Revisiting the Phenomenon of Antidemocratic Transformation of Management Institutions.
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ABSTRACT

The regularities, the phenomenon of antidemocratic entropy of management institutions are considered. The objective factors of concentration of administrative resources are established, provisions oriented at providing protection to democratic structures of management from subordination to local interests of certain social groups and entities are worded.
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INTRODUCTION

Historical experience of radical economic transformations, social reformations and revolutions distinctly detects in the middle-term perspective the predominance if negative transformations in executive power bodies.

In this aspect evolution of these institutions in RF is very demonstrative (presidential, governmental, representative, regional, local) over the last decade.

It is evident that all these establishments and institutions are developing under the common laws, as the basis of their functioning are the same principles, just modified under different levels of management. (Gubar, A.I., 2006)

Main part:

The theory of management till the present moment leaves research of the interaction of primary, basic subjective interests for the general philosophic and sociological, politological constructions or leads them to pragmatically narrowed functional technological mechanisms. Meanwhile, practically the problem of constructing effective management institutions extremely sharply arises namely in the transformational society.

The form of setting the task itself has rather general, universal nature. Let's remember V.I.Lenin when setting the task of constructing the state mechanism, «absolutely extreme bureaucracy», he stated that the army of officials «fully impregnated with antidemocratic spirit», «… it has frozen, hardened and stiffed, unable to escape out of this atmosphere … This army is bound with relations of position subordination, famous privileges of the «state» service, and the high rows of this army via the shares and the banks are bonded … to financial capital, to a known extent representing its agents, conductors of its interests and influence » (Lenin, V.I., 202-203). This was written in Russia in 1917, but it may have reference to the present time.

The bureaucratic privatization of management system in times of socialism is what, at its total repressiveness has remained indefinite, having totally spread and finally led to its destructive end. It is not by chance that its leader and founder was fateful saying: «This is what is going to kill us» (Lenin, V.I., 180); «For this we all… have to be hung on stinky ropes. And I have not yet lost the hope that sometime we’ll be hung for this» (Lenin, V.I., 87). Therewith all efforts of communist power oriented at effective social democratization of management institutions were primarily doomed to failure for the reason of both – essential attributiveness to its authoritarian machine, and indefiniteness of conditions and regularities of processes of formalization, bureaucracy and finally degeneration of democratic management systems. (Gubar, A.I., 2006; Kirdina, S.,)
The management «innocence», preserved till our time, lies in the fact that, assuming the possibility of monopolization of economic mechanisms, our expectations are absolutely disembodied from the regular expressions of this possibility in the sphere of formation of management institutions. Systematic interruptions of these institutions as the rule refer to frequent failures in the sphere of creation of regulations, they are the result of these or those failures, unfaithfulness, abuses etc. (Matveev, V.V., 2014; Suslov, N.I., 2013).

Russia, undoubtedly, has the most rich experience of «suppressing» the democracy, its adopting to clicarian interests, negatively selected powerful and about powerful groups (Barzilei, M.; B.Armadzhani., 2003; Kaufman, D.; et al., 2012).

In order to find out the phenomenon of the fast, bureaucratic, shadow and then clicarian transformation of management institutions it is necessary, at least, to investigate the two establishing aspects. The first is in consideration of the essence, conditions and contents of clicarian transformation processes. The second is in establishing the specific features of this phenomenon in conditions of Russian post totalism. The results of such consideration allow formulating some conclusions for substantiating the approaches to formation and functioning of management institutions in transition society. (Levin., S.N., 2013; Lipov, V., 2012)

The phenomenon of the antidemocratic entropy of management institutions expresses itself in two major forms.

Firstly, it finds its reflection in the total formalization and bureaucratization of management institutions. This form has most of all realized itself in conditions of rigid totalitarian and repressive system of power. The «strictness» of the system has let support the management within the framework of officially stated norms, but its effectiveness if extremely low and is regularly reducing. (Shastitko, A.S., 2013; Aslund, A., 2007)

Secondly, it is realized in the weakened, insufficient management system, liable to democratic mimicry, hiding the really corpusculated institutions, monopolization of the existing management spheres and processes and finally their privatization. These processes are characteristic for the transition, institutionally non-procured society, where evidently ineffective obsolete management institutions are replaced by the new – unbalanced, forming numerous contradictions, regulatory niches and breakdowns, not possessing the instrument, corresponding with the transformation period. Such position, reasoned by the difficulties of the growth (if it lasts for a long period of time, moreover – the decades), gives rise to systematic institutional deformations and rather possible danger of moving towards well-known, historically repeated way of formalization of management institutions, maintenance of the look of their longstanding and extremely ineffective reformation. (Gubar, A.I., 2006)

