

The Principles of Management Culture

Dzhamal Z. Mutagirov*

Department of Philosophic Sciences, St. Petersburg State University, Russia

*Corresponding author: Dzhamal Z. Mutagirov, Department of Philosophic Sciences, St. Petersburg State University, Russia, Tel: +7 812 328-94-55; E-mail: dezamy@mail.ru

Received date: Oct 25, 2017, Accepted date: Nov 24, 2017, Published date: Nov 30, 2017

Copyright: © 2017 Dzhamal Z. Mutagirov. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Abstract

Problems of management occupy humankind's minds since the formation of societies and states. They turned into central points of political science in periods of transition from absolutist to republican order and subsequent waves of the democratic revolutions. What are the governments' goals, forms and levels of administration, and the best ways of their organization? - Here are the questions that faced the first champions of democracy. Since different political regimes with their adherents and opponents coexist in the world at the same time, the answers to these questions sound differently. For a long time, they were determined, especially in the countries with authoritarian regimes, from state-centrist positions, which had to promote the further strengthening of statehood at the expense of the power of societies and their members. The vocation of the managements' systems depends from the governments forms. In this article the purposes and vocation of the management systems, as well as their activity's effectiveness are considered from society and human centrist view on all socio-political and spiritual processes of life, and a state is understanding as the only one of the many thousands institutions of people, each of which is designed to serve them, solving specific tasks.

Keywords Society; People; Society; State; Constitution; Human rights; Democracy; Institutions; Rule of law; Corruption; Responsibility

Introduction

Almost simultaneously with the appearance of the first human institutions, some management systems arise to regulate relations between their members. Origins of the states, development of productive forces and expansion of social activities accompanied by modifications of administrative systems and moving towards their refinement and complexity. Evolution of social systems, emancipation, extension of people's rights and freedoms change and recast administrative, management functions, and their purposes. The idea, that the society forms the state to promote rights and freedoms of their members and to ensure their security, that people have the right to change their governments if they do not meet their needs and replace the inefficient and ineffective, gradually formed [1]. In an era of further expansion and improvement of democracy the main goals of all administrative systems are: "erasure of status differences, recognition of equality of all people "without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status" [2] and creation of the most favorable conditions for that. These problems are solved differently in different countries and with various effects with regard to democratic traditions, education, and political culture and so on. All these factors have strong impact on cultural level of administrative and management systems and their efficiency.

The State as an Institution of People

We can often hear such concepts as 'state governance', 'social-state governance', 'social governance' and 'public governance'. The content of the notions 'society' and 'state', as well as their relationship, helps to find a common denominator. Sociology understands a society as a

natural association of people to solve jointly with the vital for all problems, which cannot be solved individually. The society solves these vital problems by formation of numerous institutions of special competence, including the institutions of political power and control. Self-government (in dealing with the problems of life of the individuals and groups of individuals) and social government are primary and basic; the state government is secondary and only one of the many channels of public administration. The state and its authorities have to serve its society efficiently and effectively on sites. Hence comes the concept of "a servant", "servants of the people". This means that the entire administrative process is an organization of consistent solutions of vital problems of an area, region, society and later of humankind, creating necessary conditions for realization by every member of the society and commonwealth their fundamental rights (to life, work, education and health, adequate standard of living, human security, etc.).

Terms the Administrative Systems Efficiency

The efficiency of any system's functioning depends on staff structure, their knowledge and competence, social and political positions, and many other factors. Civil servants are authorities elected by people with delegated rights to solve the emerging problems. Each civil servant must meet several mandatory requirements. Firstly, they must be staunch supporters of the official administrative course. Secondly, a civil servant must have appropriate knowledge and significant experience to solve problems successfully and efficiently. Thirdly, they must be able to allocate the main tasks in their activity to succeed with other tasks of the team. Fourthly, administrative staff should be systematically renewed, rotated and rejuvenated by the most competent and advanced representatives of new generations able to express interests of their contemporaries more. Fifthly, the activities of all levels of the administration and their civil servants should remain under permanent control of the society.

Theorists of democracy reasonably considered that functioning and protection of the principles of republicanism should not be entrusted to the supporters of monarchism and to someone, who can use it against the will of the nation. "To appoint a monarchist to conduct the affairs of a republic is like appointing an atheist to the priesthood" [3] T. Jefferson wrote. This does not mean, however, that the opponents and critics of the country's social order might not execute any administrative functions. They can and should do, but on the terms that they will not use their organizational skills and positions to resist processes necessary for the society, but remaining faithful to their views, because the divergence of views and evaluations of social processes is a natural phenomenon. The differences of views and the conscious causing of evil are different things with different attitude to them.

