

Bureaucratic Administration in Modern Society

Goga Gina Livioara

Danubius University of Galati, Faculty of Law, ginagoga@univ-danubius.ro

Abstract: In the European states, a responsible administration, from a political point of view, coordinated by law, competent and professional and neutral from a public point of view, has been the basis for the European state for a long time and a dominant model of this type of administration is represented by the Weberian bureaucratic model, which emphasized the value of efficiency, consistency, continuity and predictability. Bureaucracy is indispensable in any state and very important in the democratic regimes. Weber asserted that the bureaucratic organisation obtained power in virtue of the decrease of the economical and social differences. The modern state depends on a bureaucratic basis, but once established, bureaucracy is among the social structures that are most difficult to eliminate. The emergence and development of the bureaucratic mechanisms has become a monster of the modern society, because the bureaucracy works in the opposite direction from democracy.

Key-words: bureaucracy, bureaucratization, management, public administration reforms

Theoretic approaches on bureaucratic organization

The states cannot be durable without a power of constraint, the *domination* and *authority* being considered the only ways to make the citizens obey.

At the same time, the states cannot survive for a long time only through the coercive power of the states.¹ Thus, considering the states' persistency as form of organization of the society, so far, **Weber** asserted that large scale administration of modern states is bureaucratic. Although even in the pre modern world there have been some large bureaucracies (Ancient Egypt and China) to Weber, the modern dominance of bureaucratic organization is the result of a fully monetized market economy, considering its *simple technical superiority on every other form of organization*.²

"Bureaucracy is officially the most reasonable way of exerting power over human beings" and the necessity of mass administration is indispensable. It shows its completion in the political and eclectic communities in modern states, and in the economic scope, only in the developed institutions of capitalism.³

Karl Marx argued that bureaucratic state administration "even if it deals with problems with the best intentions, the most profound humanity and the greatest intelligence, is not capable of fulfilling the most specific tasks and replicates phenomena that in day to day life are called bureaucracy. The universal spirit of bureaucracy is the secret feature, the mystery ensured internally by the hierarchy as opposed to foreign groups, through its character of through a closed corporation". Marx's critic toward the bureaucratic regime was that bureaucratic state administration "acts according to its own interests,

¹ **Christopher Pierson**, *The modern state*, Ed. II, Ed. Routledge, London, 2004, p. 16;

² **Max Weber**, *Essays in sociology*, coauthors Hans Heinrich Gerth, Charles Wright Mills, Bryan S. Turner, translated by Hans Heinrich Gerth, Charles Wright Mills, Ed. II, Ed. Routledge, London, 1970; **Max Weber**, *Economy and Society*. Ed. G. Roth, C. Wittich. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978, op.cit. by **Christopher Pierson**, *The modern state*, Ed. II, Ed. Routledge, London, 2004, p. 16;

³ **Max Weber**, *Essays in sociology*, coauthors Hans Heinrich Gerth, Charles Wright Mills, Bryan S. Turner, translated by Hans Heinrich Gerth, Charles Wright Mills, Ed II, Ed. Routledge, London, 1991, p. 196; **Christopher Pierson**, *The modern state*, Ed II, Ed. Routledge, London, 2004, p. 16;

which are called general or public interests and are imposed to society: bureaucracy holds the essence of the state, the spiritual life of the society, as its private propriety".⁴

According to Weber, bureaucracy is a form of organization based on three principles: *hierarchical authority* implying that the electoral mandate offered by the citizens has to be applied through the government's representatives; the authority based on constitutional law, lawful state and laws authorized by the legislator and interpreted by the court; the expert authority, based on special, professional knowledge, impartial and non partisan, as well as clear government principles.⁵ Thus, Max Weber (1864-1920) characterized the modern official functions of bureaucracy through the existence of:⁶

