UDC: 351:(321.01 +321.7 +321.015)

Ivanenko Olena Volodymirivna,
Ph.D. in law, associate professor, associate professor of the department of constitutional law, history and theory of state and law of the educational and scientific institute of law named after prince Vladimir the Great Interregional academy of personnel management, 03194, Kyiv, Boulevar Koltsova, 14-E, tel.: (066) 518 97 97, e-mail: olena.ivanenko81@gmail.com
ORCID: 0000-0002-9936-6672

Іваненко Олена Володимирівна,
кандидат юридичних наук, доцент, доцент кафедри конституційного права, історії та теорії держави і права Навчально-наукового інституту права імені князя Володимира Великого Міжрегіональної Академії управління персоналом, 03194, Київ, бульвар Кольцова, 14-Е, тел.: (066) 518 97 97, e-mail: olena.ivanenko81@gmail.com
ORCID: 0000-0002-9936-6672

Иваненко Елена Владимировна,
кандидат юридических наук, доцент, доцент кафедры конституционного права, истории и теории государства и права Учебно-научного института права имени князя Владимира Великого Межрегиональной Академии управления персоналом, 03194, Киев, бульвар Кольцова, 14-Е, тел.: (066) 518 97 97, e-mail: olena.ivanenko81@gmail.com
ORCID: 0000-0002-9936-6672
DOI: 10.32689/2617-2224-2018-15-5-95-108

BUREAUCRATIC MANAGEMENT FUNCTIONS: SPECIAL ISSUES

Abstract. The article is devoted to the study of the nature and essence of bureaucracy as a phenomenon of state-political reality. The author notes that for a long time the concept of bureaucratic management was recognized as the most rational and effective in the European tradition of public administration. However, today there is no single approach to understanding the essence of the bureaucracy, as well as its relationship with such concepts as public administration, public management, government apparatus, etc. In this regard, scientific research into the nature and essence of bureaucratic management , which, in turn, will help to avoid further terminological and ideological-ideological confusion.

The author notes that today in the scientific community there are two diametrically opposed approaches to the definition of bureaucracy as a phenomenon

of state-legal reality: the first approach is the quintessence of analysis of anti-bureaucratic Marxist criticism, which even in today's conditions has not lost its relevance, and its basic provisions are scientific interest in studying the problems of public administration; The essence is briefly reduced to fixing the dysfunctions of the public management system; The essence of the second approach is the identification of the latter with government, when bureaucracy is understood as a rationally organized system of public administration, creates the most effective mechanism for implementing managerial decisions.

In the article it was proposed to proceed from the understanding of the bureaucracy as a structured and hierarchically constructed system of highly skilled intellectual workers who have a high level of professional training, intelligent backgrounds, an unblemished reputation, ideological education in the spirit of priority of nationwide well-being, are appointed to posts by competitive selection and qualitatively carry out their professional activities to perform the functions of state darstva. The author also notes that all the "negative" signs of bureaucratic management that are distinguished by scientists should be considered as dysfunctions of the bureaucracy. Thus, shifting the emphasis from the struggle against bureaucracy, attention should be focused on identifying negative factors in the implementation of public administration and working out ways to overcome them.

Keywords: state administration, bureaucracy, bureaucratic management, bureaucratic dysfunctions, state manager, state functions, state-power authorities.

ДИСФУНКЦІЇ БЮРОКРАТИЧНОГО УПРАВЛІННЯ: ОКРЕМІ ПИТАННЯ

Анотація. Досліджується природа і сутність бюрократії як явища державно-політичної дійсності. Наголошується, що протягом тривалого часу концепція бюрократичного управління визналася найбільш раціональною та ефективною у європейській традиції державного управління. Проте, на сьогоднішній день відсутній єдиний підхід щодо розуміння сутності бюрократії, а також її співвідношення із такими поняттями як державне управління, публічний менеджмент, апарат державної влади тощо. У зв'язку з цим, як ніколи, актуалізуються наукові розвідки в частині дослідження природи та сутності бюрократичного управління, що, у свою чергу сприятиме уникненню у подальшому термінологічної та світоглядно-ідеологічної плутанини.

