

UDC 35

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30839/2072-7941.2019.165144>

RESEARCH DIRECTIONS OF POLITICAL-ADMINISTRATIVE RELATIONS IN COUNTRIES WITH INCIPIENT DEMOCRACIES

© FETESCU, CEZARA

State Agrarian University of Moldova (Chisinau, Republic of Moldova)

E-mail: cezarafetescu@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0002-3593-9080

Annotation. The study is relevant as long as it highlights the existing approaches to political-administrative relations in the incipient democratic state, focusing on the defining aspects of the main European models. **Analysis of literature.** The article has made use of the work of foreign researchers such as Max Weber, Woodrow Wilson, Frank Johnson Goodnow, Luther Gulick, Kenneth J. Meier, Laurence J. O'Thole Jr., Christopher Pollitt, Geert Bouckaert, James H. Svara, Jon Pierre, Carl Friedrich, Fred Kramer, and the natives such as V. Juc, V. Saca, G. Rusnac, A. Zavtur, A. Popovici, C. Solomon, P. Fruntasu, V. Popa, V. Mosneaga and I. Bucataru. **The aim of the article** is to determine the type of optimal political and administrative relations to ensure open and responsible governance in countries with early democratic regimes. **Research objectives** are reduced to the study of the various models of public administration that have been going on in time, in order to determine the particularities that are compatible with the specifics of the countries with a transition democracy. **Research Methodology.** The study is based on comparative analysis and inductive and deductive reasoning. **The result of the study.** At present, the theories and models used by researchers are limited to the two extremes, namely the separation of the politicians of the administrators, on the one hand, and the argumentation of the complementarity between politics and administration, on the other. Both theoretical models have been implemented in practice through three public administration systems: continental, mixed and British. Until now, there are various debates about the viability of the two models in academic environment, and there is no real possibility of achieving a complete separation of the roles and goals of politicians and bureaucrats, and that the supreme power in a state is politics, irrespective of its designation. As regards the political-administrative relationship in the states with an incipient democracy, it is observed over the decades of independence, the use in the relations of the authoritarian methods with a democratic decoration, aimed at satisfying the noble, or rather subject to, narrow interests by the ruling and opposition forces, which absolutely did not take the public interest into account. **Conclusions.** In the desperate attempt to find a genuine way to approach political-administrative relations in countries with early democracies, we find it stupors that it is hard to suggest the implementation of a pure model, but the optimal model implies the existence of a freely chosen political power and a an autonomous, efficient and stable administrative sector that corresponds to the orders of that power.

Keywords: incipient democracies, political-administrative relations, administrative system, dichotomy, complementarity.

Introduction. Relations between public administration and the political system in democratic governance have long been a subject of controversy in the academic world. It is trying to determine the degree of state involvement in the administrative process. One of the main directions of approaching the political and administrative relations is channeled on the perspective of total separation between these two

Research directions of political-administrative relations in countries with incipient democracies

areas, political and administrative, the first adopting decisions concerning the community and the second dealing with their implementation. Since the second half of the 20th century, the separatist paradigm has been subject to many criticisms. Nowadays, most public administration specialists have come to the conclusion that, although the sources of legitimacy, the way in which they are constituted and functioning are the same to each of them, their activities cannot be separated. In other words, we have to deal with public authorities or institutions in which politicians and career officials work together to meet the purpose for which they were created. Thus, the issue of political-administrative relations is now to be addressed from the point of view of the balance that must exist between the political and the administrative side of the public administration.

Analysis of the literature. The theories and patterns used to unravel the relationship between politics and public organizations have sought their validation in the writings of Max Weber, Woodrow Wilson, Frank Johnson Goodnow, Luther Gulick - the bitter promoters of the separation of administrative politics and Kenneth J. Meier, Laurence J. O'Thole Jr., Christopher Pollitt, Geert Bouckaert, James H. Svara, Jon Pierre, Carl Friedrich, Fred Kramer, who consider the relationship between the administrative and the political system to be compatible and support the interconnection between them.

The analysis of the processes of democratization and of political relations is the subject of study of

many moldavian scholars including V. Juc, G. Rusnac, A. Zavtur, A. Popovici, C. Solomon, P. Fruntasu, etc. An extensive and profound analysis of political issues and relations, especially during the transitional phase, includes the investigations of political scientist V. Saca, which emphasizes the quality of political and social relations in the governing act. The issues of power and conflict, the legislative and decision-making process as social and political phenomena are approached tangentially in the works of V. Popa, V. Mosneaga and I. Bucataru.

