output of that system.\textsuperscript{35}
Dror sees public policy as "a continuous flow of more or less interdependent policies dealing with many different activities." The indirect output of public policymaking, he contends, is "how it affects real situations, which range from behavior involved in secondary decisionmaking and policy execution to society as a whole." Dror also raises the question of negative policy, which he defines as "non-decision in issue areas." His reference is to a decision not to decide, which also is policy.

As important as the content and direction of public policies, according to Goodwin, "are the methods and structures used to carry them out." Goodwin thus introduces the technique aspect of policy:

The United States, Russia, and China, for example, have all worked to increase agricultural production, but their differing techniques have shaped the life of the individual farmer in drastically different ways.

Examination of the aspects of public policy leads to an examination of its components. This, in turn, leads us to Vernon Van Dyke's philosophical analysis in which he identifies the two components of policy as rules and action. He explains that a rule is "a criterion that an actor follows in making decisions," and that if followed, leads him to do the same kind of a thing on the same kind of occasion. "Rules are prescriptive or normative rather than descriptive." Van Dyke contends that rules are guides to action, and are "more closely related to reasons for action than to causes of action, for they are associated with purpose and choice." Van Dyke's notion of policy components is given substantial elaboration in the concept of content offered by Austin Ranney. Rules, as defined by Van Dyke,
equates with Ranney's "declaration of intent." Van Dyke's "action" can be equated with Ranney's "selected line of action." 42

As Ranney observes, the special character of public policy "consists of the fact that it is adopted and implemented by what David Easton calls 'the authorities' in a political system." The rule here is according to the Easton concept to which Ranney calls attention, that there are persons "recognized by most members of the system as having responsibility for these matters." 43 Easton thus points us toward the Van Dyke action concept in the same discussion with the observation that these "authorities" are the ones whose actions are "accepted as binding most of the time by most of the members so long as they act within the limits of their roles.

The examination of policy aspects and components leads us to the question of the origin of policy. Where does it all come from?

The question recalls Ranney's "modest elaboration" that policy is a "projected program of goal values and practices." The elaboration included the notion that policy includes "some designated part of the environment....which is intended to be affected." 44 If a projected program of goal values and practices aimed at affecting some designated part of the environment is involved, then policy must have its origins in the environment. One perceives that friction exists in the environment, and that policy is developed to eliminate it. As it becomes developmental, and begins to take form, it finds proponents and opponents who perceive either a potential improvement, or a deterioration of their stakes in the environment. Policy, says Professor Koenig, "can be understood as an accomodation and reconcilia-
tion of several antithetical concepts and influences. For instance, policy may be a relating of special interest to public interest groups: the mass groups of nationality, race, religion, and labor; economic entrepreneurial groups; moral groups, and professional and bureaucratic groups.45

Not only political values, "but a wide range of nonpolitical values enter into policy questions and become policy goals," Sorauf tells us.46 Curry and Wade claim that "policies are the generic commodities available in a polity."47 Dye sees policy as a "product of socio-economic input variables and political system characteristics."48 Dror asserts that, "The indirect output of public policymaking is how it affects real situations, which range from behavior involved in secondary decision-making and policy execution to society as a whole."49 Easton admonishes us that "policy arises out of a situation consisting of the interaction of various social elements" and that we therefore "must go beyond activity at the level of governmental institutions."50 Lasswell presents us with his succinct outline: "Man pursues values through institutions on resources," particularly wealth and power.51 And Koenig adds the notion that legislative and executive policymaking both influences, and is influenced by, a series or orders in our pluralistic society. He identifies these as the cultural, social, moral, economic, and political orders.52

The foregoing suggests that policy does, indeed, originate in the environment, and that it is an environment of substantial proportions. It also suggests that despite the fallibility of the theory of democracy, some of the publics, as well as the groups which they form, make their
influence felt. And it suggest that while the process itself may be located in the institutional setting as a matter of convenience, it cannot be restricted to it as a matter of fact.

We also have the concept offered by Lipson and Ransone, and by our five participating governors, that the process is a continuum, and that different spectators of the action enter it at different times. The idea is that policy is not inclined to be static, but is undergoing constant alteration even though such alteration may not be highly visible at times.

We are suggesting here that the environment includes inner and outer chambers, but these chambers are not closed. In the inner chamber, we find the formal institutions—the executive, the legislature, and the court. All of these institutions are involved in making policy, the executive as a prescriber and a modifier, the legislature as the formal prescriber, and the court as a modifier, or even truncator. Clustered about all of these institutions in the inner environment, but particularly in the executive agencies, is the bureaucracy. Few will argue that the bureaucracy is not one of the major sources of public policy today. Certainly, our five governors will not do so. As one set of editors have observed, "It remains to be noted that agency policy making is a never-ending process."53 Indeed, we are reminded that agencies often modify or change existing policies, as well as adopt new ones. 54
Our policy process environmental role model indicates the inner environment, with the bureaucracy as an informal but effective institution located in it. It also indicates the interlocking roles of the executive, legislative, and judicial branches.

In the outer environment, we have the media, the publics, the non-party interest groups, and the political parties, all of whom have access to the inner environment by way of the electoral system, and means of bringing direct pressure. Simplistic as it may be, the model
thus offers us a concept of the total environment in which policy has its origins, and of the environment in which a Governor as Self is maneuvering as Chief Executive, or Chief Legislator.

Chief Legislator rates number two billing as a role on the gubernatorial stage in Ohio. Our data indicates that all six governors who held office from 1939 to 1971 played it that way.

We are saying that Chief Legislator is clearly a role in the reciprocal gubernatorial role-set in Ohio, and that it is rank ordered second only to Chief Executive. It must be understood, however, that both roles are subordinate, in fact, to the Governor As Self. We also find that while the role of Chief Legislator is interlocked with that of Chief Executive, as John W. Bricker and Frank J. Lausche perceived, the interlock is not direct. Indeed, it is by way of the core role—the psychic character of Governor As Self—that the linkage is achieved. There is but one hat because, as Governor Lausche observed, "The Lord, in creating man, did not put two heads on his shoulders." Governor As Self wears that hat at all times. But there are times when he wears it as Chief Executive, and times when he wears it as Chief Legislator. The function differs, and so does the script, but the man in the hat is the same man.

We are indebted here to the Survey Research Center of the University of Michigan for being able to link a governor whom we were unable to interview into the 32-year gubernatorial span. He is Thomas J. Herbert, who held the office from 1947 to 1949. The SRC popularized by extensive use an alternative form of questioning called open-ended, which gives respondents the opportunity to express their opinions in their own way,
without being forced to select among categories. A number of such questions were included in the schedule structured interview used as our data-gathering methodology. In responding to an open-ended question, C. William O'Neill provides us with the testimony of an expert witness that Thomas J. Herbert played the role of Chief Legislator. And the same question provides us with a corroborative witness in the person of an interested spectator of the action. He is Frank J. Lausche, who was defeated by Herbert in the 1946 gubernatorial election, and who successfully unseated Herbert in the 1948 general election. O'Neill can be classified as an expert witness because, as he points out, he was Speaker of the Ohio House during the term that Herbert was governor.

O'Neill's response was in answer to a request in the schedule structured interview, to indicate at that early point a conception of the gubernatorial roles, and a rank ordering of them. He specified Chief Executive as "the first role," and then declared:

And the way it is organized in Ohio, particularly when the Republicans are in power, you really play the role of the leader of the legislature. I've noticed it from the days when I was a "baby" member, under Bricker, and I finally got to be whip of the house while he was still governor, so I went to the policy meetings, and I saw something of the inside there. And Bill McCullough put me on the Rules Committee, so I saw it again there as we formulated policy in the house. It was clear under Bricker. He called the shots for the legislature, and I was Tom Herbert's speaker, and I would say to a lesser degree, he did. Basically, he was recognized. The words "administration bill" were still magic, and you were supposed to go along, and everybody did.

And when I was governor, I couldn't have had better cooperation. Maybe I would have been better off if I had not had such good cooperation. Everything I wanted, they put through. Everything I asked. And certainly it was that way under Jim (Rhodes). He called the shots in the legislature all the way.
Lausche, responding to the same open-ended question, observes that, "I do not believe that you can formulate a rule that will be uniformly applicable to each governor," but observes further:

I do believe that the governor must play a role that I would call chief legislator. You might call him that. Certainly, I played it, and I know that Tom Herbert did, and Jim Rhodes did. A governor must play the role if he is going to have views of what ought to be done, and thus recommends the adoption of those views.

Is the governor of Ohio, in fact, chief legislator? This was the lead off question of that section of the schedule structured interview dealing with the alleged Chief Legislator role. The responses were as follows:

Bricker--Why of course. He has to be to carry out his program, but there's a clear distinction between the executive and the legislator. I wouldn't put it ahead of chief executive, but then I may not look at it in the proper light because of the leadership we had in the legislature when I was governor.

Lausche--Yes. As I said, he undoubtedly has views of what ought to be done and he thus recommends the adoption of those views. Ultimately, the power lies in the legislature, except that the governor has the power to veto laws, and thus, in a negative way, having not done what he doesn't want done, but he doesn't have the ultimate power of making done what he does want to have done.

O'Neill--Yes, I would say that he is the leader of the legislature, and particularly when the Republican Party has controlled both the governor's office, and the legislature. That's the way it is organized in Ohio. It is different with the Democrats. I was in the legislature quite a while, in a leadership role, when Frank (Lausche) was governor, and I've also observed the Democrats twice when they've been in the majority, and it just seems to me that it doesn't operate the same for the Democrats. It just seemed to me that their concept was different.
DiSalle--It all depends on what you mean by Chief Legislator. If by that you mean does he submit in number the largest items of the legislative program, yes, he is the chief. Secondly, does it mean that he tries to influence legislative members in buying his program? Yes, he is chief legislator in that capacity. It all depends on what methods he uses.

Rhodes--I think that if the governor wants to get along with the legislature, he can get along. I don't think you can give the legislature castor oil, and tell them to remain stationary someplace. You just can't do that. A lot of people thought we were highly successful in our relationship with the legislature, but we didn't send things up to get defeated. We send things up to get them passed.

The five governors agree that the governor is the most potent policy-making power in the state, as is suggested by former Governor Sanford, of North Carolina, but they all qualify the assessment to include what Bricker terms "overall policy." None of the five will confine their assessment to legislative matters alone. Indeed, O'Neill ranks the speaker of the house as the second most potent policy-maker. Lausche thinks the governor has "adequate authority," but observes:

There were times when I saw, through manipulation bad items wrapped into a package with good items. Normally, you can make line vetoes, but I think I encountered situations where I had to veto a bad together with a good one.

DiSalle views the governor as the most potent policy-maker "outside of the lobbies." He explains the observation this way:

Now I don't want to seem facetious, but you've got to face reality. If I had a piece of legislation and there was no opposition from the Ohio Bankers, or the Ohio Manufacturers, or the Ohio Chamber of Commerce, or the Ohio Utilities, or the Ohio Druggists, or the Ohio Retail Merchants, I think I'd have a pretty good chance of getting it passed. But if you have legislation that is opposed by one of these groups, or all of them, you are really in trouble.
In spite of Ransone's finding to the contrary, Ohio's governors draw a clear distinction between legislative policy-making and administrative policy making. Rhodes sums it up this way:

Policy is established, and administration is second. You have formally enacted policy, and then there's discretion in administration; an interpretation that this is the way it ought to be enforced. Policy is the overall veneer of the law. No man can change that veneer. But there are certain discretionary areas where you set policy. Discretion is policy. Policy is how you administer the law. Some people don't want to enforce it, and that's policy, too.

Sociologists generally find that there are six bases of social power, or potential social influence. French and Raven summarize these as informational power, coercion power, reward power, legitimate power, referent power, and expert power. Raven classes informational power as an independent influence, in this important social psychological perspective on social power, while the other five are classed as socially dependent, since their impact depends upon something the source does, or is.

Our governors indicate that it is this independent influence of informational power, more than any other, that they tend to rely upon as chief legislator. They do so by way of frequent messages, formal and informal, to the legislature. French and Raven define informational power this way.