- Precise and official jurisdictions, coordinated by rules, meaning laws or administrative regulations. Within public government and according to law, we are talking about bureaucratic authority, while in the economic scope, they represent bureaucratic management. Bureaucracy is completely developed within political and eclectic communities only in modern states, and in the economic scope only in the developed institutions of capitalism.
- The subordination system in monitoring the inferior offices by the superior ones, which describes a state of hierarchy in what concerns function organization
- Modern offices management, based on written documents, "files", kept in their original form. The staff involved in public offices, together with the specific mechanism of material and file implementation forms a "bureau" or "office" in private enterprises.
- The access to public employment in the public service that takes place through the process of examination will prove the knowledge of some special administrative procedure, relevant to the appointment, based on complete and professional training of civil servants. In exerting his functions, the civil servant does not act according to his personal capacity, but as a holder of a public position in a public office, reason for which he can hardly be held responsible from a professional point of view. According to Weber, "holding a position within the public service is regarded as being a vocation, subjected to a special feeling of public duty and involves the civil servant in a direction of a clear and precise defined career", so that he obtains a position for life, together adequate with salary and pension.⁷

In general, the term 'bureaucracy' is regarded as having a negative connotation, although there have been anarchists that enjoyed the excess of formalism and rigor.⁸

Bureaucracy⁹ is a social subsystem in which the decision-making power, "divided between hierarchic orders" has the purpose to fulfil, by the bureaucrats, some administrative activities that aim at some resources (money, capital or the activity of other people).

Bureaucratization¹⁰ was identified in the literature in many different forms: *the historical evolution of bureaucracy, as a type of organization, the extension of the organizations build in this manner, the*

⁴ **T. B. Bottomore**, *A Dictionary of Marxist thought*, ed. II, Ed. Wiley-Blackwell, 1991, p. 63;

⁵ **Johan P. Olsen**, *Democratic government, institutional autonomy and the dynamics of change*, Centre for European Studies, University of Oslo, Working Paper, No. 01, January 2009, ARENA Working Paper (online), p. 11, <http://www.arena.uio.no>;

⁶ From **Max Weber**, *Essays in sociology*, coauthors Hans Heinrich Gerth, Charles Wright Mills, Bryan S. Turner, translated by Hans Heinrich Gerth, Charles Wright Mills, Ed II, Ed. Routledge, London, 1991, p. 196;

⁷ **Christopher Pierson**, *The modern state*, Ed II, Ed. Routledge, London, 2004, p. 16;

⁸ **Rolf Torstendahl**, *Bureaucratization in northwestern Europe, 1880-1985: dominance and governance*, Ed. Taylor & Francis, Routledge, London, 1991, p. 37;

⁹ **Donald P. Warwick, Marvin Meade, Theodore Reed**, *Theory of Public Bureaucracy: Politics, Personality, and Organization in the State Department*, Ed. Harvard University Press, 1975, p. 4;

variations in the degree of bureaucratization in a certain organization or as a phenomenon of social change, replacement of government administration and non bureaucratic by bureaucratic conditions.

But in general, bureaucratization was identified with the consequences of the growth and development of bureaucracies, the power extension and its influential scope.¹¹

Bureaucracy isn't just a synonym for bureaucracy growth and development. Understanding bureaucracy requires understanding the society in which it is introduced. Bureaucratization is a general tendency, but the bureaucracy is modified according to national necessities. The changes in the bureaucracy imply changes of the society. The reforms at the beginning of the 20th century have been inspired by the necessity of more efficient service provision. The ones at the end of the 20th century had a slight different necessity, namely providing the services at a smaller cost. The difference is that in the beginning of the 20th century, the welfare state was at the beginning of its construction, while at the end of the century it already needed modifications and retouches.¹²

Together with Weber's theory of the growth and development of bureaucratic powers, there is also Frederick Taylor's theory of modern business organization. Known as "the father of scientific management" after editing the monograph "The principles of scientific management", Fredrick Winslow Taylor approached the principles of modern organization.