Methodology and research methods. Political-administrative relations present different forms of country-to-country manifestation, with each state having its own characteristics. Thus, there are countries where bureaucracy is extremely strong and the political factor plays a small role in building public policies and countries where politicians have found ways to reduce the role of career functionaries in decision-making processes. In order to study the variety of political and administrative relations that took place over time, administrative systems and models of organization of public administrations, the comparative analysis of the typologies of relationships founded by theoreticians in the specialized bibliographic sources was used, and in order to determine the viability one of these models under the conditions of the incipient democratic regimes will resort to inductive and deductive reasoning.

The aim of the article is to determine the type of optimal political and administrative relations to ensure open and responsible governance in countries with early democratic regimes.

The presentation of the main material. Political and administrative relations are a highly controversial topic, and most of the complex problems have not found clear solutions without controversy and ambiguity.

At present, the theories and models used by researchers are limited to the two extremes, namely the separation of the politicians of the administrators, on the one hand, and the argumentation of the complementarity between politics and administration, on the other.

Starting from the genesis of studies on political and administrative relations, it should be noted that the classical theory of bureaucracy, built by sociologist Max Weber in 1947, became the master model of many scholars in public administration in general and the relationship between elected politicians and civil servants in particular. The theory of bureaucracy imposed by Max Weber recognizes the „formal control of politics on the administration, the functioning of the strict hierarchy principle requiring a series of formal relations between superiors and subordinates, the realization of recruitment, selection, promotion within a merit-based system, while the expected results are to create a politically neutral, career-centric corps of civil servants able to

implement a set of public policies without being influenced by the political color of the governing party or alliance” [1, p. 73]. This pattern of relationship has long been called the Weberian political and administrative dichotomy which states that „there must be a distinction between the process of determining the political course that politicians should be responsible for, on the one hand, and the implementation of the policy, which should be the responsibility of the executive branch, on the other. This vision implies the same relationship between politics and administration as between purpose and means of achieving it” [4, p. 38]. „While politicians are involved in policy-making, the administration is only responsible for their implementation” [5, p. 464]. According to this scientific approach, it is assumed that politicians and civil servants exist in two separate worlds, with their own values, rules and methods. In this sense, the central idea is focused on the relationship between political and administrative, which in most cases must interact in order to create favorable conditions for the development of an efficient act of governance and a transparent and fair decision-making process.

Along with the affirmation in many European countries of the new scientific direction in public administration theory - the New Public Management - the Weberian dichotomy is subject to numerous criticisms that refer in large part to the fact that „if there is democratic control, there can be no bureaucratic

autonomy and vice versa” [3, p. 32]. This position was argued by the fact that there is no real possibility of achieving a complete separation of the roles and goals of politicians and bureaucrats because „this dichotomy is often not respected precisely because of politics, which intervenes in the administration by means of specific levers. These situations create premises for conflict and, as a consequence, jeopardize the modern act of government” [7, p. 11].

This was well pointed out by Fred Kramer's conclusion on this relationship, that „public administration is not apolitical since administrators are political actors” [2, p. 83].

Considering the role and place of politics in society, political relations, in their sense, do not only concern politics, they refer to the organization and leadership of the whole society, since any act of leadership, regardless of its area of influence, always has a substrate and a political content. Both theoretically and practically, political relations base their action on an ideology, which, in most cases, materializes in political programs and doctrines. „Political relations have a profound determination in the structure of human activity. They are organically linked to the acquisition, preservation and exercise of power by individuals, social groups, which create them a special status in social activity” [7, p. 13].

Thus, according to the New Public Management theory, the priority of political aspect in politico-administrative relations must be restored, because in many states

politicians have lost control over the growing administrative system and new forms of control over bureaucracy need to be established, especially in the field of policy development setting targets for civil servants in order to increase governance efficiency.

All these visions have given rise to the principle of complementarity between the political and the administrative system. On the one hand, it is about administrative independence and, on the other hand, it is a political, excessive, sometimes controlled, central and local public authorities. In the literature, this influence is defined by the term of intensity: sometimes politics is the one prevailing, sometimes the administration, because not always the high degree of political control can ensure efficiency in the activity of the public administration through the decisions adopted and vice versa.