All civil servants without any exception should have a good understanding of the administrative mission of a management, and be able successfully meet the challenges of the authorities. Their behavior, actions and way of life must correspond with the norms of public morality, for the conduct of the officials has a stronger effect on many members of the society who tend to imitate them. Short duration of the mandates for the elected representatives and constant rotation of administrative teams with the best and most competent representatives of the people are a guarantee their compliance with the mission and requirements. Comparing people with the sea, one of the authors of the Declaration of Independence and the United States Second President John Adams wrote that the deputies, governors, etc., "Like bubbles on the sea of matter borne; they rise, they break, and to that sea return. This will teach them the great political virtues of humility, patience, and moderation, without which every man in power becomes a ravenous beast of prey" [4]. The mandates' duration should not be so long that a deputy has time to forget the will of their electorate. "Corruption in elections is the great enemy of freedom" [4].

Without administrative rotations, society will stagnate with inevitable setbacks and rotting, just as water, deprived of tributaries, turns into a marsh with all the corresponding consequences. The increase in power and control of the proportion of the appointees directly by the first persons of these structures and leaders of political parties greatly contributes to it as well. The appointees tend to serve not to people, but only meet the interests of the first persons of the institutions [5]. Traditionally, the criteria for selecting the appointees are not so much knowledge and qualification, but close relations and personal dedication to those appointing them. In truly democratic, social and law-abiding states, an appointee can only be axillary personnel of power institutions, as well as advisers and assistants of senior officials in the quantities prescribed by law.

An important indicator of administrative culture is the officials' ability to see and solve timely the most pressing problems in their area of the activity and prioritize them correctly. The practice of "bread and circuses and, what is worse, "circuses without bread or instead of bread" is a testament of the team's inability to meet the challenges in the interests of all people and total administrative irresponsibility. Generous use of scarce public funds to organize entertainment, leaving the seriously ill citizens, especially children and their mothers without public aid, is an evidence of irresponsibility of the authorities before their society. The officials' lifestyles, that sharply contrast the life of ordinary people, should also be evaluated.

An integral requirement for the authorities, that indicate the level of their culture and performance, is knowledge of not only socio-economic and political theories, but also human rights and civil laws.

This will help them to find right ways and methods of solving the problems of society and ranking them in order of importance.

According to the theory of democracy, the state is an institution for the protection of human rights and ensuring security of a society and its members by creation of a coherent system of law relations. Law system of a society should not look like impassable jungles, full of danger to human life but as a park area, clearly structured in accordance with the systems of national values, with visible and understandable to everyone benchmarks to facilitate sociopolitical processes and harmonize relations between the participants. These guidelines are designed to provide a society with the shortest and easiest ways to its objectives. Authorities with a deficit of knowledge and positive experiences within public life spheres often prone to bureaucracy and regulate each step of either an individual or a group by adopting new laws, regulations and instructions, as well as multiplying punishment. With this, they impose a not always correct dogma like "law is law", "ignorance of the law is no excuse for its violation", etc. These formulas can be attributed only to law regulations, which are an expression of the true will of people and have been adopted with observance of all rules of the theory of constitutionalism, as well as brought to the attention of all citizens. However, "whether the acts of tyrants or reciprocal obligations thieves are laws?" asked one of the classics of the theory of law more than two thousand years ago. In addition, he negatively answered this question, naming them not laws, but harmful and wrong actions, far from law and justice. Objectively, for disobeying such "laws" people should not be punished, but rather encouraged. The law is a fair distinction between the right and the wrong. This distinction corresponds to the nature, the original and the main regulator of all processes with which laws of peoples must be measured, regardless of whether are they punishing the guilty or protecting the innocent [6].

Society as a whole and each member individually feels free when laws establish rules of their behavior in key areas of life. It is therefore considered that there should be a few laws; many laws are a sign of the society's and the state's sickness. "When multiplying laws and commands, a number of thieves and robbers are growing" [7] believed Lao Tzu, a Chinese philosopher. "The closer the State to the fall, the more numerous are its laws" [7], echoed from the other end of the World famous Roman Historian C. Tacitus. The more intense and accelerated is a process of laws making, establishing what is allowed and what is forbidden, the "more uncertain and short-lived, they become" [8] and the more offences happen in a society. We can observe the law-making activity of some modern "legislators", especially members of the State Duma of the Russian Federation, who set new records each year for the number of hastily taken "laws" detached from reality. Their norms often contradict each other. That is why they are not accepted by society. It has to note that not all of them comply with the requirements listed above. They do not think about the answers to the questions of the reasonable people: "what is the use of vain laws, where there are no manners? What do empty laws without customs mean?" [6]. The reader may ask, 'what is common between the times of Cicero and our days?' Yes, indeed, these are very different eras. However, the true republican and democratic values have been formed and consolidated for millennia and have become norms of democracy as a universal value [7], norms of common law.

Any law must correspond with certain mandatory requirements: express the true will the citizen's majority, be democratically adopted according to customs and traditions of the country, be aimed exclusively for the benefit of the society and be clearly explained. It is

necessary to add three more requirements, given by John Locke: "First, They are to govern by promulgated established laws, not to be varied in particular cases, but to have one rule for rich and poor, for the favourite at court, and the country man at plough. Secondly, these laws also ought to be designed for no other end ultimately, but the good of the people. Thirdly, they must not raise taxes on the property of the people, without the consent of the people, given by themselves, or their deputies. And this properly concerns only such governments where the legislative is always in being, or at least where the people have not reserved any part of the legislative to deputies, to be from time to time chosen by themselves. Fourthly, the legislative neither must nor can transfer the power of making laws to anybody else, or place it anywhere, but where the people have" [9].