На сьогодні у наукових колах існує два діаметрально протилежних підходи до визначення бюрократії як явища державно-правової дійсності: перший підхід є квінтесенцією аналізу антибюрократичної марксистської критики, яка, навіть, в умовах сьогодення не втратила своєї актуальності, а її базові положення становлять науковий інтерес при вивченні проблематики державного управління; сутність стисло зводиться до фіксації дисфункцій державної управлінської системи; сутністю другого підходу є ототожнення останнього із державним управлінням, коли бюрократія розуміється як раціонально організована система державного управління, яка створює найбільш ефективний механізм реалізації управлінських рішень.

Запропоновано у подальшому виходити із розуміння бюрократії як структурованої та ієрархічно вибудованої системи висококваліфікованих спеціалістів інтелектуальної праці, які мають високий рівень професійної підготовки, інтелігенте походження, незаплямовану репутацію, ідеологічне виховання в дусі пріоритетності загальнодержавного добробуту, призначаються на посади за результатами конкурсних відборів та якісно здійснюють свою професійну діяльність на виконання функцій держави. Наголошується на тому, що усі "негативні" ознаки бюрократичного управління, які виділяються науковцями, слід розглядати як дисфункції бюрократії. Таким чином, переносячи акцент із боротьби з бюрократією, увагу потрібно зосередити на виявленні негативних факторів здійснення державного управління та виробленні шляхів їх подолання.

Ключові слова: державне управління, бюрократія, бюрократичне управління, дисфункції бюрократії, державний управлінець, функції держави, державно-владні повноваження.

ДИСФУНКЦИИ БЮРОКРАТИЧЕСКОГО УПРАВЛЕНИЯ: ОТДЕЛЬНЫЕ ВОПРОСЫ

Аннотация. Исследуются природа и сущность бюрократии как явления государственно-политической действительности. Отмечается, что в течение длительного времени концепция бюрократического управления признавалась наиболее рациональной и эффективной в европейской традиции государственного управления. Однако, на сегодняшний день отсутствует единый подход к пониманию сущности бюрократии, а также ее соотношение с такими понятиями как государственное управление, публичный менеджмент, аппарат государственной власти и др. В связи с этим как никогда актуализируются научные исследования в части исследования природы и сущности бюрократического управления, что, в свою очередь, будет способствовать избежанию в дальнейшем терминологической и мировоззренчески-идеологической путаницы.

На сегодняшний день в научных кругах существует два диаметрально противоположных подхода к определению бюрократии как явления государственно-правовой действительности: первый подход является квинтэссенцией анализа антибюрократической марксистской критики, что даже в сегодняшних условиях не утратила своей актуальности, а ее базовые положения составляют научный интерес при изучении проблематики государственного управления; сущность кратко сводится к фиксации дисфункций государственной управленческой системы; сущностью второго подхода является отождествление последнего с государственным управлением, когда бюрократия понимается как рационально организованная система государственного управления, создает наиболее эффективный механизм реализации управленческих решений.

Предложено в дальнейшем исходить из понимания бюрократии как структурированной и иерархически выстроенной системы высококвалифициро-

ванных специалистов интеллектуального труда, которые имеют высокий уровень профессиональной подготовки, интеллигентное происхождения, незапятнанную репутацию, идеологическое воспитание в духе приоритетности общегосударственного благополучия, назначаются на должности по результатам конкурсных отборов и качественно осуществляют свою профессиональную деятельность на выполнение функций государства. Автор также отмечает, что все "негативные" признаки бюрократического управления, что выделяются учеными, следует рассматривать как дисфункции бюрократии. Таким образом, перенося акцент с борьбы с бюрократией, внимание нужно сосредоточить на выявлении негативных факторов осуществления государственного управления и выработке путей их преодоления.

Ключевые слова: государственное управление, бюрократия, бюрократическое управление, дисфункции бюрократии, государственный управленец, функции государства, государственно-властные полномочия.

Formulation of the problem. For a long time the concept of the bureaucratic administration was recognized as the most rational and effective in the European tradition of the government administration. The term "bureaucracy" comes from the French bureaucratie or German Bürokratie [1], and literally means (from the French Bureau — the office, the bureau) the power of the administration apparatus.

To date, there is no single approach to understanding the essence of the bureaucracy, as well as its relation with such concepts as government administration, public management, the apparatus of state power, etc. In this regard, the scientific researches are never updated as part of the study of the nature and essence of the bureaucratic administration which in turn will contribute to avoiding the terminological and ideological confusion in the future.