It is often the case (the Republic of Moldova is not an exception) that in political situations, administrative decisions are not effective and lack results in the long term, but there may also be situations in which politics are not involved in the decision-making process, a phenomenon called „political impasse”. The ideal solution under these conditions would be to ensure a high degree of independence for both the political and the administrative system. This can be accomplished through mutual respect, cooperation and participation in joint consultations on conflict issues, in other words by „complementing the roles in the process of decision making and the adoption of laws,

rulings and other documents for internal or international use. Similarly, the political executive is appreciated for the formulations and expertise that it develops, and civil servants respect the policies developed by the government and are loyal” [7, p. 18]. This formula is present and functional in many mature democracy states, where local government has a high degree of autonomy and financial independence.

These two ideologies on how to organize political-administrative relations, linked to the socio-economic specificities of each state, have inevitably led to the creation of a wide variety of possible „schemes” to substantiate the various administrative systems.

Considering international practice, three public administration systems were defined:

1. The continental or French system that emphasizes uniformity, balance and guardianship on the part of the state, tutelage which is achieved by the state's appointment of its representative in the territory.

2. The mixed system which is specific to two edifying elements governing the relations of the federal level with the rest of the states: the first is based on the principle of autonomy of the member states and their participation in the federal decision-making process, while the second refers to the principle of subsidiarity, at the level of the Länder, the administrative and communal districts have a wide and real autonomy of management. There is also the constitutional guarantee of the

principles of self-administration of communes for the management of all local businesses under their own responsibility.

3. The Anglo-Saxon or British system is based on the principle of full local autonomy, that is, the absence of any regional control authority, the authorities of administrative oversight, the choice of local authorities by direct or indirect voting. It should be noted that in the Anglo-Saxon system, the administrative-territorial units have a „mini-republic character”, each of the regional collectivities being patronized by a ministry that concentrates the attributions assigned among various members of the government, torturing the administration's activities.

In this context, referring to the analytical reflections on the conditions of a society in transition to democracy, with an agonizing transformation in all spheres of social life today, far from being finalized, it is extremely difficult to expose us to one or the other of the models mentioned above, the conclusions being multivalent.

However, we cannot deny that the governmental institutions, through their structural-functional levels, intervene with influences on all aspects of public life: political, social, economic, cultural. „Thus, the public interest comprises in the orbit of impact the social in general and its main components in particular” [6, p. 38].

According to M. Costea, „the supreme power in a state is politics, regardless of its designation. Power

adopts fundamental decisions or, if it leaves the administration, all political power remains responsible. Administration is subordinated to political power, but its own power is invariable. There are a growing number of factors that shape the mission, activity, internal organization and the attributions of the administration, these factors depending on the role the political power attributes to the state, as well as on the form of state organization, the structure of political forces and pressure groups. Thus, if the political group in power aims for a rapid transformation of the economic and social structure of society, it gives it a great competence in the administration, instead, if the political power is satisfied with a slow transformation or leaves it to result the administration has much more limited powers and is more concerned with its activities of observing the norms of law, ensuring legality” [8, p. 38-39].

Now, if we look at Eastern European transitional societies, we find that all are based on a weak mechanism in the area of democratic stability. Its elements, embodied in unilateral means and methods of organization and public activity, make up a defective democratic system with a more authoritarian than democratic public interest, which in turn determines the equally authoritative character of their connection with transformations in the broad sense of society, with the parameters of a limited democratization in the context of political-administrative relations. Such machinery has been plagued

over the decades of independence by the ruling and opposition forces. Both used authoritarian methods with democratic decoration, aimed for satisfying their narrow interests [9, p. 204 -211].

Thus, through conflicts of subjectivity, the disintegration of the bearers of interests maintains the disagreement between political and administrative, which inevitably hampers the democratization process of these countries [10, p. 117-125].

Conclusions. In the desperate attempt to find a genuine way to approach political-administrative relations in countries with early democracies, we find it stupors that it is hard to suggest the implementation of a pure model, but the general lines of evolution of democracy in transition states have to observe a certain theoretical trajectory. The optimal model implies the existence of a freely chosen political power and an autonomous, efficient and stable administrative sector that corresponds to the orders of that power. If there is a plenary administration at the disposal of the political power, there is a danger of malfunctions in the exercise of its powers and, on the contrary, absolute protection may create some bottlenecks in the enforcement of the political decision by the officials. However, administrative reform and reform of the managed sector can only be done through political decision-making, but there is no good practice model, but only different practices depending on political conditions. So, at present the issue of political-administrative

relations must be addressed from the perspective of the balance between the political and the administrative side, despite the fact that the interests of the two factors are not always converging.