Known as *taylorism* or *Taylor's principles*, the ideas of scientific management consist in a certain philosophy that derives from the combination of four principles: *the development of a real management science, the scientific recruitment of workers, the education and development of the employees, the proximity between employees and science, a uniform division of work and responsibility between the manager and the employees.* Taylor's warnings were related to the situation in which these elements are not accompanied by an adequate management philosophy because if they wouldn't be based on management principles, despite the rapid changes in the old system, the results could be disastrous.¹³

In what concerns the creation of a management science, Taylor indicated that the incentives represented by large salaries, in order to reach to standard results will motivate the employees. In this context, the employees have to be selected according to scientific methods to make sure that they have the right skills for a certain position so that the efficiency will be at best. Also, between the managers (those who plan) and the employees (those who fulfill the tasks) has to be a close collaboration, based on harmony in order to improve the work and management. This phenomenon, argues Taylor, causes "psychological revolutions". The close cooperation, bearing in mind the fact that the power exertion is arbitrary, eliminates the conflicts of interests, the individualism and generates prosperity. As far as the uniform division of work and responsibility between workers and the management is concerned, they have to have equal shares of each.¹⁴

Taylor presented the idea according to which there could be antagonist interests between the employees and the employers and the scientific management theory is the one supporting the fact that their interests are the same, as the well-being of the employee depends on the long term prosperity of the employer.¹⁵

¹⁰ **Rolf Torstendahl**, *Bureaucratization in northwestern Europe, 1880-1985: dominance and governance*, Ed. Taylor & Francis, Routledge, London, 1991, p. 34-35;

¹¹ **Jos C. N. Raadschelders**, *Handbook of administrative history*, Ed. Transaction Publishers, 2000, p. 261;

¹² **Frederick Winslow Taylor**, *The principles of scientific management*, Ed. Forgotten Books, 1913, p. 103;

¹³ **R.K. Sapru**, *Administrative Theories and Management Thought*, Ed. PHI Learning Pvt. Ltd., 2006, p. 87-89;

¹⁴ **Frederick Winslow Taylor**, *The principles of scientific management*, Ed. Forgotten Books, 1913, p. 5;

¹⁵ **H. Fayol**, *L'Eveil de l'esprit public*, Ed. Dunod et Pinat, Paris, 1918, p. 6;

Taylor's scientific management is concerned with the analysis of the proportion between time and movement in order to identify the fulfillment of a task. In what concerns the functional authority, unlike Taylor, Fayol will approach the command unity, arguing that the chances for an organization to survive under the command of two leaders will be very slim.

In this context, the engineer and then manager **Henry Fayol (1841-1925)** had as essential role because he underlined the necessity of improving the employees and the managers as well, in multidisciplinary fields.

Henry Fayol considered that between the public and private administration there is no difference, as "there is no doctrine of private business administration and a separate one for the state affairs: the administrative doctrine is universal. The principles and general rules that apply to business are useful to the state administration and vice versa".¹⁶

Fayol underlined the necessity of consecration the management principles in what concerns the administrative activity and they are foreshadowed in: the labor division; the need for authority and responsibility; the need for discipline; unity of command; direction unity that imposes a set of clear actions aiming at the organization's activity; subordination of personal interests to the general ones; a fair remuneration; centralization, with the admission of some slight tendencies of decentralization, based on the organization's size; equity among employees, stability of the leadership; initiative in approaching the most efficient solutions that can confer prosperity to the agency; team spirit, strongly connected to the relations between the employer and the employee, meant to unite the employees in supporting some common projects. According to Fayol, the employee must be seen as "an organ for thinking, analyzing and observing", nothing but "an extension meant to consolidate the manager's personality".

Although was considered to be one of the most important theories of management and therefore administration, it was criticized¹⁷ for its boldness to try to offer a universal model of organization.¹⁸ Thus, some of his principles are applied even today (the concept of manager's qualification, the identification of principles regarding the effectiveness of managerial behavior) and his ideas were introduced in the administration disciplines of the Henry Fayol's Centre for Administrative Studies.¹⁹

Still, the rational-formal approaches mentioned above and supported by their representatives were criticized because they were focused mainly on the people and program management, ignoring the aspects that concern the way in which the government and bureaucracy affect the society.²⁰

¹⁶ This refers to the possibility that the subordination units of different authorities can connect with each other, without the necessary course of the hierarchic line, in order to wait for an answer from the authority of command and without breaking the authority principle.