Analysis of recent research and publications. The scientific study of the problems of the bureaucracy began in 1985 when the scientific achievements of such scientists as V. P. Makarenko, A. V. Buzhalin, B. P. Kurashvili, A. G. Khudokormov, A. G. Karatuev, S. A. Denysov. Recently, the scientific researches are being updated in the direction of understanding the role and significance of the bureaucratic administration in the context of the formation of a new state, as well as analysis of the obstacles that arise during the implementation of this process.

The purpose of the article is the general theoretical analysis of the nature and essence of the bureaucracy as a phenomenon of state-political reality in order to eliminate the terminological and ideological confusion.

Presenting the main material. There are various interpretations of the bureaucracy, among which are the following scientific interests for us:

• the bureaucracy is understood in the strict sense as a hierarchically organized system of governance of society, and in a portable one — as a formal-

ism in the conduct of the cases, "closing of the eyes" to the essential in order to comply with the formalities [2];

• the bureaucracy — this is, on the one hand, the form of organization of the work, and on the other — the drift of this organization. Speaking about it as a form of organization of work, then the bureaucracy is an administration whose activities are strictly regulated by the law, and the employees that are selected through the qualification examinations must strictly obey their supervisor and work in the specialized sector. But here it should be noted that the formalism of the bureaucracy can lead to the severity and rigidity of the administrative activity, and even the monopolization of the power in order to achieve exclusively the interests of the bureaucrats [3];

• the bureaucracy (the French Bureau — the office, the Greek kratos — the power) — the organization of the professional state officials who carry out their activities for the purpose of a well-qualified and effective implementation of the state policy (M. Weber, M. Krosse, F. Selznyk, A. Gouldner, S. Lipset, etc.) [4];

• the bureaucracy is a specific form of social organization in a society the essence of which is the separation of the centers of executive power from the will and decisions of the majority of the members of this organization; in the prevalence of the form over the content of activity; in the subordination of the rules and tasks of the organization to the goals of its preservation and strengthening; and ultimately leads to the emergence of a privileged social stratum detached from the society and the political leadership [5];

Extremely interesting and deserving of scientific analysis is, as it may seem strange, the statements of the famous politicians, scholars, philosophers on the theme of bureaucracy. We suggest to consider some of them:

• the bureaucracy is like fishing there where there is no fish (*Cyril Northcote Parkinson*);

• the government administration is an incredible mechanism that allows ten to do one's work; a bureaucrat is a person with a talent of misunderstanding; a part of any government administration apparatus exists exclusively for beauty in its pure form and does not have any purpose (*George Elgozy*);

• the bureaucratic way to get rid of the useless papers is to eliminate them retaining a copy of each page; to optimize — to complicate the matter so as to ensure the maximum level of its security (*Lawrence Peter*);

• even the paragraph sign looks like an instrument of torture; I believe in the inevitable death of all the living organisms but not of organizations; the faith in the paper is mystical, because the guarantees of the eternity of the granite are written on it (*Stanislav Jerzy Lets*);

• carry it first, and then improvise; the official secret documents do not exist to protect secrets, but in order to protect the officials (*Jonathan Lin* and *Anthony Jay*);

• the memorandum is not written to inform its addressee, but in order to protect its author (*Dean Acheson*);

• the bureaucracy is expanding in order to meet the needs of the growing bureaucracy (*Isaac Azimov*);

• to work with people is easy; difficult is to work with the living people (*Oleksandr Kulych*);

• the official papers tend to fill all the free drawers (*Jerry Brown*) [6].

The analysis of the above aphorisms which, one way or another, can be regarded as a manifestation of the public opinion about a certain phenomenon of the state-legal reality, and in this case — the bureaucracy. Proceeding from the above, one can formulate the thesis that the bureaucracy is a negative phenomenon of the state-political reality. However, in our opinion, such an approach to understanding the essence of the bureaucracy is completely wrong. In this case, we propose to consider the negative manifestations or dysfunctions of the bureaucratic administration not as the essential signs of the latter, but as the factors whose elimination will enable the government administration to perform qualitatively in the long term.