REFERENCES

1. Androniceanu, A. (2008). News in public management. Bucharest: University Publishing House, 3, 73.
2. Feed, A. K. (1981). Dynamics of public bureaucracy: an introduction to public management. Cambridge: Mass, Winthrop, 83–85.
3. Georgescu, C. (2010). Theories on the relations between politics and administration. Bucharest: Revue des Sciences Politiques, 25, 32–37.
4. Popvici, A., Popovici, C. (2016). Political-administrative relations: theory and new approaches. Chisinau: Materials of the international scientific and practical conference, 37–40.
5. Bendix, R. (1960). Max, Weber. An intellectual Potrait. New York: Double Dayand Co., 480.
6. Saca, V. (2017). Significance of public interests in the context of the political-administrative field. Chisinau: Public administration, 3, 33–45.
7. Saca, V. (2013). Connections between political and administrative decision-making relations in the Republic of Moldova: challenges and recommendations. Chisinau: Public administration, 1, 11–19.
8. Wilson, J. (2006). The emergence of the administrative state.
9. Kindratets, O. M. (2009). Politychna kultura yak chynnyk demokratychnykh peretvoren. Humanitarnyi visnyk Zapoizrzkoi derzhavnoi inzhenernoi akademiyi, 39, 204–211.
10. Kindratets, O. M. (2009). Hromadianska aktyvnist yak umova demokratyzatsiyi suspilstva. Humanitarnyi visnyk Zapoizrzkoi derzhavnoi inzhenernoi akademiyi, 38, 117–125.

ФЕТЕСКУ, ЧЕЗАРА – аспірант, Державний Аграрний Університет Молдови, викладач кафедри бухгалтерського обліку та економічного аналізу Кишинівського Центру підготовки з економіки та фінансів (Кишинів, Республіка Молдова)

E-mail: cezarafetescu@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0002-3593-9080

ДОСЛІДЖЕННЯ ПІДХОДІВ ДО ПОЛІТИКО-АДМІНІСТРАТИВНИХ ВІДНОСИН У РАМКАХ НОВИХ ДЕМОКРАТИЧНИХ РЕЖИМІВ

Анотація. Дослідження є актуальним тому, що воно висвітлює існуючі підходи до політико-адміністративних відносин у демократичній державі, що народжується, приділяючи особливу увагу провідним аспектам основних європейських держав. **Аналіз літератури.** В статті проаналізовано роботи зарубіжних дослідників, таких як Макс Вебер, Вудро Вільсон, Френк Джонсон Гудноу, Лютер Гулік, Кеннет Дж. Майер, Лоуренс Дж. О'Тоул молодший, Кристофер Поллітт, Гірт Бокерт, Джеймс Х. Свара, Джон П'єр, Карл Фрідріх, Фред Крамер, і вітчизняних авторів, таких як В. Жук, В. Сака, Г. Руснак, А. Завтур, А. Попович, С. Соломон, П. Фрунташу, В. Попа, В. Мошнеага і І. Букатару. **Метою статті** є визначення типу оптимальних політичних та адміністративних відносин для забезпечення відкритого і відповідального управління у країнах з демократичними режимами, що народжуються. **Завдання дослідження** зводяться до вивчення різних моделей державного управління, які змінювалися у часі, щоб визначити особливості, які сумісні зі специфікою країн з перехідною демократією. **Методологія дослідження.** Дослідження базується на порівняльному аналізі та індуктивних і дедуктивних роздумах. **Результат дослідження.** У теперішній час теорії