¹⁷ **Peter Ferdinand Drucker**, *Management: Tasks, Responsibilities, Practices*, Ed. Transaction Publishers, New Brunswick, N.J., London, 2007, p. 527-528;

¹⁸ In the American literature on management, the term organization is usually used with two compatible meanings. Is used in the first place to determine the structure of the positions in which all the necessary activities of every system are included but, following the article 'an organization' is used as well as representing a system of human collaboration considered to be a whole. It is possible to understand that any debate on this subject, without the authors to specify the meaning of the term, adopted in each situation. See **Lyndall Urwick**, *Papers in the Science of Administration*, in **John C. Wood, Michael C. Wood**, *Henri Fayol: critical evaluations in business and management*, Ed. Taylor & Francis, 2002, p. 33;

¹⁹ **Jhon D. Breeze**, *Henry Fayol's Centre for Administrative Studies*, in **John C. Wood, Michael C. Wood**, *Henri Fayol: critical evaluations in business and management*, Ed. Taylor & Francis, 2002, p. 121;

²⁰ **Ioan Alexandru**, *Tratat de administratie publica*, Ed. Universul Juridic, Bucharest, 2008, p. 193;

Bureaucracy and public administration in modern society

Bureaucracy is indispensable in any state and very important in democratic regimes.

On one side, there is the certainty that “the modern state is dependent on a bureaucratic base” and that “once it is fully established, bureaucracy is one of the social structures that are most difficult to eliminate”.²¹

But the creation and the development of bureaucratic mechanisms has become a *monster* of our society, as bureaucracy “works in the opposite direction than democracy. In a bureaucracy, the decisions are taken at the highest level and are enforced at the lower level, while in a democracy, the citizens are the ones that take the decisions and the leaders are the ones enforcing them. The bureaucratic mechanism needs hierarchies, authoritarian lines of command and discipline among its officials, while democracy promotes equality, autonomy and the absence of subjectivity among citizens. The bureaucracy’s task is to support the superior level, while in a democracy the inferior level is the one being supported”.²²

Reality shows that in the European states “a responsible administration, from a political point of view, coordinated by law, competent and professional and publicly neutral, has been for a very long time the foundation of the European state and a dominant model in this context was represented by the Weberian model, that underlines the value of efficiency, coherence, consistency, continuity and predictability.” Olsen draws the attention on the fact that democratic societies, despite de equality and the decisive role of regular citizens, “didn’t inherit a coherent set of principles and institutions that define good governance and good administration.

They inherited elements of different traditions. In time, compromise and democratic attempts have been introduced in independent configurations but not completely autonomous”. Bureaucracy has its own reason of existence and its legitimacy is based on rule of law, power division impartial expertise, procedural reason, governance based on knowledge and is an expression of the cultural values of society. From this point of view, the bureaucrat is the one that serves these principles, is politically neutral and the only way to signal the society and the citizen’s interests has to be accomplished through the legislators and the judicial courts.²³

The main objectives in establishing an effective bureaucracy are represented by: corruption; bureaucratic conservatism, derived from older structures; the necessity of bureaucratic incentives; lack of punishment for weak results; unfairness; education in order to achieve a bureaucratic career, based on professionalism and merit. But a bureaucratic reform is not accomplished from the inside. In this context, some authors have pleaded for the necessity to involve the government and the bureaucracy in society, to include the bureaucrats in the local communities they have to serve but some supported the elimination of bureaucrats from political influence. But the success of government depends on the existence of “an honest and rational bureaucracy, but also a political leadership with sufficient coercive power to apply the propriety rights and sufficient constraints so that the power doesn’t become indifferent. Government leaders as well as bureaucrats have to be capable to credibly engage

²¹ Christopher Pierson, *The modern state*, Ed II, Ed. Routledge, London, 2004, p. 16;

²² Luis Villoro, *Which democracy* in M. Cherif Bassiouni, *Democracy: Its Principles and Achievement*, Ed. Inter-Parliamentary Union, Geneva, 1998, p.98;