The most complete basic principles of a rational bureaucratic organization are formulated by M. Weber, namely: the bureaucracy has a hierarchical structure; each institution/organization has its own sphere of competence/influence; the officials are appointed on the basis of the professional qualifications, as indicated in the diplomas, or on the results of examinations, but are not elected; the salary of a state official depends on the rank; the work of the state official is his profession, or at least the main type of work; an official is not the owner of the institution/organization where he works; the state official adheres to labour discipline and is in control; the reason for dismissal is the decision of the governing bodies. Indeed, according to Weber, the state bureaucracy recognized the system of highly skilled intellectuals who have a high level of professional training, an intellectual of origin, has an unblemished reputation. He believed that without it there would be a danger of terrible corruption and low moral qualities which in turn would jeopardize the purely technical efficiency of the state apparatus [4, p. 184].

In his opinion, the true profession of a true official should not be politics. He must exercise government administration, first and foremost, impartially (this requirement, incidentally, also applies to so-called political state executives); officially; "sine ira et studio" — "without fury and bias" to solve all the state affairs; the state official should not do what is always and in some way obliged to make a politician — to fight, since it is decision making, struggle and passion that is a factor of politics; the activity of the politician must always be carried out responsibly, but this responsibility is directly opposite to the responsibility of the state official; if the senior management insists on the execution of the order, the matter of honour of an official should be precise and qualitative execution of it under the personal responsibility of the person providing the order; in the absence of such discipline, the whole apparatus of the government administration is doomed to collapse.

It should be noted that the post Weber period is characterized by a gradual departure from the rational model of the bureaucracy, offering more realistic models that define the latter as a social system that, along with the rational laws of functioning, allows the influence of the irrational, personal and

informal factors. In this sense, the use of the notion of the dysfunction of the bureaucracy which at that time was introduced into the scientific use of R. Miquelson, T. Parsson, R. Merton, for which the typical dysfunction of the bureaucracy is the shift of the state officials of the accent for the purposes of the organization to its means, such means of administration as the hierarchy of the management structure, discipline, instructions, etc., become an end in itself. In parallel, within the system of the government administration is the replacement of the main goals to secondary, rational to irrational.

However, the most serious problem of the government administration is its gradual politicization. If the bureaucracy in the classical sense at the beginning of the XX century was oriented towards the achievement of the welfare and the satisfaction of the general interests, having a conscious conviction that all the state affairs should be decided on purely business apolitical basis; then the modern politicized bureaucracy is openly and clearly guided by the various political groups of influence, trying to exercise the government administration in the process of political negotiations, while using a pluralistic margin of protection, namely, parliament, parties, lobbying, etc.

There is a stance that the modern bureaucracy even tries not only to influence the formation and implementation of the state policy by the highest officials of the state, but also to direct the politicians themselves. Very often in the exercise of the government administration it happens that most of the government administration apparatuses are in favour of a certain state policy, and as those who carry out the technical preparation of the decisions by the high-ranking officials, using an arsenal of available means they try to dictate it to their management which is authorized to implement the state policy [7].

To date, in the scientific circles there are two diametrically opposed approaches to the definition of bureaucracy as a phenomenon of state-legal reality. For example, the latter can be studied at the level of society as a system of governance and decision-making (K. Marx, L. Trotsky, R. Michels, J. K. Galbraith) or as a mechanism independent of the political form (M. Weber, R. Merton, F. Selznyk) [8]. Also, the bureaucracy can be seen as a manifestation of the professional implementation of the government administration (G. F. F. Hegel, G. Mosca, C. Marx, M. Jilas, D. Brethem) or the theory of the "formal organization" (M. Weber, R. Merton, M. Duverger, F. Selznyk) [9].

Within the framework of this study, it is logical to stop separately in considering two main diametrically opposed approaches to understanding the essence of the bureaucracy which can be conventionally called as politicized and apolitical.

The first approach (K. Marx) is the quintessence of the analysis of anti-bureaucratic Marxist critique, which, even in today's conditions, has not lost its relevance, and its basic positions are of scientific interest in the study of the problems of the government administration. The overwhelming majority of the data of the scientific theses is the fixation of the dysfunctions of the government administration system. The main ones are:

• the bureaucracy is a phenomenon of real reality, when formal is perceived as a content, but the content as a formality;

• the state tasks turn into stationery, and stationery tasks — into state ones [10];

• the basis of the Marxist approach to bureaucracy is to represent the latter as a social parasitic organism which throughout its period of existence is an objectification of the social class antagonisms and contradictions, as well as the materialization of the political alienation [11];

• the bureaucratic relations are a form of manifestation of the social contradictions between the state and society, the apparatus of the government administration and the citizens; the state officials who form the state apparatus have a so-called monopoly on the political consciousness and intelligence and all the time try to take full responsibility for the ineffective decisions and low effective government administration to be transferred to the society;