If a change in attitude or behavior occurs as a result of cognitive reorganization or new insight produced by the content of an attempt to influence—and has nothing to do with the source of the attempt to influence—then the change has been produced by informational power.
The five governors, all of whom indicated they sent frequent formal and informal messages to the legislature, were asked if they believe that messages from the governor are effective. Their verbatim responses:

Bricker--I think so, if you properly analyze the problems and make the suggestions, and they know that you have valid information which is pertinent to the subject at hand. Legislators want to know about any information that you have.

Lausche--I sent them according to the necessity of the times. Messages are effective from the standpoint of letting the legislature know what the governor wants done, and why.

O'Neill--I sent messages almost daily, to the Senate leader, and the speaker of the house, and talked to them either in the office or at the mansion, or on the phone, and worked with them very closely. It was very effective.

DiSalle--Yes, both formal and informal. In fact, instead of trying to cover it all with the State of the State Message, I sent special messages with independent pieces of legislation. I think there is no question about it where there is debate.

Rhodes--I sent very few formal messages, but I met with the legislative leaders, Democrats and Republicans, and I would tell them what we thought was good for the State of Ohio, and why we thought so. They had some good ideas, and we conformed to what they believed. We never felt that we had a monopoly on all of the good ideas for state government. Success lies in the communication of information back and forth, and we communicated. Both sides must listen to each other. It is a matter of mutual respect.

Coercion power, French and Raven remind us, "stems from the ability of the agent to mediate punishment," and to be effective, "a high power person must be able to apply or withhold punishments depending on what the low-power person does or says. Reward power, by the same token, results from the ability of the agent to mediate rewards,
and its effectiveness depends upon the power of the high-power person to apply or withhold rewards.

What is suggested here, of course, is the time-worn idea that a governor can use patronage, or other favors, as reward power. And of course, his veto power might be considered as coercion power. Ohio's five governors reject both as outdated and ineffective.

In the case of patronage (reward) power, the governors were specifically asked if power over patronage is a factor in legislative leadership.

"More important in the political organization than in legislative leadership," Bricker says. Lausche recalls that he "declared a policy not at any time to dismiss an employee under civil service solely for the purpose of creating a vacancy to be filled." He rejected the use of patronage, he says. O'Neill says "it is made up of patronage of all kinds, not just jobs. That's where the power is if you want to use it that way, but I did not favor such tactics.

DiSalle, too, says patronage power is there "if you want to use it that way." He remembers:

I had one legislator who had a father employed by the state. He always thought I knew it. I never knew it. (Laughter). He used to vote along because, he'd tell his fellow members, you know I can't lose my father's job.

Rhodes thinks patronage is "a thing of the past. It's gone. It's the old system. You have to have expertise these days. The only thing left for patronage is unskilled jobs, and who wants that kind of pay?"
The idea of punishment is suggested by the gubernatorial veto power in Ohio, where the constitution also provides for the partial veto in the case of appropriation bills. The governors were first asked if they felt the veto to be a factor in the role of the governor as legislator. "Not if you have a cooperative legislature," Bricker responds, "and if you have a recalcitrant legislature, there's very little you can do anyway. When you enter into a debate, and get things in confusion, you don't get a constructive program anyway." Lausche views the veto power as a factor, however, and his position points to the ever-present variable of who is in power in the legislature. Lausche was confronted with a Republican-dominated legislature for most of his tenure, and DiSalle for half of his. Bricker, O'Neill, and Rhodes, all Republicans, had clear Republican majorities in both houses except in the 1965 session, for Rhodes, when the Lyndon Johnson landslide created a 16 - 16 split in the Ohio Senate.

Thus, Bricker, O'Neill, and Rhodes find the veto power not very effective, while Lausche and DiSalle find it a source of power. O'Neill suggests, however, that it "might be effective in a fight..." He adds: "I didn't have that kind of a fight." DiSalle looks at the veto power this way:

Oh, that's very important, because it gives you a lot of votes that you never had before. Sometimes, using the veto power as a bargaining device works. One time I vetoed the whole second year of an appropriation bill.

Rhodes, in responding, again indicates the nature of his linkage with the legislature:

Vetoes come about because you don't watch legislation. The reason we had so few vetoes is that we had good liaison
with the legislature. We watched. When there was a bad piece of legislation, we just told them, there's no use to send it down here. We're going to veto it. We only had three in eight years, and none were overridden.

The apparent discrepancy in the Rhodes position that the veto is not very effective as a bargaining tool, but that it can be effective, is resolved in his response to the question of whether he was able to use it as a bargaining device.\footnote{66}

You can't talk veto until the legislation is signed by the lieutenant governor and the speaker of the house. The governor has the responsibility to watch that legislation up to that point. Our liaison with the legislature was the finest. We had bad legislation, and we told them. We had students of legislative problems. They made recommendations that bettered legislation. The legislature respected our office. Our thoughts on bills were before them. That was a department in the governor's office that had authority. They always knew what I thought, and what I believed in. And they adhered to that.

DiSalle feels that you can use the veto as a bargaining device, "and sometimes it works." He says he used the veto nine times during two legislative sessions. O'Neill says he did not try to use the veto as a bargaining device. "I vetoed whenever I thought the bill was loaded with vitiating provisions." Lausche refused to use it as a bargaining device, he says, and "didn't find it very effective in my time. I vetoed only two or three bills all the time I was governor." Bricker used the veto power three times in his six years as governor, an average of once per legislative session.

The indicators thus presented to us are clear: If a governor has a good working majority, partisan or otherwise, the veto power is effective as coercion power, and as a bargaining device. In the case of a recalcitrant legislature, however, Bricker offers the answer. "There's very little you can do."
We are led to the conclusion that Rhodes offers the best formula for gubernatorial dealings with a modern state legislature:

I think that communication between a governor and the legislature is a must. Both sides must listen to each other. It is a matter of mutual respect. I think on many occasions, because of their disposition, some governors think they are the supreme court, the legislature, and the governor, all rolled into one. Time always proves that a governor will be put in his place. It is like water reaching its own level. The legislature will speak its piece, and so will the court.

Where, then, can governors get what French and Raven have called "referent power?" The authors define it as influence that occurs "when a person uses another person or group as a frame of reference..." The idea is that people often change their attitudes so as to make them similar to people in groups with whom they positively identify.

This brings up the idea that a governor is a kind of "chief communicator," as Lipson suggests, because he commands the attention of the news media. In the time of Lipson's study, of course, the media was primarily newspaper press and radio. Ransone referred to the governor's "public relations" role, using Lipson's general concept saying:

The governor's position is such that he must constantly be engaged in exposition. He must not only prepare a legislation program and see that it is enacted and establish administrative policies and see that they are adhered to, but he must also constantly assure the citizens that these functions are being well done and that he is carrying out the promises which he made in the election.

How do the five Ohio governors assess media power as affecting a governor's program? Bricker responds:

Very important. Very powerful. I knew practically all of the editors of the state personally. I always made it
Lausche says that "in Ohio, the media has a tremendous effect on the governor's legislative program." O'Neill declares:

I think it is obvious that the media is in constant contact with the public, and if it gives support to the views of the governor, as distinguished from supporting the views of the legislature, those views are more likely to be adopted.

DiSalle comes on equally strong:

Oh, gosh, I think it is terribly important, you know. I don't mean a case of an editorial for, or against. I mean when they go in and do a campaign for something. Unfortunately, they don't all campaign for the same thing; they all have local projects for which they really build.

DiSalle and Rhodes represented, according to the assessment of all governors interviewed, a time when the gubernatorial press conference had reached what DiSalle calls "the full dress stage." That is, radio, newspaper, and television reporters thronged the press conferences, and indeed, followed them wherever they went.

Both DiSalle and Rhodes say they experienced "strong" media coverage as they moved about Ohio, and that they accommodated all media at their press conferences. DiSalle had a regular schedule of such press conferences in his office, he said, but Rhodes did not. The Rhodes position was that "they ought to cover the governor, and not the office." Both believe that the press treated them fairly and objectively, and Rhodes observes, regarding media support:

Yes, the media will support your programs if they are good programs. They've got to be good programs. I don't think the press buys a bad program. I just don't think it does. Even those who disagreed with me, I think, were fair.
But Rhodes, like Frank Lausche, strongly endorses gubernatorial face-to-face communication with the publics.

There's two types of governors. There's one who wants to remain in Columbus and watch every little thing. The other type gives responsibility—he delegates—and he is free to go out and communicate with the people. We saw more people by accident than any eight governors on purpose.

All of the governors agree on one point, however: A governor can derive referent power by using the media, but the attraction of both media and people to him is his sub-role of Chief of State within his core role of Governor As Self.

O'Neill recalls "how frustrated we in the legislature used to be when Lausche could command the media and we couldn't get any attention at all. We were opposed. We were buried."

Lausche delineates for us the use of media power by a governor:

A governor can use media power to the extent that he has meetings with the press and publicizes his views. I did so only to the extent of communicating my views to the legislature, repeating them frequently to members of the news media, with which I met every day, and repeating them in my speeches as I went throughout the state. Its (media power) origin was in my press conferences in Columbus, and then distributed through the state, and to the extent that I appeared on television when I went into a specific community with reference to some ceremonial function.

And it is Lausche, whose somewhat Lincolnesque appearance and behavior was coupled with a kind of Shakespearian prose, as our responses indicate, who summed up media power as viewed by the governors: "It's like drops of water falling on top of the head. If they continue falling, they eventually bore a hole into the most obdurate skull."
The concept of "legitimate power," as suggested by French and Raven, refers to both the constitutional powers of a governor, and whether the legislature views the governor as having a legitimate right to influence. The five governors responding here believe that an Ohio governor has all of the constitutional tools he needs. Furthermore, they believe that a governor's recommending power, as well as his duty to submit a budget, enhances his legitimacy as a legislator in the eyes of the general assembly. They view it as "a tradition in this state," to use O'Neill's words, "that the governor has the responsibility for initiating state-wide legislative programs." DiSalle says, "I think, primarily, the responsibility has to rest there." Lausche views it as "a primary responsibility," but says he does not want "to diminish the responsibility of the legislative body, which is the true legislative branch of government." And Rhodes says, "The governor definitely must have programs. A governor must see the big problems; the big picture."

An assessment of the 32-year span covered by our governors, then emerges as follows:

The reciprocal gubernatorial roles of Chief Executive and Chief Legislator have emerged as clearly separate and distinct ones in Ohio. They interlock, but the linkage is by way of Governor As Self.

An Ohio governor is Chief Legislator, but certainly not the dominant one unless he maintains close liaison with the general assembly, and utilizes face-to-face interaction with leaders on both sides of the aisle to achieve "mutual respect."
Gubernatorial power as a legislator depends upon the nature of the coalition he has assembled, and upon whether or not his, or the other party's members are in the majority.

Gubernatorial legislative power depends upon media support, and a governor can get media support if he has good programs, but he must get around his state in order to enhance that support. DiSalle explains this:

The Columbus newspapers have a lot more influence (on the legislature) than the other papers around the state. The legislators are there, and they read there. This happens in Washington, with The Washington Post, and The Star, and the television stations. The legislators are impressed by what they see, and hear. And in Ohio, this is remarkably true, because state news doesn't make front pages unless it's really something. Now Governor Rhodes, I think, and I think Lausche, overcame a lot of that by going. Rhodes worked very closely with publishers.

Thus, gubernatorial power as Chief Legislator depends upon these variables: (1) which party is in power, (2) extent of media support, (3) the ability to deal with pressure groups, and (4) methods used by the governor in dealing with the legislature. And the Rhodes admonishment reminds us that while the arm of the King is, indeed, a long one, "the legislature will speak its piece."
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CHAPTER V
CHIEF OF PARTY

You've got to keep your hand on the state organization.

John W. Bricker, Governor of Ohio, 1939-1945

Michael Vincent DiSalle spun his chair about so that he was looking out of his office window on the ninth floor of the Pennsylvania Building in Washington, D. C. He had just been asked an open-ended question in a schedule structured interview that had now consumed nearly three hours:

Do you have any other observations with regard to the assignment of Party Chief as a gubernatorial role?1

DiSalle was silent for several minutes as he stared out over Pennsylvania Avenue. Then the former Ohio governor turned back to the interviewer whom he had wryly described as his tormentor.

