

“THE LOGIC OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN POLITICAL POWER AND PUBLIC SERVICE”

Kholikova Khumora Nuriddin kizi
Graduate Student of Yonsei University

Abstract

This paper addresses the relationship between political power and public service, the primary common mission of politicians and public officials, short-term and long-term prospects of their goals as well as the distribution of authority, obligations and responsibilities between them. Public officials serve for the benefit of the people. The critical question in this case is: “What is good for the people?”. Should they find the answer to this question on their own? Is it possible to achieve a balance between the political and public-administrative sector? How do the administrative power and the political power relate to each other? Current paper examines these significant questions and sheds some lights on the complicated relationship between political power and public service.

The purpose of this paper - obtaining the maximum advantage for the government from the activities of political power and public service within the framework of their powers and responsibilities.

Main area of research - the essence of not only political power but also public administration in terms of formulation and implementation of public policy to serve society and solve problems related to social development.

Keywords: political power, public service, bureaucracy, politics-administration dichotomy, neutral competence.

Introduction

The theory of the politics-administration dichotomy was first found in the literature on public administration back in the 1940s. However in spite of the fact that more than 80 years have passed since then, the topic of establishing the boundaries of public administration and the approval of normative relations between elected officials and administrators in a democratic society remains an urgent subject of major discussions. The core of political power is the definition of state policy, the formulation of strategic goals and objectives for the development, and strengthening of the state, society. The need to implement such a policy, to establish the necessary socio-political order in society, has brought to life another equally important sphere of activity — administration, which means the appearance of another key governing figure along with the politician — an administrator, a bureaucrat official. Despite the formal subordination of civil servants to political authority determined by law, they have a significant and sometimes decisive impact on the process of distribution and redistribution of power. Involvement in the formation and implementation of public policy allows civil

servants participate in political decision-making (let's call it - indirect participation) and interacting with political authorities. This, in turn, does not allow the inclination to a single theory of the dichotomy of politics-administration.

It seems to me that it's time to close discussions on the politics-administration dichotomy and in general pay attention to the correct construction of relationship between politicians and administrators. Politics and political factors have the strongest influence on the organization and activity of the civil service, because the decision on the type of state, the main parameters of its structure and functioning, as well as on the goals and values of the state is an entirely political act adopted by the governing bodies. However, both the politician and the administrator are called to serve society and solve problems related to social development. They cannot exist separately from each other - politics without administration is powerless, administration without politics is meaningless. The policy needs administrative implementation mechanisms. Therefore, the key question of the study should be "How do the public service (administrative power) and the state political leadership (political power) relate to each other?".

What came first or the etymology of politics and bureaucracy.

To study the essence of the relation between politicians and civil servants, first of all it is necessary to identify the interpretation of the concepts used in this work, such as politics, administration and bureaucracy.

Politics (from Greek: politika — "public affairs", polis — "the state") is a field of activity related to interactions between social groups, the essence of which is to determine the forms, tasks, and content of the state's activities. This term appeared in Medieval Europe after the translation of "Politics", the work of a 4th-century BC Greek philosopher - Aristotle. The section of social sciences that studies politics and public administration is called political science.

A politician is a person elected on the basis of direct elections either by the relevant representative body or appointed by an elected official who takes part in political activities and is responsible for these activities. It acts as a key factor in the political decision-making process in order to develop the social system and meet its needs.

Bureaucracy (from French bureau "office," Greek suffix -kratia — "power of") - this is a group of people employed in the executive structures of state power and called upon to put into practice the decisions of the political elite. According to Max Weber's classical concept of bureaucracy, a bureaucrat is characterized by such features as apolitical nature, eagerness to comply with laws, professionalism, competence, loyalty to legally elected or appointed political authorities. The word "bureaucracy" was coined by a French economist Jacques Claude Marie Vincent de Gournay for the first time, about the mid-18th century. (1712-1759)¹.

Administration (administracioun, "act of giving or dispensing", from Latin administrationem — "aid, cooperation; direction, management,") - currently, it is the same bureaucracy that runs any public (private) institution. Equally important, administration has a long history as well, perhaps not as long as politics, but it has also survived millennia of changes and transformation both in theory and practice.

In the process of building public administration, the emergence of relations between politicians and bureaucrats is inevitable. One of the features of political administration relations is that they are regulated by legislative acts, political principles and norms of the established political traditions in the country.

Complementarity and cooperation in the process of formulation and implementation of public policy.