• there is a direct relationship between the scale of the bureaucracy and the level of the democratization of the society: in the conditions of authoritarianism the government administration is reduced to the functioning of a completely independent in relation to the interests of the society, the state apparatus which consists of specially trained people with state-power [12]; precisely the lack of pressure from the civil society on the people's electors to fulfill their obligations to the voters and causes the flowering of the negative bureaucratic manifestations [13];

• such a phenomenon as a state formalism takes place, the social basis of which is the relation of the private and state property, material interests and division of labour, which is what forms the corporate interests; the bureaucracy is called to protect the imaginary universality of the special interest, the corporate spirit in the name of salvation of the apparent specificity of the general interest, of its own spirit; the need to protect their interests leads to the emergence of the stable organizational and managerial forms in which the apparatus of the government administration can not have a simple structure [10, p. 270, 271];

• the political consciousness acquires a specific character, because the determining factor in its formation is the material criterion, and the more the policy influences the economy, the more bureaucratic the state is;

• the bureaucracy developed on the basis of a historically legitimate process of the allocation of the government administration into a particular type of social activity, the professionalization of the state apparatus and the provision of it necessary for the exercise of the state governance of the authorities; thus, the socio-economic roots of the bureaucracy can be considered the excessive delineation of the state apparatus from the society, strengthening the bureaucratic egocentrism, the use of state power by the government administrators to secure their own group and individual interests which are primarily determined by their material position;

• the bureaucracy can manifest itself in two forms: conscientious or paternalistic (its formula: the maximum of the public benefit with a maximum of order and a minimum of confidence in the state officials, a minimum of their

independence and initiative; the state officials are conscientious and honest officials who, however, are subjected to the influence of the egocentric spirit of the state apparatus, professional snobbery, and technocratic superiority [14, p. 9–12]) and selfish (its formula: maximum career and selfish use of the office with minimal concern for public welfare; the reason for the alienation of the apparatus of the government administration from the society is the need for the implementation of the professional management which itself creates the feeling of superiority over the officials among officials; there is a substitution of the mechanism of the bilateral ties between the government administrators and the society by a mechanism of one-sided command from above, which, of course, raises the mercenary secrecy, the alienation of the apparatus of the government administration from the society, the use of mercenary motives of the state power, etc. [15, p. 18]);

• there is a specific legal basis the main purpose of which is the legal provision of the bureaucracy of its reproduction and existence;

• the ideological unity of the state and the apparatus of the government administration;

• the existence of a system of methods by which all the production was transformed into a nationwide one; the state bureaucracy in the economic sphere carried out a confiscatory policy that completely neutralized the competition, fetishized the planned indicators, attached priority to procedures and regulatory documents;

• there was a total dependence of the society on the government administration which created conditions for the total control of all the spheres of the public life, maximum use of the state authorities by the government administrators through monopolization, preservation and permanent restoration of the bureaucratic apparatus, supposedly, in order to ensure general welfare [16].

The essence of the second approach to understanding the phenomenon of bureaucracy is the identification of the latter with the government administration. In this sense, the bureaucracy is understood as a rationally organized system of the government administration which creates the most effective mechanism for the implementation of the administration decisions. This approach to its design is largely due to M. Weber. Briefly, the essence of this approach can be reduced to the following:

• the bureaucratic apparatus has the main purpose of ensuring the integrity of the existence of the society;

• the social structuring is necessary not only for the forces that are directly in the system of the government administration and interested in its conservation, but also for the whole society [17, p. 175]; in this sense, the dominant position of the bureaucracy receives its functional justification and the right to enforce a narrow circle of officials in order to achieve universal welfare rather than a separate social stratum;

• the roots of the phenomenon of bureaucracy lie far from the sphere of the economic relations and property relations, but in the ontological need of a person in the social structuring and organization in order to secure his own daily security;

• there are two types of bureaucracy: traditional or patrimonial, and modern or rational;

• the bureaucracy is an administration organization with a linear functional structure characterized by a clear division of the responsibilities between the hierarchical levels; the presence of orders that are mandatory for execution; the strict separation of the individuals in accordance with the hierarchical levels of the organization, etc. [18].