"Look," he said, "let's just lay it out. I don't care where this goes. What's it going to do to me?" He began drumming his fingers on his desk to emphasize his points.

"The only way that a governor can really be effective is to build a state party, and to build a state party, you need money. Now where do you get his money? And if you permit it to interfere with your duties as governor, then you are compromising yourself there. To do the job in a big state, to organize the party, to have a party that's effective, is going to cost millions and millions of dollars. Now
either some way is going to have to be found to get that money from legitimate sources, or, if the governor starts doing it, you'll find it going all the way down. Money is collected here. Money is collected there.

"For what?"

"For favors."

"It just gets to the point where you can't see your way clear to do all of the things that people require you to do, because with it goes the inevitable compromise of principle. If you want to go down in history as a good public official, you just can't accept it."

DiSalle thus bares a dilemma that has threaded its way through the terms of five Ohio governors since 1939. It is the dilemma of the historic role of a governor as Chief Of Party.

Duane Lockard gets at it quite well. "The ideal governor's reputation for being independent, fearless, and honest is not made any simpler by the demand that he be at the same time an effective political operator..."²

What DiSalle's remarks spotlight is what sociologists and social psychologists call a form of structural imbalance--perceived discrepancies between rewards and costs--in a role-set. We are offered a pioneering study of the sources and the consequences of conflict stemming from a role network in the 1958 work of Neal Gross, Ward S. Mason, and A. C. McEachern.³ Role-set consists of roles reciprocal to a given position, and each imposes a set of demands upon the person occupying the position. In complicated and dynamic role-sets it is not unusual for some of these demands to be incompatible and conflicting.⁴
A governor occupies positions in at least two different structures which impose incompatible demands on him, even though there is no role-set conflict within any one of these structures. Our governors perceived that their position in the gubernatorial structure, and their position in their political party structure were in conflict. Thus, their role-sets as governor in party, and partisan as governor, imposed incompatible and conflicting demands.

Escaping the costs of structural imbalance, we are told, is not easy.

The politician who can segment his constituents and tell each what they want to hear may also get away with it, but only so long as each segment does not know of his contradictory statements to others. Behavior which meets one set of expectations and violates another may be easier in the relative anonymity of the city than in the village; on the other hand, the technologies of modern urban society, such as television may add considerable complications for the politician.6

The most obvious way of escaping costs when under cross-pressure in different social positions is to withdraw from one of the positions. But how can a governor withdraw from the position of prominence in his party that his election to office has given him? Indeed, the withdrawal suggestion would seem to conflict with one of the fundamental postulates of role theory as expounded by Newcomb, Parsons, and other role theorists. That postulate is that a person's attitudes will be influenced by the role that he occupies in a social system. And there is also the common finding in many social-psychological studies that different attitudes are held by people who occupy different roles.7

What is suggested by DiSalle's perceptions is that this business of attitudes is the very point. The attitude of Governor As Self
overrode the attitude of DiSalle as Chief of Party, a role definition provided for him by custom, and by his party, so he tore up the script.

Roles exist in different degrees of concreteness and consistency, and in attempting to make aspects of the roles explicit, a role player creates and modifies them. Thus we have not only a process of role taking, but role making.⁸

Role conceptions are creative compromises, and an important phase of role theory is concerned with how these creative compromises are achieved. Our four most recent governors--Lausche, O'Neill, DiSalle, and Rhodes--employed devices designed to restructure their role network because they could perceive that an unsatisfactory episode, or episodes would otherwise result. One of the means of reworking a role network is to transfer responsibility to another party.⁹ That is what our three governors did, and the recipient of the transfer was their respective state chairmen.

As Glen Vernon points out, role definitions have to involve more than one individual. "A major aspect of this involvement is the fact that role definitions specify how one individual is expected to relate himself to another, or how one office or position is related to another."¹⁰

The transition period in Ohio, which saw the shift of role, can be identified from data gathered in the schedule structured interviews. We have a means of cross-checking, for example, on John W. Bricker, who says, "You've got to keep your hand on the state organization. If you don't, you can't accomplish what you want to accomplish."¹¹

Bricker's perception of his role as Chief Of Party is verified, for example, by one of his successors. "Bricker was clearly the chief
of party" says C. William O'Neill, who had a dyadic relationship with Governor Bricker as a member of the Ohio General Assembly. O'Neill recalls:

There was some tension between him and Ed Schorr as chairman, all the way; some tension, but they resolved it without ever any embarrassment. And when Tom Herbert was governor, I'm not sure whether he, or Fred Johnson (state chairman) played the role. It was a sort of a division. Tom didn't pay too much attention to it, in my opinion. 12

The governors following Bricker may have taken their cue from Frank Lausche, who says he never was Chief of Party in Ohio, but admits his influence as governor. 13 He says:

I found out that too often I would have to change my views on what should or should not be done if I were to procure full cooperation and support of the party. Party organizations are constantly soliciting campaign contributions, and in the acceptance of campaign contributions, they find themselves inevitably hogtied with regard to those economic interests that require dealing with by the government in a forceful way.

Lausche said he was called "the titular head" of the Democratic Party in Ohio, "but I never considered myself so." He says he was Chief Of Party "by name" but "was not impelled to try to be, and was not." Nor is party leadership a factor, he says, in gubernatorial leadership. "I headed neither party nor faction."

That does not mean, however, in Lausche's estimation, that the governor is not "the most potent political power in the state." In Lausche's estimation, the governor is, and the other governors agree, subject to a reservation best expressed by Rhodes: "I think the governor's strength derives from how well he administers the affairs of state." 14 O'Neill elaborates the concept:
I never saw this clearer than when I was engaged in Bob Taft's campaign for president. Frequently, Taft went to states and depended upon the senators, and Dewey would be out there for Ike, depending on the Governors, and the Governors would always win the convention.

These concepts by Lausche, O'Neill, DiSalle, and Rhodes are substantially different from the apparent operating style of Bricker, who appears to be the last Ohio governor to engage in the extensive use of patronage. "The most administration bills I ever saw as a legislator," says O'Neill, "were the Bricker ripper bills, when they turned over almost every department of government, and reorganized it."

Bricker does not back away from the label of Chief of Party, nor does he downgrade it as a role. It was the custom, at the time he took office, he says.

Party leadership was very definitely a responsibility. He was really looked to as the leader in party policy. We built it up until it was a united party, I'll say that. There weren't any dissident factions, as there had been when I was first attorney general. Even Zanesville cleared up.

The Bricker role definition is a far cry from another Republican, and the last in order of time, of our respondents. Says James A. Rhodes:

The governor should not be Chief of Party, and the state chairman should not be governor. By state statute, we elect a head of the party. They should remain in that field. The governor should run the office for all of the people. If parties want to mesh in, and support programs for better government, that's fine. But as far as the parties being a ruling class within the governor's office, it is wrong.

Curiously, O'Neill feels that the governor ought to be Chief of Party. But his rationale goes against his expressed feeling:
Is that a step back to the Jackson democracy? To the victor belongs the spoils? And also is it a step back in our fundamental thinking, whereas it seems to me that the wise statesmen who formulated this system were really afraid of the concentration of power in anybody? And they went to great lengths to make sure that nobody could have too much power, and be corrupted thereby. You can make the government much more responsive to the governor, but I'm not at all sure that I would want anybody to have that much concentrated power.

As it turned out, O'Neill says, it was not a matter of concern to him during his administration, which came immediately after the years of Lausche's demonstrated independence of Chief of Party role-playing.

Ray Bliss did not operate in the same fashion as previous chairmen, so he really was Chief of Party when I was governor. That's the role he wanted to play. I think it depends on the circumstances.

O'Neill, like Bricker, saw himself as party chief, but he did not portray the role. Ray Bliss wrote the script, and Bliss performed it. DiSalle says he might have been Party Chief in theory, "but not in practical terms. I really didn't spend the time at it." Rhodes repeated his point that the office of governor and a political party "are two separate entities."

The decline of the role appears, in the estimation of the governors, to correlate with the great increase in duties and pressures in a modern governor's office following World War II, the mounting concern over sources of revenue, fed by increased spending demands, and with the decline in patronage power. This power apparently was manifested up through the O'Neill administration, although Lausche says he ignored it altogether. Says O'Neill:
Legislators are besieged back home by the party members for this favor and that favor, and they have to depend on the governor for that. So they're constantly coming to you for favors, and naturally they look to you, and you to them for legislative acceptance and help. It is made up of party loyalty, power of the office, including patronage and policy. Patronage of all kinds, not just jobs. That's where the power is.

But DiSalle, who directly succeeded O'Neill, calls patronage "a misnomer" in Ohio.

There are not that many jobs. Today, the need is for professional people. You need engineers, laboratory technicians, nurses, and doctors. These kinds of people. They are not patronage positions. It is whatever you can get. We used to have to recruit at the colleges.

Rhodes, who was DiSalle's direct successor, says the same thing:

"Not these days. The job seeks the man."

All of the governors campaigned for their party in every election, and all campaigned for legislative candidates. Only Rhodes indicated selectivity:

I campaigned for the people who believed in the things that I believed in for the State of Ohio. If they were for our programs, I was for them, and I let it be known directly, by speaking, that I was.

None of the governors admitted to participation in party fund-raising, except as speakers at dinners. Lausche sums up the posture of his colleagues in that regard:

Fund-raising was repugnant to me. I never participated in it. I spoke at events, and that was all. I campaigned for the party, hoping that the leadership would help it, and we tried to set all meetings to the convenience of the county chairmen.

The governors, Bricker excepted, do feel that position in the party, rather than party leadership, assists the role of legislative
leader. Bricker says that "there has to be coordination there," and Lausche feels that a governor's party position is helpful. O'Neill says there is a difference based on "whether the legislature is controlled by the same party as the governor."

DiSalle indicates, in two ways, why a Democratic governor in Ohio is confronted with the ancient dilemma which he first indicated:

I think you have to look at the parties. The Republican Party is a state organization that is much better organized than the Democratic Organization. The Republican organization helps candidates for the legislature--helps finance their campaigns. Certainly, they have a lot of influence. The Democratic Organization doesn't serve that function, and so a democratic legislator has no responsibility to the state organization, and this makes it a tough row for the governor.

DiSalle also notes the distinction drawn by O'Neill and Rhodes, that there is a difference in the way the Republicans organize the state in Ohio. Republicans, the two indicate, can shift the role of Chief of Party to their state chairman very handily. But in the case of the Democratic Party in Ohio, DiSalle observes:

Now let me tell you what happened right in the very beginning. I was operating on the basis that the legislature would organize itself and that would be it. So I was approached by several candidates for leadership in the house and senate, and I said I would not take part in this. And what I overlooked at the time was that when I stepped out, somebody else would step in. I had gone to Florida right afterwards, and I got a telephone call there saying that Ray Miller, the (Cuyahoga) county chairman, was going around and talking to other country chairmen and saying that I didn't care who the leadership was, and that he had these candidates.

Well, I couldn't sit back any more, then, and let Ray Miller pick the leadership, because after that, I'd be running to him, so I had to change. I had to participate. Not that this is something that I wanted to do, but this was forced upon me because someone else was going to step into the vacuum. Many times the party is thrust upon you, and you don't want it.
Even as Chief of Party advocate, however, Bricker points to a position taken by all five governors: "It is what you do yourself that determines the policy, and whether or not the people agree with it comes from your presentation to the public." Lausche says a governor can best serve his party by being a good governor.

It is not because of his political leadership, but because of his individual character. Party strength flowed from the character of the work that I was doing as governor. I was elected governor five times, and that undoubtedly spilled over into the strength of the local communities. I helped keep the party in existence for ten years.

As for being an active Chief of Party, says Lausche, "A governor ought to be completely free from the corrupting involvement that flows from it."

The transition in operating style that came so abruptly with Lausche, and spanned a decade, bloomed in the O'Neill administration, and reached full flower under DiSalle, when the party was not thrust upon him. Rhodes, as a Republican, in the estimation of Lausche, DiSalle, and O'Neill, could have taken his choice. Their view is that this is the way the Republicans are organized in Ohio.

