


#001

February 17, 2017

Glen A. Grant, J.A.D.
Acting Administrative Director of the Courts
Rules Comments
Robert J. Hughes Justice Complex
25 Market Street, Box 037
Trenton, NJ 08625-0037



Re: Supreme Court Rules Committee


Dear Mr. Grant:

I note by the 2/13/17 edition of the New Jersey Law Journal that comments-at-large are permitted upon the various reports of the Supreme Court rules committees.

Accordingly, attached please find my comments, with exhibits, on the report of the New Jersey Supreme Court Committee on Minority Concerns.

Thank you.

Yours truly,


VINCENT BUONANNO

17 Cleveland Drive
West Milford, NJ 07480

Enclosures

Dear Members of the Supreme Court Committee on Minority Concerns:

I have been an investigator in good standing with the Division of Consumer Affairs, Department of Law & Public Safety for many years. This coming March will in fact mark my seventeenth anniversary of state employment. I have worked closely with the Division of Law within the department over those same years, and with the judiciary from time to time, as various cases and investigations have required. I know of what I speak.

After having read the proposed rules of your committee, and reviewed the graphs and statistics, I am compelled to state, respectfully, that I am in disagreement with the attending proposed policy measures and their ideological underpinning. Before proceeding further, I would have the committee know that I have written to the Attorney General on this very point, prompted by his action to create a "chief diversity officer" position within the Department of Law & Public Safety. I refer you to the 12/12/16 issue of the New Jersey Law Journal for particulars. Accordingly, I observe the same misguided efforts at work.

To begin with, realities are more important than ideologies. While the intentions of your committee in making such proposals and rule changes may be of a high order, as policy measures they serve no practical purpose. The very notion of "diversity," and its associated clichés of "inclusion" and "of color," like many similar notions arising originally from academia, is not grounded in empirical evidence. As a general theory of proportional fairness it fails (Exhibit 1); as a constitutional measure with a controversial history, it has done more actual harm than good (Exhibit 2); as a business parameter it is largely a waste of money, applied more often for corporate show or liability, especially when it is mandatory (Exhibits 3 & 4); as a general principle of creating livable communities, it fails as a crude tool of artificial social engineering (Exhibit 5); and given an international perspective (as opposed to a purely American one), it has been shown to be predominantly ineffective (Exhibit 6).

Committee members will duly note that all of the cited exhibits have been authored by what the law terms "protected classes" and what many in society term "minorities."

I submit the foregoing not as a gratuitous criticism of the committee's rule proposals, but as a lost recognition that state government should not be bent and warped by an ideology of quotas and set percentages of certain personnel, which impedes, either deliberately or accidentally, its rational organizational functioning. Moreover, while it may please the ideologues to view state government as a laboratory for social experiment, the reality is that the most women, whether black, brown, or white, whether in the judiciary or out, would rather have a merited raise or promotion as a true recognition of their worth, than have lessons in "diversity training" foisted upon them. If the committee doubts this, then I propose that you put the choice to them directly.

In conclusion, rather than parsing the great body of state civil servants by race, color, and gender, and thereby causing unnecessary resentment in "the majority," which perforce directly effects morale negatively, the committee may wish to consider the merits of a comprehensive and forensic review of the "minorities" themselves, as to why they may not be succeeding in the judiciary, or in any other profession for that matter.

Merit is the only true paradigm. Anything less, however well intended, is but a falsification of merit, which degrades both the giver and the taker.

Respectfully submitted,


Vincent Buonanno

17 Cleveland Drive
West Milford, NJ 07480

Enclosures