²³ Johan P. Olsen, *The Ups and Downs of Bureaucratic Organization*, Centre for European Studies, University of Oslo, Working Paper, No. 14, September 2009, ARENA Working Paper (online), p. 7, <http://www.arena.uio.no>; Johan P. Olsen, *Democratic government, institutional autonomy and the dynamics of change*, Centre for European Studies, University of Oslo, Working Paper, No. 01, January 2009, ARENA Working Paper (online), p. 12, <http://www.arena.uio.no>;

in serving the public good”, because “a reasonable bureaucracy is one of the stages in the democracy process”.²⁴

The extension of the power of the top bureaucrats was explained by some elements:²⁵

- *The intensification of modern government* intervention in the socio-economic life, due to the increase in the volume of activity;
- *The growth of the complexity in the government tasks* that led to a greater power of bureaucracy so that a greater administrative organization is necessary;
- *The growth of the number of technical expertise* among the political leaders, determined by the complexity and technological progress;
- *The need for information in the political decision-making process* due to the last two factors. In what concerns the possibility to manipulate the information by the bureaucrats, some authors²⁶ have argued that in reality “the politicians do not make real choices anymore” because they are guided by the expertise provided by the departments within the public administration.
- *Limited resources for the politicians in what concerns time in comparison to the vast bureaucratic machinery* so that the bureaucrats are the ones that handle most of the problems of the public administration;
- *The politician’s reduced interest* in following the way the government’s policies are respected, within the departments;
- *Power transfer from the members of the Parliament to the Govern* in certain areas, through legislative delegation, due to the complexity of the problems, lack of expertise and the reduced number of personnel, that generated an abundance of ordinances issued by the government. In most on the cases, these ordinances are approved by the Parliament;
- *Regular change of politicians in the ministries, as opposed to the permanence and continuity of public servants*, that generates a certain weakness of the politicians in comparison to the experience and diversity of the problems that bureaucrats have to deal with, in the long term.

Excessive bureaucracy in public administration- obstacle to reform

Within public administration reforms, bureaucracy has been seen as a problem that every state has to deal with. But in order to understand the way the bureaucracy works in the modern state, if it is necessary or not, we have to see first what it involves and what is the way in which it operates.

Bureaucracy is responsible of the fact that “it suffocates the miracle of life”. “The proliferation of bureaucracy is a consequence of the seriousness, meaning the permanent concern for the important things, but never for those that are really important.”²⁷

²⁴ **Michael Bruno, Boris Pleskovic**, *Annual World Bank Conference on Development Economics 1995*, Ed. World Bank Publications, 1996, p. 244;

²⁵ **Eva Etzioni-Halevy**, *Bureaucracy and democracy: a political dilemma*, Ed. Routledge, London, 1985, p. 57-59;

²⁶ **Jacques Ellul**, *The technological society*, Ed. Jonathan Cape, London, 1965, op. cit. de **Eva Etzioni-Halevy**, *Bureaucracy and democracy: a political dilemma*, Ed. Routledge, London, 1985, p. 58;

²⁷ **Alexandru Paleologu**, *Despre lucrurile cu adevarat importante*, Ed II, revised and completed, Colectia Plural, Ed. Polirom, Iasi, 1998, p.20;

The problem with the bureaucracy has to be dealt with as being the symptom and not the cause.²⁸ Bureaucracy is not guilty of the existing imperfections within a state as it is a way of organizing the administration and not the administration itself.

Indeed, the concept of bureaucracy is strongly connected to the one of *bureaucratization* and *administration*. But the term administration²⁹ is usually associated with an *institution*, as well as with the social system that fulfills the tasks of that institution, while the *bureaucracy is the social subsystem of the administrative activity, within a certain frame*. Some authors³⁰ have indicated that the term bureaucracy refers also to a form of organization, even if usually is found with different meanings: *rational organization; inefficient organization; official's rules; public administration; administration by officials, either in the private or public sector; a form of organization characterized by features like hierarchy and rules; an essential quality of modern society*.

The causes of excessive bureaucracy have to be looked upon from a different perspective.