Rhodes chose not to make Chief of Party a role. The extent to which the gubernatorial operating style has become shunning, rather than playing the role, is strongly indicated by him:

A governor is Chief of Party only when he is selfish and greedy for more power. There's enough power resting in the governor's office. He needs no more. If he's a bad governor, the party is not going to follow him anyway. The party has turned against incumbents because they were weak, or bad administrators, you know.
These findings take sharp issue with most of the "intuitive" textbook literature, as well as with the general ideas of journalists. They represent a logical extension, however, of the findings of Lipson, issued the year that Bricker took office. Lipson, even then, could see "the diminishing influence of this (patronage) factor." Our findings also represent logical extensions of Coleman Ransone's findings in 1956. The term party leader, he said, is not an entirely accurate description of the governor's status because of the nature of political parties.

At this point, we can come to some firm conclusions regarding the role of Chief of Party in the gubernatorial role-set in Ohio. Our first conclusion is that governors do not want to play the role any more, believing that they can do themselves, their party, and their legislative programs more good by the manner in which they present themselves to their constituents.

We can say, however, that Republican governors in Ohio have a choice of playing the role, or not playing it. Democratic governors sometimes find that they have no choice. It is thrust upon them. It depends upon the manner in which the state parties organize a state when they come to power.

In Ohio, since the advent of Frank J. Lausch in 1945, and including the two-year term of Thomas J. Herbert, who was not interviewed, the assignment of Chief of Party to the gubernatorial role-set represents a myth perpetuated by the media, and other writers.

The governor's arm is long, however, and he can take the party crown unto himself any time he wants to do so. It is up to him.
How the role is played, even when played actively, is up to the governor himself. We are returned to the idea that the problem of leadership is directly concerned with how individuals mobilize and use power as it is derived from position, competence, and personal charisma.\(^{17}\)

Our findings add to the shape of our developing model of the reciprocal gubernatorial role-set in Ohio.

---

Figure 7.--Revised Emerging Gubernatorial Role-Set Model, Ohio Governor, 1939-1971

Chief Of Party, whether played as a role or not, is latent in the role of Governor As Self, assisted not only by the gubernatorial image, but by his dominant upstage position as Chief of State, a sub-role embedded in Governor as Self. And however the potential role is played--up or down, it is expressed through the governor as Chief Executive, or as Chief Legislator, from within Governor As Self.
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CHAPTER V FOOTNOTES (Continued)


CHAPTER VI

CHIEF JUDGE AND JUROR

But mercy is above this sceptred sway,
It is enthroned in the heart of kings,...

Shakespeare Merchant Of Venice IV.i.193

Thomas Corwin, who was governor of Ohio from 1840 to 1842, once observed that as far as he could discover, "the only prerogatives of the governor of Ohio were to grant pardons and commission notaries public." As we have already observed, the powers of an Ohio governor have multiplied greatly since those early years of statehood, but this remark by a governor of more than 130 years ago emphasizes how ancient the power of gubernatorial pardon is in Ohio.

Indeed, the power "to grant reprieves and pardons, after conviction, except in cases of impeachment," is listed among the original powers of an Ohio governor by Professors Francis R. Aumann and Harvey Walker in their comprehensive study of the government and administration of Ohio. But the power is rooted far more deeply in our national history than is Ohio, or even the Northwest Territory, which preceded Ohio's entry into the Union in 1803 as the 17th state. As Charles R. Adrian reminds us, the pardoning power of the American governor is actually rooted in his inheritance of some of the authority of the king in England. "In feudal theory, the law was the monarch's; he could, therefore, pardon offenses against it." Indeed, Adrian reminds us, until the 20th Century
the pardon was virtually the only device whereby a convicted person could be released from prison short of serving the full sentence.

This gubernatorial power has led to the "court of last resort" concept by some writers. Thomas C. Desmond expressed it, for example, by observing that, "The governor is expected to be a court of last resort for anyone wronged in his state..." Coleman Ransone, Jr., devotes some time to discussing the gubernatorial pardon, parole, and reprieve power in his thorough study of the office of governor in the United States, suggesting that the functions involved "are a considerable drain on the governor's time and are duties which cause him a great deal of personal anxiety."

As Ransone suggests, the power has not been without its problems. The late Governor Alfred E. Smith, of New York, used three pages of his autobiography to discuss gubernatorial agonizing in this area. Nor has all of the trouble been rooted in anxiety. As Adrian informs us, the pardoning power was and still is sometimes abused:

Among many examples that could be cited, there was Gov. John C. Walton of Oklahoma, who freed 693 prisoners in 11 months and was impeached and convicted (in 1923) for having taken bribes for some of the pardons.

Adrian suggests that most governors "probably disliked the responsibility involved. Not only are the decisions difficult, he says, but there is always the possibility of a grave mistake, such as "releasing someone who then commits a headline-grabbing crime," which can be politically damaging.

There was a time, Adrian adds, when nearly half of all prisoners were pardoned, but now "fewer than two per cent of prison sentences are commuted and very few terminate in outright pardons." Some governors
continue the tradition of holiday pardons, "a practice designed to help morale among long-termers."^9

Speaking of commutation and parole, Ransone declared that it does not seem to him that the functions "are among those which should be properly assigned to the governor."^10 He also observes that in some states the governor has "virtually delegated this function to the attorney general."

Professors Aumann and Walker provide the elaboration needed at this point to consider our a priori suggestion that perhaps one of the Ohio gubernatorial roles is Chief Judge and Juror, as the very meagre focus in the area of gubernatorial roles suggests. The Aumann-Walker elaboration:

Under the state constitution, the governor may issue pardons, commutations of sentence, or reprieves. A pardon exoneration of the individual from responsibility for the act pardoned. It may be absolute or limited. If limited, it may impose certain conditions that must be observed if the pardon is to take effect. A commutation of sentence is a reduction in the grade of a crime, such as from murder to manslaughter, thereby rendering the person involved eligible for an earlier parole. A reprieve is a postponement of the execution of the death penalty.\(^{11}\)

An Ohio governor also has other so-called "legal" powers which tend to add to the possible role definition of Chief Judge and Juror. The power is called interstate rendition, or extradition, and is rooted in Article IV, Section 2 of the United States Constitution, which provides:

A person charged in any State with treason, felony, or other crime, who shall flee from justice and be found in another State, shall, upon demand of the executive
authority of the State from which he fled, be delivered up, to be removed to the State having jurisdiction of the crime.

An Ohio governor actually has discretion as to whether he will grant or deny such requests from other states. Thus, a governor may judge the matter if he so chooses.

It is Portia's impassioned plea before a court of justice in Venice from which we took our introductory quotation, because the script provided for her by the playwright leads us to our own. The quality of mercy, says Portia, is not strained, but drops as the rain from heaven, and it is twice blessed: it blesses him that gives and him that takes.

'Tis mightiest in the mightiest; it becomes The throned monarch better than his crown; His sceptre shows the force of temporal power, The attribute to awe and majesty, Wherein doth sit the dread and fear of kings; But mercy is above this sceptred sway, It is enthroned in the hearts of kings...

It is "in the hearts of kings," in Governor As Self, that the power of commutation, pardon, and extradition is handled in Ohio. Formally, our five governors fix Chief Judge and Juror not as a clearly defined role in the reciprocal gubernatorial role-set, but as an increasingly institutionalized sub-role embedded in the role of Chief Executive. Furthermore, because of the historical roots that it has--"the attribute to awe and majesty"--the sub-role is a function of Governor As Self in the Chief of State sub-role. The gubernatorial vote is 5-0, but gubernatorial handling of the sub-role shows a wide variance.

We can again call upon other members of the family of social sciences for an understanding of the phenomenon. Norman Becker offers us the start
with the observation that, "Man is a historical actor. His conduct is steered by symbols rather than driven from below." Norms imported from his social background still affect him, even in his official role. Norm definitions may be defined as plans of action or expected behavior patterns, specifying what should be done and how it should be accomplished. As contrasted with norm definitions, the distinctive characteristic of role definitions is that these plans of action are associated with a particular position, or office. But self awareness is a constant human phenomenon, and the labels that we place on ourselves are self definitions. These include conceptions about how self is related to others, and to various aspects of life, together with any value definitions attached to these conceptions. Thus, role definitions are an important component of self definitions.

Talcott Parsons helps us along with the suggestion that, "All human behavior is concretely at the same time cultural, social, psychological, and organic." Furthermore, "There are many different ways of performing a role, according to the dominant active tendencies of the performer." He may be mainly interested in one of the components of the role, such as self, and tend to subordinate other components to it.

Thompson and Van Houten remind us that man has a psychological version of himself which may be termed a cognitive map. It is expected that he will attach meanings to what he perceives in his action sphere because "his conception of self reflects the fact that he is purposive, has beliefs about causation, interpretations of reality, and norms..." Thus, man's awareness and judgment of his action sphere will represent some distortion of the roles in that sphere due to his interpretation
in terms of his goals, causation beliefs, reality, and his norms.

Michael Vincent DiSalle and C. William O'Neill learned something about "the quality of mercy" early in their boyhoods. They were, as DiSalle so aptly put it, "little guys." O'Neill recalls that he used to get to play ball with his friends "If I had the bat and ball." And DiSalle, we have observed, recollected that "the kids used to really beat the hell out of me. One, especially, used to every day," when he was five years of age, and "couldn't speak a word of English." Physically, John W. Bricker, Frank J. Lausche, and James A. Rhodes were larger, we have seen, and they had to be more self-sufficient.

We have the assignment by each of the five governors of the function of a governor as Chief Judge and Juror to the role of Chief Executive. "It belongs there," says Bricker. "It is within the Chief Executive," says Lausche. "It is part of the job of being Chief Executive," O'Neill contends. "I tie that in with the role of Chief Executive," says DiSalle. "Part of the executive function," is Rhodes' assessment.

As we have already observed, there are some things common to all, or most of the five governors. All five held the office of governor of Ohio, for example. Three of the five had to work to support their families. Now we can assert another commonality. Four of them--Bricker, Lausche, O'Neill, and DiSalle--are lawyers. Indeed, O'Neill is Chief Justice of the Ohio Supreme Court at this writing.

The four attorneys say they believe the function belongs in the office of governor. Bricker explains that "you might have a mistake in fact that had changed, and you found out what the change was. You've
got to have that power someplace, and the governor is the only one that can exercise it."

Lausche terms the power "a sound one," and says, "It should remain where it is. He should be the court of last resort within the framework of the law."

O'Neil also declares a need for "one last court of resort. Sometimes, something happens after the last appeal has been exhausted." And DiSalle says, "You have to go somewhere. The governor is as good a place as any."

Rhodes, though he agrees with the placement of the function as a sub-role in the role of Chief Executive, as it is now played, differs sharply with his predecessors:

I think that no governor should have the power to prejudge a court in this state. I don't think the power should lie with the governor on any prisoner. It should be completely out of the governor's office; completely away from everybody. The penal operation ought to be separate, and I don't think the power of the governor's office should be substituted for grand juries, common pleas courts, courts of appeal, or the Supreme Court of Ohio.21

The Rhodes position is the more curious because of the view of the man whose bid for a second gubernatorial term he thwarted. Says DiSalle:

You know, I let six people be executed in the four years. Rhodes has two in eight years, and I bet no one in Ohio would believe that, because every time I commuted a sentence, which was six, it made a lot of headlines. Rhodes handled that much better. I guess maybe John McElroy was primarily responsible.22

DiSalle, a vociferous foe of capital punishment, did not spend much time on such matters "except in cases of life or death," he says. "I would never let anybody be killed in my name and not know about it."
And this is where DiSalle and O'Neill differ remarkably from Lausche, Bricker, and Rhodes. DiSalle, as we shall see shortly, agonized over life and death decisions. So did O'Neill:

Well, to me that's the most difficult thing you have to do. That's the thing that will really make you pray, and think, and search your conscience. That's the hardest job you have to do, when you play God.