та моделі, що використовуються дослідниками, обмежуються двома крайностями: розділенням політиків та адміністраторів, з однієї сторони, та аргументацією взаємодоповнюваності політики та адміністрації, з іншої. Обидві теоретичні моделі були втілені у практиці у контексті трьох систем державного управління: континентальної, змішаної і британської. До сих пір ведуться різні дискусії в академічних колах про життєздатність перших двох моделей і немає реальної можливості досягти повного розділення ролей і цілей політиків і бюрократів. Яким є одне: вища влада у державі – це політика незалежно від її призначення. Що стосується політико-адміністративних відносин у державах з демократією, що народжується, то на протязі десятиліть незалежності спостерігається використання у відносинах авторитарних методів з демократичним оформленням, направленим на задоволення вузьких інтересів правлячих та опозиційних сил, на противагу задоволення інтересів суспільства. **Висновки.** У відчайдушній спробі знайти реальний підхід до політико-адміністративних відносин у країнах з ранньою демократією, ми покликані усвідомити, що важко запропонувати реалізацію чистої моделі, проте оптимальна модель передбачає існування свободи обраної політичної влади та автономний, ефективний і стабільний адміністративний сектор, що відповідає порядкам даної влади.

Ключові слова: зароджуючі демократії, політико-адміністративні відносини, адміністративна система, дихотомія, взаємодоповнюваність.

ФЕТЕСКУ, ЧЕЗАРА – аспірант, Государственный Аграрный Университет Молдовы, преподаватель кафедры Бухгалтерского учёта и экономического анализа Кишинёвского Центра подготовки по экономике и финансам (Кишинёв, Республика Молдова)

E-mail: cezarafetescu@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0002-3593-9080

ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯ ПОДХОДОВ К ПОЛИТИКО- АДМИНИСТРАТИВНЫМ ОТНОШЕНИЯМ В РАМКАХ НОВЫХ ДЕМОКРАТИЧЕСКИХ РЕЖИМОВ

Аннотация. Исследование актуально тем, что оно освещает существующие подходы к политико-административным отношениям в зарождающемся демократическом государстве, уделяя особое внимание определяющим аспектам основных европейских моделей. **Анализ литературы.** В статье использованы работы зарубежных исследователей, таких как Макс Вебер, Вудро Вильсон, Фрэнк Джонсон Гудноу, Лютер Гулик, Кеннет Дж. Майер, Лоуренс Дж. О'Тоул младший, Кристофер Поллитт, Гирт Бокерт, Джеймс Х. Свара, Джон Пьер, Карл Фридрих, Фред Крамер, и отечественных авторов, таких как В. Жук, В. Сака, Г. Руснак, А. Завтур, А. Попович, С. Соломон, П. Фрунташу, В. Попа, В. Мошнеага и И. Букатару. **Целью статьи** является определение типа оптимальных политических и административных отношений для обеспечения открытого и ответственного управления в странах с зарождающимися демократическими режимами. **Задачи исследования** сводятся к изучению различных моделей государственного управления, которые сменялись во времени, чтобы определить особенности, которые совместимы со спецификой стран с переходной демократией. **Методология исследования.** Исследование основано на сравнительном анализе и индуктивных и дедуктивных рассуждениях. **Результат исследования.** В настоящее время теории и модели, используемые исследователями, ограничиваются двумя крайностями: разделением политиков и администраторов, с одной стороны, и аргументацией взаимодополняемости политики и администрации, с другой. Обе теоретические модели были воплощены в практике через три системы

государственного управления: континентальную, смешанную и британскую. До сих пор ведутся различные дебаты в академических кругах о жизнеспособности первых двух моделей и нет реальной возможности достичь полного разделения ролей и целей политиков и бюрократов. Ясно одно: высшая власть в государстве - это политика независимо от ее назначения. Что касается политико-административных отношений в государствах с зарождающейся демократией, то в течение десятилетий независимости наблюдается использование в отношениях авторитарных методов с демократическим оформлением, направленным на удовлетворение узких интересов правящих и оппозиционных сил, нежели на удовлетворение интересов общества. **Выводы.** В отчаянной попытке найти подлинный подход к политико-административным отношениям в странах с ранней демократией, мы вынуждены осознать, что трудно предложить реализацию чистой модели, но оптимальная модель подразумевает существование свободно выбранной политической власти и автономный, эффективный и стабильный административный сектор, соответствующий порядкам этой власти.

Ключевые слова: зарождающиеся демократии, политико-административные отношения, административная система, дихотомия, взаимодополняемость.

*Стаття рекомендована до публікації д.філос.н., проф. О. П. Пунченко
(Одеса, Україна)*

Надійшла до редколегії: 08.03.2019 р.

Прийнята до друку: 18.03.2019 р.