

Restraints on the federal bureaucracy derive from the constitution and from current law. Presidential power, congressional power, and the federal courts serve to limit the power of the bureaucracy. The president constrains the bureaucracy through his appointment power, the federal bureaucracy is decided by the president he appoints lots of jobs in the federal bureaucracy that does not have a limitation by congress, so therefore this is a main power that the president has within controlling get. This is one of the reasons why the president has a strong trust in his EXOP side of the federal bureaucracy, supposedly his "most loyal servants and advisers". The second power that the president has is the removal powers, **Article 2 of the Constitution, which gives the President the power to appoint government officials, does not explicitly provide the President with the power to remove officials.** One of the other powers is to change the organizational structure of the executive branch, when a new president comes into power changes to the federal bureaucracy are made, each president has certain preferences over this are of us politics, some presidents set up branches in the federal bureaucracy to look after significant aspects, it has grown more and more over the last number of presidents and now gives over 3million people jobs in the US. The president may also have certain problems controlling this aspect of government, as much as he has control over them with the above powers, there are certain problems with the federal bureaucracy such as Clientelism, this is where ▲gencies the second tier in the federal bureaucracies below departments, tend to serve interests for those who they are supposed to be overseeing, the term "watch dogs become lap dogs" comes into motion here, the federal bureaucracy is supposed to act as a check and balance on the specific department, but instead get to involved and let departments get away with what they shouldn't, known as being a lapdog and doing as they are told. The President could also be faced with Parochialism, this is where by agencies tend to focus on their own goals rather than the bigger picture of what they are supposed to be doing, dept interst often triumphs over national interest, this can cause problems to the president under decipline, he has appointed a member of the bureaucracy that isn't following the presidents view and putting the agency first, this often resorts in the loss of job and support by the president. One of the main problems a president from a new party in power has is Incrementalism, this is where the federal bureaucracy is against change, under each president there could be a change in the organizational structure or jobs, they are reluctant to do this, they have a conservative resistance to change therefore making it hard for a new party in power, under a new president.

The president isn't the only person who controls the federal bureaucracy there are some Congress controls aswell, **Congress tries to control the bureaucracy by influencing the appointment of agency heads, They occasionally eliminate an agency, One federal agency which is due to be removed is the Election Assistance Commission.** Formed after the mayhem of the 2000 election, it was intended to aid lawmakers and helps launch the Help America Vote Act. Its biggest responsibility was handing out millions of dollars in Federal funds. But now it spends more money on management costs instead

of doing anything else and some Republicans want to terminate the commission, this can also be controlled by passing legislation to control agencies and change the decisions of agencies. In 1966 Congress passed the Freedom of Information Act. This has required agencies to open files to persons requesting specific documents, although it does exempt certain types of documents that deal with national defense, foreign policy, trade secrets, and others that deal with the confidentiality of individuals or groups. The judiciary have a control over the bureaucracy if a bill is found to violate one of the constitutional rights, a court can say that the law is not constitutional so therefore it cannot be enforced. Then the Executive branch is obligated to follow the judicial branches recommendations and not enforce the law. This can also be done via judicial review in the Supreme court if the federal bureaucracy goes against something in the constitution the supreme court can stop it via judicial review.

In conclusion the federal bureaucracy is controlled largely by the president to a certain extent, whilst the president appoints members of the federal bureaucracy to their position without approval of congress, due to him being able to change the structure of the bureaucracy adding and removing departments he has physical control over them but control also comes from the **legislative** side of the government congress, they can use their powers to influence the appointment of agency heads and can eliminate an agency and finally the judiciary plays a role in providing a check and balance on the bureaucracy e.g. if a bill violates a constitutional right therefore the executive branch have to stop the bill. There are reasons outside of politics which control them such as the media as they will try to expose and dig up dirt on any aspect of the federal bureaucracy and hold them accountable for any mistakes made.