DiSalle says that, "You don't just let someone die and not feel it. Very frankly, I looked through to see if there was some reason why the man's sentence could not be commuted."

Rhodes, as DiSalle suggested, delegated the reprieve responsibility, as he did pardon and parole decisions, and extradition cases. And as DiSalle also guessed, the delegation was to John M. McElroy, his first administrative assistant, who handled all legal matters in the governor's office. In such delegation, Rhodes followed the pattern set by Bricker and Lausche. Lausche, for example, responds:

The duties were not a drain on my time, but considering whether a person should be put to death by the state was a heavy responsibility, and I tried to share that with the members of my cabinet who were directly connected with the social responsibilities of the state, such as the director of welfare, director of mental hygiene, and so on, and the attorney general.

Bricker recalls that he did not use the pardon and parole procedure "very much. I didn't pardon anybody. I gave three paroles." Lausche says he does not recall how many times, "but I did grant mercy in a number of cases." Neither does he recall how many executions occurred. DiSalle had "six reductions to life, and permitted six to be executed. Hardly any pardons to speak of." O'Neill recalls four commutations, but does not recall how many pardons. Seven men were executed during his two years as governor.
Bricker did not follow the custom, which Ransone found prevalent in other states, of holiday pardons or paroles. Lausche says he did, however, and so did O'Neill, "primarily for rehabilitation." DiSalle says he "did away with the idea. I thought this was a coward's way out really." Rhodes' delegation was total. "The Pardon and Parole Commission put a recommendation on my desk, we generally followed it, but I delegated all of that."

The phenomenon of holiday commutations, pardons, and paroles was not particularly new in Ohio, according to a former chief of the Ohio Division of Correction. Maurice C. Koblentz says, however, that "over the years it became ridiculous in the extreme. There were Christmas commutations, Easter commutations, Thanksgiving commutations, and commutations of persons of specific ethnic backgrounds on days set aside to honor such groups."

DiSalle and O'Neill agonized over decisions of life and death in different ways. O'Neill took it internally, he says, while DiSalle agrees that he externalized his. Indeed, it was on December 29, 1960, after one of the most extended and most publicized gubernatorial agonizings in Koblentz's memory, that DiSalle commuted the death sentence of a woman prisoner. Three years later, as he was leaving office, DiSalle reduced the sentence to second degree, an action making the prisoner's parole possible, subject to action by the Pardon and Parole Commission.

In the foregoing case, as he did in all capital cases coming before him, DiSalle made his own personal investigation. He granted two stays of execution, personally interviewed the condemned woman in her prison
cell, and had a psychiatrist administer sodium amytal—the so-called "truth serum"—to the condemned woman in his presence.

The trend in Ohio is toward institutionalization of the pardon and parole procedure. Hearings are held, and recommendations made by the Pardon and Parole Commission. The five governors have delegated those final decisions. The same is true of extradition hearings. Rhodes says he delegated all decisions, including those involving commutation of death sentences. DiSalle, the capital punishment foe, observes that there has not been an execution in Ohio since the last of the two during Rhodes' tenure. Rhodes will not say whether he believes in capital punishment, declaring it is a decision for the legislature. Lausche says he does not believe that capital punishment "ought to be completely abolished," a position similar to Bricker's. O'Neill, as Chief Justice, prefers not to comment.

But it is apparent, from the responses of all five men to the same questions, that the decisions involved, including the decision to delegate or not delegate, is a function of Governor As Self, playing the role of Chief Executive, and announced as Chief of State.

Our gubernatorial reciprocal role-set model has now commenced to take on appearance substantially different from the experimental model.29 We present it as follows:
Figure 8.--Revised Emerging Gubernatorial Reciprocal Role-Set Model, Governor of Ohio, 1939-1971.

In rank order, Governor As Self is clearly first. Our five governors attribute this ranking by their responses to the interview questions. Imbedded in Governor As Self, and a function of both how the "self" handles the role, and how it is viewed by the publics, is the sub-role of Chief of State. It is a ceremonial role, the governors agree, which a governor may aggrandize or suppress, but is symbolic of Shakespeare's "attribute to awe and majesty." And because of this, the role of Chief of Party, whether aggrandized by, thrust upon, or suppressed by the Governor As Self, is largely a function of the "reverence" in which the Chief of State sub-role is held.
Chief Executive, our respondents tell us, ranks first after Governor as Self, or number 2, as our model shows. However, as they see it, Chief Legislator is a nearly equal role, resting upon how four variables are handled. These variables are primarily a function of the party situation in the legislature, and the party's perception of the power of the governor. Chief of Party is a function of this perception, and is the linkage of the roles of Chief Executive and Chief Legislator through Governor As Self, and the Chief of State Role therein imbedded.

Finally, Chief Judge and Juror is one of the sub-roles of Chief Executive, approaching institutionalization, but a function also of the Chief of State sub-role, and thus Governor As Self, which is the fountainhead of the entire gubernatorial reciprocal role-set.
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CHAPTER VII

COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF

The governor has a role in the protection of lives and property.

James A. Rhodes, Governor of Ohio, 1963-1971

John W. Bricker was Governor of Ohio on December 7, 1941, and shortly after that memorable Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, he saw the Ohio National Guard federalized and sent off to war. As Governor, in the absence of the Ohio National Guard, he was required to form an Ohio State Guard--the home guard, as it was called--and he did. As a matter of fact, as we have already discovered, a man who was subsequently to become governor of Ohio served in that home guard. Michael V. DiSalle entered it as a private and rose to the rank of lieutenant.¹

It should come as no surprise, then, that John W. Bricker considers Commander-In-Chief as a clear and distinct role in the Ohio gubernatorial reciprocal role-set. Nor is it surprising that Bricker still believes that the function of the National Guard is needed in the states today.

What is surprising is that Michael V. DiSalle does not consider Commander-In-Chief a valid gubernatorial role, and does not believe that the function of the Guard is needed in the states today.²

The totally opposing positions of Bricker and DiSalle provide us with a path for sneaking up on an early hypothesis with regard to this
particular alleged gubernatorial role. The hypothesis is that the
gubernatorial role of Commander-In-Chief expands and contracts in accord­
ance with the demands of the times.

When DiSalle served as governor, from 1959 to 1963, the latest era
of riotously destructive protests in the United States had not yet begun. As
governor, he was required to call out the Ohio National Guard but
once. That was during a flood "the January that I took office." Other
than that, his only direct reminder of the Guard's existence, he says,
was an inspection he carried out at Fort Knox, Kentucky.

This was a tank outfit, and early in the morning I had
to get up and walk around those tanks. Well, I didn't know
what I was looking at. I could hardly see the top of them.
I hardly think reviewing a parade is very effective.

With DiSalle's immediate successor, it is an entirely different
story. James A. Rhodes had been in office less than one year when
the student protest movement erupted, starting with the "Free Speech"
movement at the University of California at Berkeley in 1964. Milton
C. Cummings and David Wise remind us how it "spread and grew steadily
in strength," reporting:

The expanding war in Vietnam provided it with a popular
cause. The 1968 student uprising at Columbia University was
soon followed by revolts at San Francisco State College and
elsewhere. In subsequent years, protesting students seized
buildings at Harvard, Cornell, Howard, and dozens of other
institutions. Frequently, as the protests increased, so
did the level of accompanying violence by police and students.

The same authors also remind us of the racial violence of the
latter 1960's.
The Watts explosion (August 13, 1966) was the most dramatic event in a pattern of major violence that was to afflict dozens of American cities. Watts was followed by disorders in Chicago and Cleveland in 1966, and by even more destructive riots in Newark and Detroit in 1967.

Thus, besides the Hough rioting in Cleveland, and similar riots in Cincinnati, Toledo, Dayton, and Columbus, Rhodes was confronted with a series of violent student protest movements on public and private university campuses. And as of May 4, 1970, one day before the Republican primary election for United States Senator nominee, he had been required to call up the Ohio National Guard 45 times, the latest being at the request of the Kent, Ohio, mayor. Units of the Guard were dispatched to Kent State University.

Thus, as Cummings and Wise recall it for us, four days after President Richard M. Nixon's decision to send American troops into Cambodia, "Ohio National guardsmen who had been sent to Kent State University to curb campus unrest shot and killed four students and wounded eleven others." Though "anguished and saddened," Rhodes says, "The governor has a role in the protection of life and property. He cannot shun it when the occasion demands that he play it."

Rhodes is joined in his belief that Commander-In-Chief is a valid gubernatorial role assignment by three of his four predecessors, including Bricker. The other two are Frank J. Lausche and C. William O'Neill. Both responded to the question, "Do you agree that the governor does have a role as commander-in-chief?" with a curt, "Yes, I do."

The suggestion of this gubernatorial role does not come on strongly in gubernatorial literature, text or otherwise. Neither Ransone, nor
Lipson mention it. Indeed, the strongest suggestions come from Charles R. Adrian and Cummings and Wise. The latter authors point out that, "like the President, he has military forces under his command in the form of state police and the National Guard." Adrian tells us:

The governor serves as commander-in-chief of the National Guard (state militia) when it is not called into national service, as it is in times of emergency, or war. The Guard, which is largely supported by Federal funds, has today apparently outlived its traditional function, but it is protected by powerful interest groups made up of members of the Guard and veterans' organizations. Prior to World War II, the Guard was used by the governor to handle large disturbances, such as prison riots, race riots, and strikes. In almost every case where it was used, the decision to do provoked controversy...

It is obvious that Adrian's judgment about the Guard and its traditional function tends to be somewhat premature. Lausche, a World War II and post-war governor, had the Guard poised for use during a troublesome telephone strike in Portsmouth, "but local leaders became distressed, and said I should hold up." He recalls that "sabotage was being committed on telephone lines, and threats made of destruction of the Court House building. I was prepared to use the Guard."

Lausche also recalls using the Ohio Highway Patrol "in my efforts to close the gambling joints of Geauga County and Mahoning County." A governor "must" fill the Commander-In-Chief role, Lausche contends.

I believe that those who want law and order are desirous of having the Guard, and those that want greater freedom in perpetrating or in achieving their objectives, by lawful means, whichever necessary, would rather not have a Guard.

As Lausche's immediate successor, O'Neill had "little experience with the Commander-In-Chief role, but it was there." He says he reviewed Guard troops, and "was referred to as Commander-In-Chief, but in my whole
term, I never called out the Guard once." He nearly did so, however:

The only time I came close was in the Portsmouth telephone strike, and I finally sent the Patrol down there, and the thing got resolved. I think I resolved it in a way that was never printed, because I really got hold of the head of the Communications Union in Washington, who I found to be a practical guy. I just pointed out to him the legislation that was pending in a strongly conservative Republican legislature in Ohio, with regard to labor. I said you're going to bring this all down on the heads of every union in this state, and he agreed with me. That was on a Saturday night, and Sunday afternoon we settled it.

The point here, of course, is that while neither Lausche nor DiSalle used the Guard, they did use the State Highway Patrol, and were prepared to use the Guard, if called upon to do so. Like Bricker and Rhodes, O'Neill and Lausche believe that the function of the guard is needed in the states today. As for Rhodes: "I think the Guard is most important to the states. It has saved the State of Ohio."

DiSalle makes it clear that he does not propose that the states remain without some kind of troop protection, if needed.

I think this ought to be a part of the defense establishment of the United States. I think this is where the decision ought to be made. If the Governor had the power to call in federal troops, this is all he would need. What difference is there? I think you might as well have some fully trained and equipped people with experience doing this on a full-time basis. And you know what? The National Guard you'll have a tough time filling once the draft is over.

Bricker, Lausche, DiSalle, and Rhodes believe "that the Guard must have the power to use deadly force." O'Neill, in his current role as chief justice, prefers not to express himself.

"If you are going to have them, they'll have to have the power," DiSalle says. Bricker and Lausche say they believe the Guard must have
the power to use whatever force is necessary to maintain law and order. "Unless it has the power," Lausche says, "it becomes a helpless instrumentality. It should be used with great circumspection, and not unless it is absolutely the only avenue of escape." Rhodes says that "in some instances, deadly force is their only protection."