Analyzing this approach, the opinion of T. Parsons, who in the second half of the 20th century criticized the mechanistic approach to understanding bureaucracy, deserves attention. He drew attention to the fact that there is an ideological contradiction between the competence, professionalism and the place of the official in the hierarchy of the system of the government administration, since the specialist and the bureaucrat have different reasons to occupy certain positions. If we consider the first one, then such personality characteristics as education, profession, experience, professional knowledge and skills are given to the priority, and therefore, the execution of his orders does not require the use of coercion. In the second case, the obedience to an order is merely under threat of taking measures of the state power. That is precisely this moment which is the key and strikes a clear contradiction between the hierarchically constructed state authorities and the technocratic authorities.

The analysis of the above-mentioned positions shows that no concept of the bureaucracy can be considered as a methodological basis for formulating the theory of the government administration without certain adjustments taking into account the current trends.

In our view, there is a scientifically interesting approach to the understanding of the permanent bureaucratization of the government administration formulated by Cyril Northcote Parkinson in his work "The Laws of Parkinson" the basic provisions of which were as follows:

• the origins of the bureaucracy must be sought through the prism of the socio-psychological orientation of the government administration: the state official multiplies subordinates, but not rivals; the state officials work for themselves [19, p. 13].

Considering the first factor (the state official multiplies subordinates, but not rivals), it is necessary to imagine that a certain state official constantly complains of the excessive workload. And it does not matter: this is actually the case, or it is the result of his imagination. These senses, justice for the sake of being noted, may be caused by age-related exhaustion. In this case, there are three ways to get out of the situation: the state official may retire, may ask for help from another public official, or ask two subordinates. Usually, the third option is selected. The explanation is as follows: if you retire, you will not receive a pension; if you ask another public official, you can not get an increase when such a chance will be (competition); choosing two subordinates — the risks are minimal. In addition, their presence will add weight, and all the work he will distribute between them, and he alone will know how exactly each kind of work must be performed. It should be emphasized that there must be at least two subordinates, since each one has to restrain others from fear, so that he does not subsist. When the new

subordinates complain about excessive workload, the state official will ask the leadership for the need and hire subordinates for them. Thus, now, under his direction, the staffing of the workers will work, and, consequently, he has been provided with an increase.

When seven state officials begin to carry out the amount of work that one could handle at a time, the second factor turns out to be over. Everyone works so much for one that is extremely overloaded. But most of them works the state official. Any document must be certified by each of them. For example, the subordinate A decides that this document falls within the competence of the B or C employees and makes instructions. He gives him to D who makes corrections to it and turns to E, and E to F. However, F is going to a vacation and transmits the case to G, who again writes everything again and passes to D, who in turn revises the document again and, in a new form, attributes to the state official. And what will happen in this case with the latter? Of course, he could sign without reading, because he has many things to do. He knows that next year he will go on the rise, and therefore it should be decided who will take his place: A or B. In addition, it should be decided whether F is going on vacation — it seems too early. In addition, you must pay G for the work at the conference and send a submission to the ministry on the appointment of a pension for C. He also heard that B was in love with the secretary, and C had quarreled for unknown reasons with D. In short, he could sign, but, in spite of all the hesitation and the problems caused by the very fact of the existence of the colleagues, our state official considers this case a matter of honour. Therefore, he carefully reads the document that he himself would write, even if all A, B, C, D, E, F, G were not born. However, this document was created by the joint efforts of many people, and it was spent a lot of time. None of the state official did shy away from work. Only late in the evening the state official leaves his place to go home. In almost all the windows of his state institution the light is off, the darkness comes as a sign of another difficult day of work. The state official leaves the work one of the last, and thinks with a distorted smile on his face that late times and gray hair in his hair is a payback for success. As a summary, the state officials are more or less inclined to reproduce... [19].

No less interesting in our study is the analysis of the "Parkinson's disease" which is able to hit any institution/organization and lose any capacity for work. This disease has certain stages:

• the first sign of the disease is manifested when among the staff of the institution appears a person who is completely unprofessional and feels jealous of others' successes. The threat increases when this person can not properly perform his work, prevent others from performing their duties and endeavors to enter the management;

• when such a person still becomes the manager, comes the second stage of the disease: he begins to supplant from the work those who are more capable of it, but does not allow the development of those who are potentially able to replace him in the future. In the end, the personnel are filled by people with less and less professional training;

• the third or comatose stage of the disease occurs when in this institution from the top to the bottom can not meet any drops of common sense. This state is incurable, and the institution is doomed to death or unsuccessful existence [20, p. 42–43].