Figuratively speaking, Constitution performs as an operational legal system. In truly democratic republics, Constitution is the genuine expression of the will of the majority of their citizens and is the basic law for all its institutions and society members. This is a contract, "according to which people came together in community, united by common for all law [10]. It accurately determines the status of citizens and social institutions, their rights and obligations. Some researchers of sociopolitical life of societies called the Constitution a "design of a permanent political order." [11]. It is not permitted to violate the constitutional norms, to breach them or substitute the will of society by a personal will of a civil servant, as well as put instructions and directions of individual officials above the basic law. Control over the observance of the norms and principles of the Constitution must perform true agents of peoples' will rather than those who disagree with its postulates. In all cases when the legislative text contains both constructive and destructive formulas, only constructive sense ought to use, because, by definition, a legislator may not and cannot pursue destructive purposes.

Improvement of administrative culture by strengthening responsibilities of each civil servant and control by people, whom he serves, as well as eradication of the deeply rooted practice of using official position in personal purposes, are possible only by rising the grade of personal and collective responsibility of the entire administrative team for the execution quality assigned by society. This is especially true for the so-called 'vertical power' states, where the higher officials make all appointments. In a democratic administrative system, the whole chain of officials contributed to the offender's appointment on an official position, shall be responsible for these acts. It must not allowed the practice when achievements are attributed to the entire team, represented by its head, and failures and law violations - only to an infringer.

Power, rights and privileges offered to authorities in order to create optimal conditions for successful functioning for the benefit of people can be used and traditionally use in Russia in personal selfish interests. Hundreds of officials, from the members of government, governors and mayors, to the heads of local administrations, caught for the embezzlement of public funds and bribery confirm the said. Each such a case ought to regard as a hotbed of cancerous growth on the body of the administrative and management system, when the whole system is doomed to an inevitable end without surgery. This system should be organized, reformed, improved and systematically cleaned so that it prohibits the slightest possibility of such hot spots, and if they emerge, should be able to self-clean immediately.

The outcome depends largely on the society, sociopolitical culture and civil liability of people. It is truly said, that every nation has such a

government (and thus an administrative system), what it deserves. A lot depends on how people look at power and authorities - as elected representatives for a certain period, responsible for their actions before a society, or the 'chiefs', who determine people's fate. In the first case, people will zealously monitor the activities of their 'servants', immediately replacing the less responsible with more capable and responsible; in the second case, they will trust them, regardless of the impact of the authorities' activities. However, as it had been noticed a long time ago and is constantly confirmed by practice, blind trust is harm for the progress of a society. "It would be a dangerous delusion were a confidence in the men of our choice to silence our fears for the safety of our rights". Thomas Jefferson believed. "Confidence is everywhere the parent of despotism. Free government is founded in jealousy, and not in confidence. It is jealousy and not confidence which prescribes limited constitutions, to bind down those whom we are obliged to trust with power. Our Constitution has accordingly fixed the limits to which, and no further, our confidence may go. In questions of power, then, let no more be heard of confidence in man, but bind him down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution" [3]. Political situation in many countries confirms Jefferson's vision of this warning.

Conclusions

Governing and command systems, originated almost simultaneously with the formation of societies, have revolutionized. They gradually transformed from institutions formed by rulers to defend their personal interests into the institutions formed by societies for the protection of interests of all their members. The process was not simultaneous. In many countries up to now, power institutions have understood their mission as serving the state and their authorities. However, laws of history are implacable and eventually serving people will become a real mission of all power systems and governance in the world.

References

1. Declaration of Independence (1776). In Congress, July 4.
2. Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Adopted and proclaimed by General Assembly resolution 217 A (III) of December 10 (1948).
3. The Writings of Thomas Jefferson. In 12 vol. Millenniums edition. New York. 1904-1905.
4. The Works of John Adams (1907). In 10 volumes (Novanglus, Thoughts on Government, Defense of The Writings of Benjamin Franklin, Albert Henry Smith editor. London.
5. Mutagirov DZ "light and shadow" of political parties 'Political Expertize/ Politex). 11: 25-37.
6. The Political Works of Marcus Tullius Cicero. Comprising his Treatise on the Commonwealth; and his Treatise on the Laws. Translated from the original, with Dissertations and Notes in Two Volumes. By Francis Barham Indianapolis (2004).
7. Mutagirov DZ (2014) Democracy as universal value. Moscow.
8. Thomas H (2011) The English Works. Liberty Fund. Indianapolis.
9. John L (2009) The Two Treatises of Government (1689, 1764). Liberty Fund, Indianapolis.
10. Kant I (2009) The Philosophy of Law: An Exposition of the Fundamental Principles of Jurisprudence as the Science of Right. Liberty Fund, Indianapolis.
11. McClellan J (1989) Liberty, Order, and Justice: An Introduction to the Constitutional Principles of American Government. Indianapolis.