To a substantial degree, with the advent of prison, campus, and street riots again, the gubernatorial role of Commander-In-Chief has been institutionalized in Ohio. The degree of institutionalization, Rhodes says, rises with demands for the Guard, or even the Patrol.

It's automatic. There's a certain procedure. When an elected official wants the guard to protect his community, you have to send them out. It is within a small staff committee. We always sent a liaison man in to really look at the situation before we called out the Guard.

One of our governors, C. William O'Neill, suggested indirectly on his own initiative that the states are in "serious trouble." Since the Chief Justice was the first of the five to be interviewed, questions aimed at eliciting responses regarding the judgment of the other four were indicated, and thus used. A major one called for the reaction of the respondents to the remarks of television commentator David Brinkley, which we cited earlier:

States are pretty much disappearing as a political force. They're almost through. I think in another generation they will be, politically speaking, just about insignificant.

"The states will continue to play a vital role in the federal system," Bricker retorts. "The governors will come through."
Lausche responds that, "I don't agree with Brinkley. The States will continue as a force and if the swing is in any direction, it will be in the direction of the need of this joint system of government."

DiSalle replies:

That's a lot of hogwash. In fact, the states have more responsibilities today than they have ever had, and they have to work at them. (Governor) Vic Donahey (1923-1929) used to say that he had to go out in the rotunda to find someone to talk to. He got lonesome. That isn't true of a governor today. He usually has to leave his office if he wants to get away from people.

Rhodes says the states "have not lost anything. They have been strengthened."

Although he raised the suggestion, O'Neill, too, scoffs at it. He adds, however:

But I do think we may be entering an era of one-term governors, because today it appears that almost all state governments are bankrupt, or going bankrupt. The only thing that saves the federal government is that they can borrow money without a vote of the people, which political subdivisions can't do. And this just makes it extremely difficult when the demands are so great and the resources available are so limited. It makes it very difficult for governors.

The conclusion here, to paraphrase Rhodes, is that Ohio governors have a role in the protection of lives and property. That role is as Commander-In Chief of the Ohio Highway Patrol, and the Ohio National Guard, or home guard, as the case may be. The role is constitutional, and actual. But the size of the part to be played depends upon the other actors on the Ohio stage. Riots and violence enlarge the role proportionately, and the governor who must play it finds it politically
dangerous, but unavoidable. And again, as in the case of the other roles, the role of Commander-In-Chief links into the sub-role of Chief of State, and in Governor as Self.

Governor Rhodes, defeated in his bid for the Republican U. S. Senatorial nomination in an election held less than 24 hours after the Kent State incident, concludes this analysis: "I think it is a responsibility of the governor to see that no faction can take over a community. It is a matter above any and all political considerations. He has a role in the protection of lives and property. When you announce for governor, you should read the statutes and the constitution."
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CONCLUSION

The most important role of the governor is to follow a course of conduct that is an example of integrity, decency, and fairness, which is quick to be followed by the public.


Thirty-two years ago, after a thorough historical analysis of the rise of the American governor from figurehead to leader, Leslie Lipson concluded that "true leadership, which inspires the willing confidence of men, cannot be crystallized into constitutional grants of power. Each governor must win it anew."

Generally, that is what this study finds with respect to the men who have governed Ohio during that intervening span of time. The gubernatorial role-set in Ohio is not sufficiently rigid that it cannot be changed. Each of the five men who served 30 of the 32 years between 1939 and 1971 has written the script anew. But it has not been their definitions of role—their script writing—that has been the sole determinant of whether they left the gubernatorial stage early, or bowed to encores. It has been the way they played the part.

We commenced with an a priori model hypothesizing that an Ohio governor moves in a cluster of six basic roles above and beyond the core role of Governor As Self. This "self" is the ego, we said, and whatever identifies with it, and is a product of the individual's total life experience, which shapes the role definition.
The six basic roles clustered about Governor As Self, we suggested, are thus rank ordered (1) Governor As Self, (2) Chief of State, (3) Chief Executive, (4) Chief Legislator, (5) Chief of Party, (6) Chief Judge and Juror, and (7) Commander-In-Chief.

Our final gubernatorial reciprocal role-set model, as fashioned by our governors, differs significantly from our experimental model, however. Indeed, we can illustrate it as Figure 9 indicates.

Figure 9. Gubernatorial Reciprocal Role-Set Model, Governor of Ohio, as of 1971.

The figure illustrates the basic conceptions of both those who won re-election, and those who did not, that a governor must first be himself. Both Governors DiSalle, and O'Neill, whose re-election bids were thwarted, reflected that this was something they ought to have
given more attention. Those who won re-election say that they did.
The strongest indicators here, on the negative side, come from Gov­
eror O'Neill's plaintive remarks that the thing he missed most in the
governor's office was "the opportunity to think." And he said it was
because he played Chief of State as a role to the point that the role-
playing denied him enough time for other duties. DiSalle, on the other
hand, did not play the role enough. His own comment was, "It's one of
the roles, and maybe one that I neglected." Governors Bricker, Lausche,
and Rhodes, on the other hand, played the role in a subdued manner, as
a part of themselves, and utilized it for communicating with their
constituents, and for advancing their legislative and administrative
policy-making. Thus, all five of the governors support the hypothesis
that Governor As Self is the core role, ranked Number 1, but Chief of
State emerges as a sub-role within the gubernatorial "self." And as
we shall see later, the "reverence" in which a governor's publics hold
the office feeds power through the Chief of State sub-role to Chief Of
Party as a function of the sub-role if "self" elects to play it that
way.

The governors are in agreement, as of this writing, that Chief
Executive ought to be rank-ordered Number 2, and Chief Legislator
Number 3, but actually with nearly co-equal emphasis. We also noted
that while Bricker and Lausche saw the two roles as nearly coterminous,
they now agree with O'Neill, DiSalle, and Rhodes that the two are
separate and distinct, made so by the substantial difference between
executive and legislative policy-making, and the differing script which
the gubernatorial actors must follow. Further, the governors perceive
the separation of the roles as the result of the increased complexity of state government, since 1939, and the increasing emphasis upon management as the executive function.

Whether they shun or aggrandize the function, they view Chief of Party as the linkage between the dual roles of Chief Executive and Chief Legislator, but their position in their party is more a function of the viewpoint of their partisan audiences than of their own choice. Thus, the model shows the party position function, labeled Chief of Party, embedded in the Chief of State sub-role, which is played according to the script written and enacted by Governor As Self.

Embedded in the role of Chief Executive is the sub-role of Chief Judge and Juror. Indeed, it can be downgraded to a mere institutional function, or upgraded into a sub-role of Chief Executive, depending upon the manner in which the Governor As Self writes and enacts the script. Thus, the sub-role is linked into the Chief of State sub-role, and Governor As Self, as are both the Chief Executive and Chief Legislator roles.

The Commander-In-Chief role is separated from Chief Executive by four of our five governors, but the size of it is written by the events of our times. The performance has a constitutional base, and however hazardous it may prove to be politically, every governor must play the part if the occasion demands. Our dissenting vote--cast by Governor DiSalle--is more ideological than assessive. He simply thinks the function ought to be shifted to the national military establishment. It also should be noted that Chief Judge and Juror, and Commander-In-
Chief, are not hooked into the Chief of Party function. Governors tend to place these roles above politics altogether. One is virtually automatic, and the other, which results in varying degrees of agonizing, is a matter of gubernatorial conscience.

Analysis of the model brings us in logical sequence to the core role of Governor As Self. The "self" is a mass of personal values shaped by its total life experiences, and these life experiences help to shape definition of role, the so-called "script-writing" function. We have seen that three governors learned specialized roles early in life, during the period that normally would be devoted to learning primary roles. Thus, they developed role-shift capability at early ages, at a time when social and political learning can become a part of the individual's basic psychic equipment. These are the governors who bowed to encores from the Ohio electorate. In each instance, Bricker, Lausche, and Rhodes were cast into breadwinner roles between the ages of eight and 15, and they were required to develop skill at manipulating role convergence to avoid loss of identity of self. These are political skills.

Guided by the a priori model, we move to Chief of State, assessed as a sub-role embedded in Governor As Self, and having as its fountainhead the "reverence" in which the Office of Governor is held by the publics. Gubernatorial constituents expect the man in that office to act in a certain manner, which includes a range of ceremonial performances, and which may be called role expectancy. If he underplays the sub-role, he risks public rejection, and if he overplays it, he risks losing sight of "self." Thus, when convergence of "self" and Chief
of State role expectancy threatens, he must be himself. Governors acting from perspectives of several roles are most effective when they maneuver the emergency of "self" as the role encompassing the action.

The governors have assessed Chief Executive as a ranking role, and their perceptions of its best portrayal calls for a strong management emphasis. That is the role expectancy of their publics, they believe.

The strong management concept has gathered support through the years, in Ohio, and its emphasis upon extensive delegation to maintain a manageable span of gubernatorial control has lead to full-blown use of the cabinet in the administration of the state agencies. Indeed, the clear trend in Ohio is toward usage of the cabinet as a part of the gubernatorial staff. The role of Chief Executive has separated as a distinct one from Chief Legislator, largely due to the differing requirements. It is not a function of party position, but its portrayal can improve or worsen the governor's position in his party. The role is thus a function of Governor As Self, and links through the "reverence" power lodged in the Chief of State sub-role. Because of this, as Governor Rhodes claims, "A governor can make himself felt in any field he wants."

The policy process in Ohio is a continuum, but is not a smooth flow. It operates in episodic fits and starts, according to the extent of executive guidelines. The stronger those guidelines, the more coherent the policy, and the smoother the flow.

Republicans organize the legislature differently from Democrats in Ohio, which gives the governor of either party, but particularly a
Republican governor, more choicemaking leeway in his role of Chief Legislator. The most effective portrayal of the Chief Legislator role tends to be one utilizing the "mutual respect" approach. Republican governors have an option of serving as Chief of Party, or simply using party position, and the clear trend is toward submerging the Chief of Party role to a position function. Democratic governors tend to have the role thrust upon them due to warring factions, and the ambition of powerful county chairmen who head them. In any event, an Ohio governor has more power as Chief Legislator if he has a party majority in the General Assembly.

An Ohio governor is the most potent policy-making power in the state, due to the strong executive tools available to him, and to his position of leadership in legislating.

Ohio governors reject the value of their veto power as a bargaining device, but often find a declared intent to use it to be effective in killing legislation. Rejection of its use as a bargaining device is based on the concept that governors ought to reason with legislators, and not threaten them.

Patronage is no longer an effective reward power for Ohio governors. The need for specialists in the state agencies requires recruitment, and "the job seeks the man."

Ohio governors prefer to avoid playing Chief of Party and will do so only when the duty is thrust upon them. Their avoidance of the role, if at all possible, is rooted to a conviction that playing it requires them to lead fund-raising efforts, and that this function compromises a governor with economic interests which may, as Lausche put it, "require
dealing with by government in a forceful manner." Republican governors have a wider range of choice in whether or not to play the role than Democratic governors.

Chief Judge and Juror is not a role in Ohio, but may be elevated to a sub-role embedded in the role of Chief Executive. Governors who are lawyers tend to view it a a proper function of the Chief Executive role; non-lawyers do not. How a governor elects to carry out the "legal powers" of reprieve, pardon, parole, and rendition is a function of Governor As Self, and is linked to "self" via the Chief of State Sub-role. The tendency of all of these functions is toward institutionalization.

Commander-In-Chief is a clear-cut role in the gubernatorial constellation in Ohio, but its importance expands and contracts in proportion to the level of threat to life and property posed by either people, or disastrous events. While four of the five governors assess it as a role, they link it with the role of Chief Executive. During periods of social tranquility, the role tends to become a small, dormant one absorbed by the Chief Executive role. Governors cannot write the script for the Commander-In-Chief role. It is written for them.

The longer a governor remains in office, the more institutionalized it tends to become.

Each new governor rewrites the role-definitions, but the script of each has become increasingly similar.

Ohio governors place high value on conduct which provides, to use Lausche's opening words, "an example of decency, integrity, and fairness,"
and perceive that such role-playing is reciprocal. Both the publics, and the bureaucracy, tend to reflect the governor's conduct.