It is worth mentioning that in the Russian conditions the systematic transformation of management institutions are not only doomed to overcoming the contradictions of monopolism, being fastened while decades, but also in the situation of longstanding permanent transformation for decades, are exposed to the strengthening influence of factors of «social exhaustion», adapting capacity, living power, deformation of social and economic transformation, satellitism, parasitism, final loss of the initial guidelines and criteria of reformation, suppressed positive results of which may be privatized by a small mafia, leaving the difficulties of transition for the majority of the population. (Lenin, V.I.; Besley, T.; T. Persson, 2011)

The doubtless initial aspect of formation of the whole system management institutions on the modern civilized society is the postulate of democracy. Namely the democracy as the initial institutional principle provides maximum expression of interests of all social system entities. Therewith one may not mix the initial nature of this principle with its generality. This way, in its special functionality the principle of democracy is combined with the principle of professional authoritarian nature. Substitution of the spheres of implementing these principles is one of the widely spread forms of democratic mimicry. (Schmitt, A., D. Treisman, 2012)

Principles of democracy stipulate the most complete accounting of interests for all entities of the management system, which are not only multiform, but also contradictory. This objectively reasons the necessity of formation of social institutions and norms, providing realization of the initial principle. This way, democracy may exist only in condition of special antientropy procurement. It may not, as an elementary market mechanism, be realized automatically. Moreover, failure to observe the principles of democracy in management institutions needs special protection, as it is systematically exposed to treats of deformation, subordination to the interests of these or those social groups or certain entities.

It evident that the first threat to the principle of democracy is its deformation from the side of the won executive bodies – the mechanism, performing current management over the democratic institution. The world practice of functioning of similar institutions, as distinguished from the pseudo democratic socialistic constructions, has a priori developed special mechanisms against such deformations. (Davies, S., P. Ormosi, 2010; Lane, D., 2008).

There are objective presuppositions for concentration of the whole completeness of management functions with the executive mechanism. Let’s point out the most important of them.

Firstly, the mechanism as a special management body is duly organized, hierarchically co-subordinated, bonded with administrative norms and expresses itself in the democratic institution as a certain and the most managed integrity.
Secondly, the executive body accumulates the well-known management qualification, concentrates specially trained personnel.

Thirdly, the mechanism accumulates special management information, is knowingly the monopolist of the exhausting information about the system under management.

Fourthly, as the rule, it has the most wide spread material opportunities in its disposal to realize these or those decisions, consequently, the conditions for ranging these or those preferences.

Fifthly, the mechanism concentrates possibilities of material and moral incentives, as well as career development of management personnel.

Sixthly, the most important management communications pass through and are under control of the mechanism.

Seventhly, the executive bodies, as the rule, subordinate the activity of controlling and repressive bodies and authorities to their competence.

Results:

These presuppositions form mainly the so-called administrative resource, providing wide, and often determining possibilities of the democratically elected entities of executive management institutions. The same resource often allows distributing the influence of the executive mechanism at the election process, under the worked-out mask of pseudo performance of the established democratic procedures and norms. Finally, this process of deformation spreads to transformation of the latter into external formal element of realizing the interests of the management of the executive body.

Conclusions:

Within the framework of this article there are some provisions formulated, providing acting guarantees against antidemocratization of management institutions.

First – strict rigid division of normative-creating and executive and instructional functions. Failure to observe, non-obedience to this principle, and sometimes specially performed mixing of them, shall quickly and obligatory lead to privatizing of the management institution. This is inherent to the majority of Russian joint-stock companies and especially – higher school management bodies, having stopped at some level of half and fast degenerative by democratization.

Second – strict observation of established democratic procedures, which are invisibly simplified, «humanized» - for example, by way of ignoring the requirements of the quorum, «transparence» of poll procedure, manipulating with issues, put on the democratic discussion etc.

Third – observation of the principle of accumulating the responsibility while the level of management hierarchy is growing. This way, release from responsibility of the management link of this level leads not to removal of the latter, but to acceptance of such responsibility by the administrative subdivision of the subsequent, higher level.

Fourth – the necessity of special development for every institution of unified norms of responsibility up to dismissal from the position. Therewith the selective nature shall not be the basis for escaping from the responsibility, or administrative immunity.

Fifth – forming on the basis, and, evidently, within the framework of already existing legal bodies of special structures of administrative and legal control, as the greater part of administrative activity at present is outside any control. As the result there appears a position, when the executive body itself issues often not so legally correct acts, executes them, corrects and sometimes distorts.

Sixth – observation of the principle of balanced responsibility, i.e. correlation of management decisions being with the executor, incentives to their performance and possible negative results of non-performance.

Seventh – principles of correctness, transparence of management decisions, adoption and realization of which shall be to the maximum extent provided legislatively, essentially substantiated and clear for the executors.
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