It is hypocrisy to speak of functioning public-administrative sector without a political power. Let's take the relationship between a doctor and a nurse during a patient's surgery as an example. Their main goal is the same: to save the patient's life, but at the same time they have different tasks, different obligations and absolutely different responsibilities. The method of the operation, its sequence and order are established by the doctor, as a result of which all responsibility is assigned to him/her. Meanwhile, the nurse prepares for the operation, ensures the sterility of the medical instruments, fulfill all the doctor's requirements and in parallel, takes responsibility for the quality of her/his work. Despite the fact that the doctor is in charge of the patient's life as a whole, a significant deal depends on the nurse too. If the nurse professionally prepares everything necessary for a successful operation in advance and promptly meets the doctor's demands with further systematic notification of the patient's postoperative condition, the chances of the patient's quick recovery will increase greatly. As we see in this case, there is no need to emphasize the dichotomy between doctors and nurses, everything is as clear as the sky.

In our example above: doctor is politician, nurse is public servant, and the patient's life is the implementation of public policy. Negative relations between politicians and civil servants will lead to "the death" of the state. The tasks and obligations, the boundaries of the activities of political power and public service should be as clear as the relationship between doctors and nurses. The division of functions between politics and administration definitely takes place, but in general, their efforts should be combined to achieve better results and the best quality of governance overall. Neither politics nor bureaucracy is able to cope with the tasks assigned to them alone. These relations should be based on mutual trust.

Realization of specific individual goals for the public interest: designing phase and implementation phase.

Elected politicians make up the highest layer of managers, which creates the prerequisites for supporting and turning doctrinal plans into tasks of operational state management. This group of people mainly have their status capabilities activated. The presence of several individually strong politicians opposing each other in the development of collective goals creates a competitive environment in the leadership of the country as well as broader prerequisites for the internal diversification of the activities of the state apparatus. Often this situation leads to the fact that a number of decisions in the state is made at the whim of key figures in the ruling class. Moreover, the primacy of many political figures preserves the possibility of polarizing the decision-making process, i.e. achieving such a level of split positions within the governing body, which may result in blocking the nomination of common goals.

Top executive is expected to harmonize political goals with organizational action and effectively communicate these goals to staff, the media and the public (Svara, 2006)[2], which requires certain professional skills. Often, the prospects of politicians are short-term, due to their tenure in position, therefore, specific goals set on such a basis can lead to poor outcomes in the long term. Here, there is an urgent need for professionalism and foresight of civil servants. The advice provided by them in decision-making by politicians in the process of forming public policy can prevent negative consequences in the long term.

The stage of designing strategic goals for the further development of the country is entrusted to politicians, but at the same time civil servants would give objective advice to their political masters (Kernaghan, 1986)[3]. To listen to their advice or not is political leaders' decision, in any case, political leaders take responsibility for decisions. Whilst civil servants take responsibility for converting political goals into action.

Recognition and acceptance of responsibility for decisions, actions and their consequences.

Public officials serve for the benefit of the people. The critical question in this case is: "What is good for the people?". Determining the true needs of the people is not a simple task. The exercise of legislative power falls within the authority of politicians. Politicians elected by public represent the will of the people, therefore, civil servants carry out their activities and make decisions strictly obeying the laws adopted by elected politicians. Control over the legitimacy of civil servants' actions and the results of their activities are carried out by politicians. As Feiner argued, public officials do their job on behalf of politics, i.e. public officials are accountable for their work to politics. If they do their job improperly, they will be penalized by politicians who represent the interests of public[4].

Simon claimed that Public administration can and should be a science. Moreover he considered public administration as the activity of the executive branches of government. Bureaucrats have to act objectively and follow the rule of law, if there is something inappropriate about that law than it is up to the politicians or the legislature to change what the rules are. It is not their role to be politically responsive. Bureaucrats should be neutral and competent, i.e. they should not interfere with their political superiors, chosen representatives of the people, but at the same time they need to act competently (Kaufman, 1969). Bureaucrats are, basically, protection against morally insensitive politicians, who are probably pursuing the achievement of their goals.

The relationship between political power and public service: construction and main concern.

Is it possible, on the whole, to achieve a balance between the political and public-administrative sector?