Finally, Ohio governors dislike the concept of "different hats." To repeat the observation by Governor Lausche, "You've got to have one head."

Ohio governors wear but one hat. Its label reads: "Self."
CONCLUSION FOOTNOTES


APPENDIX A: RESEARCH STRUCTURE

Questions Answered By The Respondents

SECTION I A. PRIMARY ROLE AND SOCIALIZATION

1. What is your full name? ____________________________________________

2. Have you changed your name from the one originally given? __________

3. When were you born? Month_______ Day__________ Year__________.

4. Were you born at home _____ hospital _______ elsewhere ________?

5. Where was your home? ____________________________________________

6. What were your parents' names?
   a. Father's full name ____________________________________________
   b. Mother's full maiden name _____________________________________

7. What is the ethnic background of your parents?
   a. Father___________________.
   b. Mother___________________.

8. What is the religious background of your parents?
   a. Father___________________.
   b. Mother___________________.

9. How would you rank your parents' economic status?
   a. lower income____________
   b. middle income___________
   c. upper income____________
   d. independently wealthy_____
SECTION I A. CONTINUED

10. Did you have any brothers and sisters?
   a. If so, how many?______________
   b. Older?_______________________
   c. Younger?____________________

11. What was the extent of your parents' education?
   a. Mother_______________________
   b. Father_______________________

12. What was your father's occupation?________________________

13. Did he ever change occupations?___________________________

14. Did your mother have an occupation other than housewife?___

15. How would you rate your parents as disciplinarians?________

16. Was your family close-knit?______________________________.

17. Do you believe your parents showed preference for any child?_____ 

18. What were the political preferences of your parents?
   a. Mother_______________________
   b. Father_______________________

19. Did they discuss politics and public policies?
   a. Never___________
   b. Rarely___________
   c. Occasionally_______
   d. Often___________

20. Did you adopt the political preferences of your parents?_______

21. Are your preferences the same today?______________________
22. Do you believe that your parents strongly influenced you?
   a. Strongly________
   b. Somewhat________
   c. Not at all_______

23. How would you describe your relationship to each parent?
   a. Father  Close___Not very close___Alienated____
   b. Mother  Close___Not very close___Alienated____

24. Did you have a close relationship with any other relatives?____

25. Did you have a close relationship with any other non-related adults?____

26. Did your parents live to your adulthood, age 21?
   a. If not, when did they pass away?
      (1) mother________
      (2) father_______

27. Did you work to help support your family before age 18?_____ 
   a. If so, under what circumstances? What kind of work:_______

28. How would you describe your boyhood years?

29. How would you classify your boyhood friends?

30. How do you view yourself in relation to them at that time?

31. Would you describe your boyhood generally as happy, or otherwise?

32. What is the extent of your elementary and secondary education?

33. Where did you attend school?

34. Did you attend public or non-public schools?

35. Did you regard yourself as different from other students?

36. Do you recall any teacher whom you believe greatly influenced you?
SECTION I A. CONTINUED

37. Did you attend church regularly? Not regularly? Not at all?
38. Did any church-affiliated persons strongly influence you?
39. Of all who were influential during your boyhood years, who would you classify as most influential of them?
40. How would you differentiate yourself from others during those years?
41. Do you have any other comments regarding your childhood years?

SECTION I B. SECONDARY ROLE AND SPECIALIZATION

42. Describe the extent of your higher education.
43. Were you required to work while going to college?
44. What kind of work, if any.
45. Did your parents support you at all in college?
46. Did you believe yourself to be different from other students?
   a. If so, in what way?
47. Did you serve with any of the military services before or after college?
48. Did you drop out of college?
49. If so, did you return?
50. Why did you drop out?
51. Are you married____divorced____widowed____?
52. Where were you married?
53. When were you married?
54. What is your wife's maiden name?
55. Do you have any children?
   a. elaborate
56. Do you have any grandchildren?
   a. Your age when you had your first grandchild.
57. Do you have any great-grandchildren?
58. When did you become interested in party politics?
59. Was your party identification then the same as your parents?
60. Under what circumstances did you become interested in politics?
61. What was your first political activity?
62. What, if any, non-elective public jobs have you held?
63. Have you been a candidate for elective public office besides governor?
64. Please trace your candidacies, defeats and successes, in chronological order.
65. Did you view each office as a possible stepping stone to higher office?
66. Did you plan a career of stepping stones?
67. At what age did you become governor?
68. At what point in your life did you decide you would like to become governor?
69. Did you have ambitions for higher office from the governorship?
70. Did you seek higher office from the governorship?
71. What, if any, higher offices did you win?
72. How long did you serve in these higher offices, if any?
73. Did you seek, or were you offered, the vice-presidency?
74. Did you seek, or were you offered candidacy as, President?
75. What was your occupation at the time you were elected governor?
SECTION I B. CONTINUED

76. At the time you became governor, how did you view yourself in your societal setting?

77. Did your view of yourself change?

78. If so, in what way?

79. Did your duties as governor change your relationship with your family in any way?

80. During your term as governor, what was your family role?

   a. father____husband____grandfather____.

81. Did this role change during your years as governor?

82. Did you enjoy being Governor of Ohio?

83. Given the opportunity and the circumstances then, would you still seek the office you won?

   a. reasons for response.

84. Did you notice any change in the attitude toward you of persons with whom you were acquainted after you became governor?

85. If so, what change in attitude did you notice in your friends?

86. If so, what change in attitude did you notice in political enemies?

87. Did you notice any change in your own attitudes during your years as governor?

88. If so, what changes?

89. What is your current occupation?

90. Do you believe that your experiences as governor helped you in your present occupation?

   a. If so, in what way?

   b. If not, why not?
SECTION I B. CONTINUED

91. Is your view of the Office of Governor of Ohio the same now as it was before you took office?

92. Is your view of the office the same as it was when you were holding it?

93. If your view differs from your views before holding office, in what way?

94. If your view differs from the view you held during office, in what way?

95. Would you like to Governor of Ohio again?

96. What do you believe are the gubernatorial roles, and in what order of importance would you rank them?

SECTION II A. CHIEF OF STATE

Explanatory note: Most students of governors of the states have ascribed a cluster of roles to the governorship. Of course, these begin with the governor as self. The following sections relate to an a priori model which is a composite of those that have been suggested. The roles of this model are (1) Governor as self, (2) chief of state, (3) chief executive, (4) chief legislator, (5) commander-in-chief, (6) chief judge and juror, and (7) chief of party. The numbers do not suggest a rank order. Your responses will do that, and will also suggest your evaluation of the validity of these role assignments, as well as others that you may perceive. We have already examined the first role. The following sections are geared to the foregoing numbers.
SECTION II A. CONTINUED

1. Do you agree that the Chief of State is one of the gubernatorial roles? Please explain your answer.

2. Is a governor "the living symbol of the state?"

3. Is he the "representative of all the people?"

4. Must he participate extensively in dedications, ribbon cutting, responding to letters, and associated speeches?

5. Do you agree that "the rituals both sacred and profane, which the governor is expected to take part in require much of his personal time?"

6. Do you believe that a governor avoids these rituals "at genuine peril to his political career?"

7. Is a governor the symbol and conscience of the state?

8. Must he fulfill a role that calls upon him to visit the sick, the lonely, the aged, "and to pat on the back an underpaid mental hospital attendant?"

9. Must a governor be "the state's chief tub-thumper?"

10. Should a governor be a one-man chamber of commerce?

11. Did your list of callers suggest that you were willing to see anybody in the state who had a problem?

12. Did you have a criteria of selectivity for whom you would, and would not meet with?

13. Did you receive much mail dealing with subjects which you had neither the authority, nor the capacity to do anything about?

14. If so, can you estimate what percentage of the mail was of this kind?
SECTION II A. CONTINUED

15. Did you consciously try to fit yourself to the role model of Chief of State, or chief ceremonial head?

16. If not consciously, do you think you did so anyway?

17. What was the most time-consuming of your functions as ceremonial head of state?

18. React to the following statement: "So great, indeed, is the drain on a governor's time occasioned by excessive demands in this field that most governors find this function interfering with their efforts at policy formation, and encroaching upon the time they might otherwise devote to management."

19. Is a governor "at once his party's political leader and his state's ceremonial head?"

20. Do you believe that the governor, by his very office, embodies his state?

21. Do you agree that the center of the state system, and its chief proponent in the eyes of the people, is the governor?

22. As the consequence of stimulative questions preceding this one, do you regard Chief of State as a role which may be validly ascribed to the gubernatorial role constellation?

23. Would you please defend your response to the above question?

24. If you agree that Chief of State is a valid role assignment, would you say that it meshes with, interlocks with, and is significant to other gubernatorial roles?

25. If so, in what way?
SECTION III A. CHIEF EXECUTIVE

1. Do you agree that one of the gubernatorial roles may properly be classified as "chief executive?"

2. In Ohio, other elected state executives are the lieutenant governor, attorney general, auditor, treasurer, and secretary of state. Do you view the existence of these independent lesser executives as limiting the chief executive's power?

3. Would you prefer to see these elective offices abolished?

4. Do you agree that presently the state's chief executive is actually the chief executive only in the sense that he is first among several executives?

5. Would you prefer to see the governor and lieutenant governor elected as a team?

6. Would you prefer to see the other elected officers appointed by the governor?

7. Would you prefer to see the auditor appointed by the legislature?

8. Can you differentiate between the governor's role in legislative policy and his role in administrative policy?

9. Do you believe that the governor's role in management is one of establishing the policies governing day-to-day operations of the executive branch?

10. Are the constitutional bases of the governor's power in Ohio a limitation upon his power to govern?

11. Do you believe that the people of Ohio see the governor's role as chief executive as primarily a management function?

12. Can a governor secure policy coordination among the agencies which make up the executive branch?
13. Is the essential role of the governor in regard to management the control of the policies of the agencies under his supervision?

14. Is state government a single, continuous process of phases, with legislating as one phase, and administration as another, but merged together at times so as to become indistinguishable?

15. Has the Governor of Ohio emerged as a leader of both legislation and administration?

16. Are other elected state officials a potential source of opposition to the governor?

17. Are other elected state officials inclined to assert their independence whenever possible?

18. Is a Governor of Ohio denied tidy, centralized control?

19. Is each of the other elected officials likely to have his own political organization and his own political aspirations?

20. Is a large part of the management of the state outside of a governor's control?

21. Were you really very interested, as governor, in managing?

22. Were you detached from executive branch management?

23. Does the executive budget strengthen your executive authority?

24. Can an Ohio governor successfully coordinate the activities of 50 or more separate agencies?

25. Are boards and commissions an administrative problem for governors?

26. Does an Ohio governor have adequate power over appointed officers?
SECTION III B. CONTINUED

27. Are curbs on the power of the governor to remove incompetents limitations on his ability to administer?.

28. Can a governor effectively supervise and coordinate the operating agencies?

29. Is the governor's cabinet useful and effective as an administration tool?

30. Is the governor's cabinet, in effect, vanishing?

31. How often did you meet with your cabinet to discuss administrative problems?

32. Did you find the cabinet helpful in administration?

33. Do most governors have a more difficult job than the President?

34. Does an Ohio governor lack effective power and influence over many departments?

35. What factors limit gubernatorial control of the agencies?

36. Do legislative provisions isolate certain agencies from the influence of the governor?

37. What would you give a governor more effective power over agencies?

38. Did you perceive that some agencies developed close relationships with clientele interest groups?

39. Do you believe that interest groups try to obtain what they want from the legislature without gubernatorial intervention?

40. Is a governor able to manage the executive branch with any degree of effectiveness and comprehensiveness in Ohio.

41. Did you view yourself as the primary power-wielder over state administrators?
SECTION III B. CONTINUED

42. Do the heads of independent government agencies show a desire to cooperate with the current administration?

43. What changes do you believe would improve an Ohio governor's power to govern?

44. Do you believe that the present limitation of terms in Ohio tends to provide the "lame duck" limitation on power in the second term?

45. One scholar suggests that "the governor is elected in an air of factional politics and continues to operate in that atmosphere in his dealings with the legislature, department heads, and other members of the executive branch. Do you agree?