Conclusions. Summarizing the above, we propose, in the future, to base our understanding on the bureaucracy as a structured and hierarchically constructed system of highly skilled intellectual work specialists who have a high level of professional training, an intellectual of origin, an unpolished reputation, ideological education in the spirit of the priority of the national welfare, appointed to positions on the basis of competitive selection and qualitatively carry out their professional activity in the performance of the state functions. All of the above "negative" essential features of the bureaucratic administration we propose to consider as dysfunctions of the bureaucracy. Thus, we are shifting the emphasis from the struggle with the bureaucracy focusing on identifying the negative factors for the implementation of the government administration and developing ways to overcome them.

REFERENCES

1. *Jetimologicheskij* onlajn-slovar' russkogo jazyka Maksa Fasmera (2018), "bjurokratija", available at: https://vasmer.lexicography.online (Accessed 20 August 2018).
2. *Vikislovar'* (2017), "bjurokratija", available at: https://ru.wiktionary.org/wiki/%D0%B1%D1%8E%D1%80%D0%BE%D0%BA%D1%80%D0%B0%D1%82%D0%B8%D1%8F (Accessed20 August 2018).
3. *Dictionnaire* sensagent du journal Le Parisien. "bureaucratie", available at: http://dictionnaire.sensagent.leparisien.fr/BUREAUCRATIE/fr-fr/ (Accessed 20 August 2018).
4. *Ivin A. A.* (2004), Filosofija: Jenciklopedicheskij slovar' [Philosophy: Encyclopedic Dictionary], available at: https://dic.academic.ru/dic.nsf/enc_philosophy/184 (Accessed 12 August 2018).
5. *Illichov L. F., Fedoseev P. N., Kovalyov S. M., Panov V. G.* (1983), Filosofskij jenciklopedicheskij slovar' [Philosophical Encyclopedic Dictionary], Soviet encyclopedia, Moscow, Russia.
6. *Svodnaja* jenciklopedija aforizmov (2011), "bjurokratija", available at: https://dic.academic.ru/dic.nsf/aphorism (Accessed 07 August 2018).
7. *Headey B.* (1972), The Civil Service as an Elite in Britain and Germany, Revue international des sciences administrative, vol. 38. — № 1.
8. *Spiridonova V. I.* (1997), Bjurokratija i reforma (analiz koncepcii M. Kroz'e), [Bureaucracy and Reform (analysis of M. Crozier's concept)], IP RAS, Moscow, Russia.
9. *Makarin A. V.* (2000), Bjurokratija v sisteme politicheskoj vlasti, [Bureaucracy in the system of political power], Saint-Petersburg University, Saint-Petersburg, Russia.
10. *Marks K., Jengel's F.* (1867), Nabroski k kritike politicheskoj jekonomii, [Outline to the criticism of political economy], available at: https://www.marxists.org/russkij/marx/cw/t01.pdf (Accessed 14 August 2018).
11. *Makarenko V. P.* (1989), Bjurokratija i stalinizm, [Bureaucracy and Stalinism], Rostov-na-Donu, Russia.
12. *Lenin V. I.* (1970), Polnoe Sobranie Sochinenij, [Full composition of writings], Publishing house of political literature, Moscow, Russia, available at: http://www.uaio.ru/vil/39.htm (Accessed 08 August 2018).

13. *Vasilenko I. A.* (1998), Administrativnoe upravlenie v stranah zapada: SShA, Velikobritanija, Francija, Germanija, [Administrative management in the countries of the west: the USA, Great Britain, France, Germany], Moscow, Russia.
14. *Kurashvili B. P.* (1988), Bor'ba s bjurokratizmom, [The fight against bureaucracy], Moscow, Russia.
15. *Butenko A. L.* (1982), "Protivorechija razvitija socializma kak obshhestvennogo stroja", Voprosy filosofii, vol. 10, p. 18.
16. *Karatuev A. G.* (1993), Sovetskaja bjurokratija: sistema politiko-jekonomicheskogo gospodstva, [Soviet bureaucracy: a system of political and economic domination], Belgorod, Russia.
17. *Gajdenko P. P., Davydov Ju. N.* (1991), "Problemy bjurokratii u Maksa Vebera", Voprosy filosofii, vol. 3, p. 175.
18. *Weber M.* (1965), Theory of social and economic organization, New York.
19. *Parkinson S.* (1989), Zakony Parkinsona, [Laws of Parkinson], Izd. "Progress", Moscow, Russia, available at: http://lib.ru/DPEOPLE/PARKINSON/parklaws.txt (Accessed 02 August 2018).
20. *Tregubov M. V.* (2003), "Jeffektivnost' sistemy gosudarstvennogo upravlenija: teoretiko-pravovoj aspekt", Abstract of Ph.D. dissertation, Theory of state and law, history of political and legal doctrines, Severo-Zapadnaja Akademija gosudarstvennoj sluzhby, Moscow, Russia.

СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ

1. *Этимологический* онлайн-словарь русского языка Макса Фасмера. [Электронный ресурс]. — Режим доступа: https://vasmer.lexicography.online
2. *Викисловарь.* [Электронный ресурс]. — Режим доступа: https://ru.wiktionary.org/wiki/%D0%B1%D1%8E%D1%80%D0%BE%D0%BA%D1%80%D0%B0%D1%82%D0%B8%D1%8F
3. *Dictionnaire* sensagent du journal Le Parisien. [Електронний ресурс]. — Режим доступу: http://dictionnaire.sensagent.leparisien.fr/BUREAUCRATIE/fr-fr/
4. Философия: Энциклопедический словарь / под ред. А. А. Ивина. — 2004 [Электронный ресурс]. — Режим доступу: https://dic.academic.ru/dic.nsf/enc_philosophy/184
5. *Философский* энциклопедический словарь / гл. ред.: Л. Ф. Ильичев, П. Н. Федосеев, С. М. Ковалев, В. Г. Панов. — М.: Сов. энцикл., 1983. — 840 с.
6. *Сводная* энциклопедия афоризмов // Академик. — 2011 [Электронный ресурс]. — Режим доступа: https://dic.academic.ru/dic.nsf/aphorism
7. *Headey B.* The Civil Service as an Elite in Britain and Germany / B. Headey // Revue international des sciences administrative. — 1972. — Vol. 38. — № 1.
8. *Спиридонова В. И.* Бюрократия и реформа (анализ концепции М. Крозье) / В. И. Спиридонова. — М.: ИФ РАН, 1997. — 202 с.
9. *Макарин А. В.* Бюрократия в системе политической власти / А. В. Макарин. — Изд-во Санкт-Петербургского ун-та, 2000. — 151 с.
10. *Маркс К., Энгельс Ф.* Наброски к критике политической экономии. — Соч. 2-е — Т. 1. — [Электронный ресурс]. — Режим доступа: https://www.marxists.org/russkij/marx/cw/t01.pdf
11. *Макаренко В. П.* Бюрократия и сталинизм / В. П. Макаренко. — Ростов-на Дону, 1989. — С. 14.

12. *Ленин В. И.* Полное Собрание Сочинений. — Т. 39. — С. 69 [Электронный ресурс]. — Режим доступа: http://www.uaio.ru/vil/39.htm
13. *Василенко И. А.* Административное управление в странах запада: США, Великобритания, Франция, Германия / И. А. Василенко. — М., 1998. — С. 39–50.
14. *Курашвили Б. П.* Борьба с бюрократизмом / Б. П. Курашвили. — М., 1988. — С. 9–12.
15. *Бутенко А. Л.* Противоречия развития социализма как общественного строя / А. Л. Бутенко // Вопросы философии. — 1982. — № 10. — С. 18.
16. *Каратуев А. Г.* Советская бюрократия: система политико-экономического господства / А. Г. Каратуев. — Белгород, 1993.
17. *Гайденко П. П., Давыдов Ю. Н.* Проблемы бюрократии у Макса Вебера / П. П. Гайденко, Ю. Н. Давыдов // Вопросы философии. — 1991. — № 3. — С. 175.
18. *Weber M.* Theory of social and economic organization / M. Weber. — New York, 1965. — P. 128–130.
19. *Паркинсон С.* Законы Паркинсона [Электронный ресурс] / С. Паркинсон. — М.: Прогресс, 1989. — Режим доступа: http://lib.ru/DPEOPLE/PARKINSON/parklaws.txt
20. *Трегубов М. В.* Эффективность системы государственного управления: теоретико-правовой аспект: дис. ... канд. юрид. наук: 12.00.01. / М. В. Трегубов. — М.: РГБ, 2003. — С. 42–43.