As we have already noted above, the essence of political power is to define state policy, formulate strategic goals and objectives for the development and strengthening of the government and society. In turn, the state policy is a general action plan of political-administrative bodies of power and administration aimed at solving important social problems affecting the lives of citizens. The key word here is "political-administrative" authorities,

therefore it is necessary to understand that public policy cannot be carried out without the participation of political authorities or without the participation of administrative authorities. No matter how much we would like to completely divide the legislative and executive branches of government between politicians and bureaucrats, in practice it is difficult to fully deny the influence of the administrative system on the proceeding of legislative policy. The administrative system, within its vaguely defined jurisdictions, influences the solution of a certain range of policy issues. However, their help should not be confused with making independent political decisions. The task of civil servants is the loyal implementation of political decisions in accordance with the established laws of the country, regardless of their personal opinions. Professional, politically neutral activity, good behavior and prompt response to the assigned policy tasks should guarantee the tenure of civil servants. But under no circumstances would politicians be allowed to manipulate them (Wilson, 1887)[5].

Perhaps the persistent tension between politics and administration is a healthy condition for democratic governments (Moynihan & Ingraham, 2010), and it is impossible to achieve a balance between the political and public-administrative sector.[6] I reckon that it is possible to achieve a happy coexistence of politics and administration. This only requires the professionalism of the sides, the appropriate distribution of powers and responsibilities as well as mutual trust between the political and public-administrative sector.

The primary common mission is implementing policy to help the people.

Aristotle revealed the essence of politics through its purpose, and, according to the philosopher, the highest one is educational and consists in giving citizens good qualities and making them people who act nobly. In other words, “the goal of politics is the good, moreover the fair, that is the common good” Therefore, a politician should look for the best, i.e. the most appropriate political device for this purpose.

The managerial influence of politicians on civil servants greatly affects the intensity and effectiveness of their activities. In a particular interaction, the statuses of the subjects differ greatly from each other. The status of politicians is usually decisive: due to the availability of certain resources, it sends impulses of influence to civil servants in the form of establishing legislation, which contain, explicitly or indirectly, information about how they should function in the future. In this interaction, the definition of the mission becomes an important point, that is, the coordination to some extent of the needs and interests of the people. Missions become the starting point of interaction by creating conditions for the realization of common interests of public policy.

Conclusion

Public officials serve for the benefit of the people, while politicians elected by public represent the will of the people. Therefore, civil servants carry out their activities and make decisions strictly obeying the laws adopted by elected politicians. Control over the legitimacy of civil servants' actions and the results of their activities are carried out by politicians. If public officials do their job improperly, they will be penalized by politicians who represent the interests of public. The stage of designing strategic goals for the further development of the country is entrusted to politicians, but at the same time civil servants would give objective

advice to their political masters. I believe that it is possible to achieve a happy coexistence of politics and administration. This only requires the professionalism of the sides, appropriate distribution of powers and responsibilities as well as mutual trust between the political and public-administrative sector.

References

1. Fred Riggs, Introduction: shifting meanings of the term 'bureaucracy', *International social science journal*, Vol. XXXI, No. 4, 1979. p. 563-584 ;
2. Svara, J. H. (2006). Complexity in political-administrative relations and the limits of the dichotomy concept. *Administrative Theory & Praxis*, 28(1), 121-139;
3. Overeem, P. 2005. The value of the dichotomy: Politics, administration, and the political neutrality of administrators. *Administrative Theory & Praxis*, 27, 311-329;
4. Finer, H. 1941. *Administrative Responsibility in Democratic Government*. *Public Administration Review*, 1(4), 335-350;
5. Wilson, Woodrow. June, 1887. "The Study of Administration", *Political Science Quarterly* 2 (2): 197 – 222;
6. Moynihan, D. P., & Ingraham, P. W. (2010). The suspect handmaiden: The evolution of politics and administration in the American state. *Public Administration Review*, 70, s229-s237;
7. OECD (2014), *The Governance of Regulators, OECD Best Practice Principles for Regulatory Policy*, OECD Publishing;
8. Friedrich, C. J. 1940). *Public policy and the nature of administrative responsibility*. *Public*, 3-24;
9. Tansu Demir and Ronald C. Nyhan, 2008. "The Politics – Administration Dichotomy: An Empirical Search for Correspondence between Theory and Practice", *Public Administration Review*: 81-96;
10. Kuzmin P.V. "The relationship between politicians and bureaucracy as a problem of political science and practice", *Scientific notes of the Tauride National University named after I. Vernadsky*, 24(63), 2011, p: 177-185.