46. Does a governor attempt to formulate and place in operation policy in the fields of administration, legislation, and partisan politics?

47. Are these three aspects of policy formation, in practice, very difficult to separate?

SECTION IV A. CHIEF LEGISLATOR

1. Is the Governor of Ohio, in fact, Chief Legislator?

2. Is this his most important role?

3. If the above response is negative, how do you rank the governor's importance with regard to legislation?

4. Did you send frequent messages to the legislature?

5. Do you believe that messages from the governor are effective?

6. Is "leading the legislature" the governor's most important role?
7. Does a governor "set the agenda for public debate?"

8. As governor, did you believe it important to formulate programs, mobilize support, and carry new ideas into action?

9. Did you, in fact, try to do so?

10. Does an Ohio governor have "dominant authority" in the budget process?

11. Would you elaborate upon your response to the above question?

12. Is the governor the most potent policy-making power in the state?

13. Does the alleged distinction between "politics" and "administration" have valid application at the state level?

14. Is the governor's principal role that of policy formation?

15. Does policy consideration run through other governor functions in a compelling manner?

16. Does whether a governor assumes the role of legislative leader depend on party leadership?

17. Does it depend on customs and traditions of the state?

18. Does it depend on his own view of his proper functions?

19. Did you actively seek to carry out this role?

20. Must a governor "be constantly engaged in exposition?"

21. What are sources of legislative leadership power?

22. One scholar suggests that the governor can lead the legislature only if it does not, or cannot lead itself. Do you agree?

23. Is the "power to recommend" a legislative power for the governor?

24. Is party leadership a factor in a governor's legislative leadership?

25. Is power over patronage a factor in legislative leadership?
SECTION IV B. CHIEF LEGISLATOR (Veto Power)

26. Is the gubernatorial veto a factor in the role of governor as legislator?
27. Did you resort to the veto very often?
28. Do you recall how many measures you vetoed, and how many vetoes were overridden?
29. Did you manage to use the veto power as a bargaining device?
30. If so, did the threat of veto work?
31. Is the veto really a potent element in gubernatorial leadership?
32. Does the potential veto lead department heads to seek the governor's approval?
33. Could an Ohio governor govern without the veto power?
34. Is the power of partial veto in appropriations a useful one?
35. Would you favor extension of the veto power?
36. Would you favor extending the power of partial veto to all legislation?
37. Can we attribute development of the governor as a legislative leader entirely to veto power?

SECTION IV C.

38. Is the responsibility for initiative in state-wide legislative programs the governor's?
39. Is a governor's party leadership a factor in his role as legislative leader?
40. Did you perceive that most complaints and suggestions come to the governor, rather than to department heads?
SECTION IV C. CONTINUED

41. If so, does this situation tend to increase gubernatorial perception of policy needs?

42. Did departments submit their legislation to you for approval?

43. Were you aware of any departments bypassing the governor's office?

44. During your term of office, did you note a marked increase in administration bills?

45. Did the power to call special sessions, and focus on specific subjects, enhance your power as chief legislator?

46. Does strong party backing assist the chances of recommendations made to the legislature?

47. In your opinion, does "the typical citizen" probably think of the governor not so much as an administrator as a policy leader?

48. Does public opinion assist gubernatorial policy-making?

49. Are pressure groups helpful in the governor's legislative role?

50. Did you, as governor, try to coordinate your legislative recommendations and goals with your state party?

51. One student of governors has said: "Even for politically shrewd, veteran chief executives the task of dealing with traditionally balky, unpredictable, and sensitive legislatures and their politically wise legislative leaders is a critical challenge that can plunge a Governor into political oblivion--or, sometimes propel him into the national spotlight." Do you agree?

SECTION IV D.

52. Did you, as governor, always have a legislative program?

53. Where did your administration measures come from?
SECTION IV D. CONTINUED

54. How were they prepared?
55. Were they introduced as administration bills?
56. Was your participation in preparation of the budget dominant?
57. Does an Ohio Governor have "dominant authority" over the budget?
58. If not, should he have?
59. Does the governor's ability to command press attention assist him in the legislative process?
60. How do you assess media power as affecting a governor's legislative program?
61. Is the press generally objective?
62. In your opinion, is the newspaper press influential in shaping public opinion?
63. Is the television media influential in shaping public opinion?
64. In your opinion, which is most influential?
65. What did you view as the most influential medium when you were governor?
66. Did you have a regular schedule of press conferences?
67. How often did you have full-dress press conferences?
68. Were you easily accessible to the press in your opinion?
69. Did you have a public information (or public relations) staff member, or organizational setup?
70. Did you accommodate television, or radio (TV if existing then) at your press conferences?
71. Did you experience strong coverage by media as you moved about your state?
SECTION IV D. CONTINUED

72. Did you try to "sell" your legislative ideas via media?
73. If you made such efforts, were they successful?
74. What, generally, is your assessment of media treatment of you as governor?
75. Do you believe that the news media helped your legislative programs?
76. Do you believe that the news media hindered such programs?
77. Does a governor have a communicator role with his publics?
78. Did you try to perform in such a role?
79. Did you find it necessary to constantly assure the citizens that you were redeeming campaign promises?
80. Can press power be utilized as a power resource in advancing gubernatorial programs?

SECTION V

PARTY CHIEF

1. When you were governor, did you consider yourself as "the titular head" of your party?
2. Were you, in fact, chief of your party?
3. Were you impelled to try to be?
4. Is party leadership a factor in gubernatorial leadership?
5. Was your position in your party a factor that tended to strengthen, or weaken your power in relation to both legislative and management duties?
6. Did you consider your role in forming party policy, or acting as party leader, as separate and distinct from your role in legislative and administrative policy formation?
SECTION V. CONTINUED

7. Respond to this statement: "The governor seldom acts as a party leader except with some specific objective in mind."

8. Because of the nature of political parties, is the term "party leader" an accurate description of the governor's status?

9. One student has said: "While the governor may be a party leader in terms of the state party's relation to the national party, he is a factional leader in terms of the organization of the party within the state." What are your observations in terms of your years as governor?

10. Were you, as governor, conscious of the distinctions indicated by the assertion that a governor "wears three hats," party chief, legislative leader, and chief administrator?

11. Are the effects of gubernatorial decisions felt in all three of the areas mentioned in question 10?

12. Is the governor "the most potent political power in the state?"

13. If your answer is yes, why is it yes?

14. Please comment on the following statement: "The ideal governor's reputation for being independent, fearless, and honest is not made any simpler by the demand that he be at the same time an effective political operator."

15. Did your position in your party require you to spend much time attending party activities, such as barbecues, dances, picnics, rallies, and conventions?

16. Did your party position enable you to iron out disputes between rival legislative factions, or members?
17. Did you campaign for the party in each election, whether you were a candidate, or not?

18. Did you campaign for your party's legislative candidates?

19. Did you coordinate campaigning with county party chairmen?

20. Did your role as party leader (if you feel you had one) become intertwined with everything else you did?

21. Did you find it necessary to serve as a party fund-raiser?

22. Did you dispense patronage?

23. Did you try to bring peace among warring party factions?

24. Did you try to buoy the morale of party leaders in areas dominated by the opposing party?

25. Is the following a fair statement? "He must capture his party's political machine, or else be forced to dicker, scrape, or submit to a party boss who is the real source of power and leadership."

26. Was much of the impact that you had on your party either unintentional, or unavoidable?

27. Is it true that you did exert influence on your party?

28. If so, did you derive power from exerting that influence?

29. Do you have any other observations with regard to the assignment of Party Chief as a gubernatorial role?

30. Do you believe it deserves assignment as a governor's role?

31. If so, how do you rank its importance?
SECTION V. CONTINUED

32. At this point, if you agree that the roles discussed so far are valid, what would be your ranking of them in order of importance?
   a. Chief of state ______
   b. Chief F'recutive ______
   c. Chief Legislator ______
   d. Party Chief ______

SECTION VI

CHIEF JUDGE AND JUROR

1. Do you think Chief Judge and Juror is a valid role assignment?

2. Should the governor be "a court of last resort for anyone wronged in his state?"

3. Should the so-called "legal" powers of the governor with respect to pardon, parole, clemency, and rendition, be delegated?

4. Did you observe the tradition of pardoning men on special holidays?

5. Should executive clemency exist primarily to correct miscarriages of justice?

6. Have you any idea how many pardons and paroles you granted?

7. Do you recall how many times you extended executive clemency?

8. Were these functions any considerable drain on your time?

9. Did these duties tend to cause you a great deal of personal anxiety?

10. Are these functions among those properly assigned to a governor?

11. Are problems rising from gubernatorial power to grant requests for rendition as serious in terms of time consumed as problems relating to pardon and parole?
SECTION VI. CONTINUED

12. Are requests for rendition as numerous as for pardon and parole?
13. Did you, as governor, preside at extradition hearings?
14. If not, was this function delegated?
15. How did you make pardon and parole decisions?
16. Do you believe these duties tend to make a governor "chief judge and juror" in his state?
17. Do you believe in the death penalty in capital crimes?
18. Would you please explain your answer to the above question?
19. Did you stop the scheduled execution of any persons during your time as governor?
20. Do you recall how many, if any, were executed?
21. Do you think a death penalty, if provided for in the statutes, should be appealable to a governor?
22. What is your rationale for your above response?

SECTION VII. COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF

1. Do you agree that a governor does have a role as commander-in-chief?
2. Did you have military forces under your command in the form of state police and the National Guard?
3. Were you called upon to use the National Guard?
   a. If so, do you know how many times?
   b. If so, on what kinds of occasions?
4. Do you believe that a governor should fill such a role?
5. As commander of the state police, did you have occasion to issue special orders to them?
SECTION VII. CONTINUED

6. Are state police powers limited in Ohio?
7. Do you believe that state police powers ought to be expanded?
8. Did you think so when you were governor?
9. Is the Guard protected by powerful interest groups?
10. Do you believe that the function of the guard is needed in the states today?
11. Did you believe so when you were governor?
12. Did all of your decisions to use the guard, if you used it, provoke controversy? Most of them? Few of them?
13. Do you believe that the Guard must have the power to use deadly force?
14. Is the governor really active in the role of commander-in-chief?
15. Did you play an active role as commander-in-chief?
16. Did you delegate decisions regarding whether or not to call out the Guard?
17. If so, what was your delegation procedure?
18. Do you believe that the National Guard ought to be continued?
19. If so, should it continue to serve as the state militia, when not federalized?
20. If not, should Ohio maintain a state militia?

SECTION VIII. GENERAL

1. Are there other gubernatorial roles in the constellation about the office of governor in Ohio?
2. If so, what are they?
3. There are two general positions with regard to the power positions of the states in our federal system:

   a. That the "sovereign" states are in a bitter struggle with the national government, and that if we are to keep our freedom and save our American way of life, we must restore state powers and stop forces stripping the states of their sovereignty and independence.

   b. That the states have lost any real reason for their continued existence, and we ought to recognize our federal system on the basis of new administrative and political ideas corresponding to geopolitical or demographic reasons.

What is your view?

4. What resources are necessary for any governor who wants to make the most of his leadership position?

   a. Personal?
   
   b. Party?
   
   c. Publicity?
   
   d. Legal-constitutional?

5. David Brinkley has said: "States are pretty much disappearing as a political force. They're almost through. I think in another generation they will be, politically speaking, just about insignificant." Please comment.
SECTION VIII. CONTINUED

6. As governor, did you feel it necessary to emphasize certain kinds of:
   a. dress
   b. speech
   c. posture
   d. slogans
   e. symbols (such as the Great Seal, on a lectern)

7. Will you describe the extent of your office organization?

8. What was your relationship, in your view, with your office staff?

9. In decision-making, did you utilize your staff exclusively?

10. If not, did you consult party leaders?

11. What kind of persons did you consult in making decisions?

12. What were your major sources of information, as governor?

13. What newspapers and magazines did you read?

14. Was such reading a regular habit, or a matter of stimulus?

15. Will you, using your own terms, now provide a rank order of what you conceive to be the cluster of roles about the Office of Governor of Ohio?
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