Bureaucracy is usually criticized because it cannot adapt to the present problems of society. Olsen indicated that bureaucracy cannot operate in modern society because it is “*too big, too strong, hierarchic coerced by rules, indifferent to the results, lazy, incompetent, consuming, inflexible, irresponsible, inhuman and harmful to democracies, to economic efficiency and individual freedom*”³¹ and the bureaucratic organization is typical to “a simple, legalist and authoritarian society”.

In most cases,³² the de bureaucratization process was approached as being an attempt to open the administration towards the society and this objective was supposed to be achieved through the new reforms adopted mostly by the western democratic states, starting with the '70s. The remains of a strongly centralized administration, closed and state interest oriented, as an entity and less to the well being of the individual, have to disappear. The citizen is the beneficiary of all the state's services, and the state has to confer him the legal framework in which these interests have to be granted. At the same time, the citizen has to possess all the legal guarantees through which he can address complaints regarding the laws that are useless. And the central role in this process belongs to the administration. It is the administration that replaces and mediates the relation between the *governed* and the *government*. It is the administration that feels the citizen's obstacles and the opposition in what concerns the government's operation, but not in a less extent than that, is it the one that feels impotent faced with the implementation of an *imperfect operation*. A society that has many citizens, a capitalist society, strongly developed, very industrialized and a receptive society in what concerns the promotion of democratic principles together with other international institutions and forms of territorial organization, does not translate itself in simplicity in power organization in comparison to the territory. Naturally, there is a tendency of over bureaucratization. Most of the times, this last aspect was interpreted as being one indicating centralized and absolutist proceedings. The truth is that a state administration has to be bureaucratic. The approach to citizens, principle that is consecrated and valued in the last period of time in the activity of the European Court of Justice, cannot be accomplished without a decentralized administration. As long as the administration is close to the citizen and it offers diverse services, in all areas, we can say that the citizen is provided with all the

²⁸ **Jos C. N. Raadschelders**, *Handbook of administrative history*, Ed. Transaction Publishers, 2000, p. 270;

²⁹ **Rolf Torstendahl**, *Bureaucratisation in northwestern Europe, 1880-1985: dominance and governance*, Ed. Taylor & Francis, Routledge, London, 1991, p. 37;

³⁰ See **Martin Albrow**, *Bureaucracy*, Ed. Pall Mall, 1970 cit. de **Donald P. Warwick, Marvin Meade, Theodore Reed**, *Theory of Public Bureaucracy: Politics, Personality, and Organization in the State Department*, Ed. Harvard University Press, 1975, p. 4;

³¹ **Johan P. Olsen**, *The Ups and Downs of Bureaucratic Organization*, Centre for European Studies, University of Oslo, Working Paper, No. 14, September 2009, ARENA Working Paper (online), <http://www.arena.uio.no>, p. 3;

³² **Johan P. Olsen**, *op.cit.*, p. 10;

legal mechanisms through he can have an affective participation to the improvement of the legislation and can observe any inconsistency or illegality. The role of the bureaucratic administration, strongly divided into compartments, is therefore essential.

Of course, we are talking about the bureaucracy within new principles of management. It is true that the bureaucrat is the one that executes the public administration tasks, the bureaucrat is the one listening to the hierarchic master's orders and in general it unconditionally obeys, out of fear not to lose his position or the possible benefits he can prevail throughout a good relationship with the boss.³³

A perfect public servant is one that obeys only the moral principles and the behavior codes and the public servant's statute. If these mention enough democratic principles in their content and their provision doesn't cause any practical issues, meaning that there might be a juridical and institutional frame to allow addressing to the juridical organs, then we can talk about the model of a public servant. In the first place, the public servant must have the initiative, be receptive, find solutions to solve the problems and benefit from the availability of his superiors in order to make the information each the centre, in case the problem needs that in order to be solved. An administration that has a personnel comprising unmotivated public servants, both from material and professional point of view, constrained, untrained, cannot ensure the good functioning of the services it is supposed to deliver. That is the reason why a good division of services within the administration, from a functional perspective, transforms itself in the famous saying, *shape without substance*. In this context, we consider the argument that the administration doesn't work because it is too bureaucratic as being true, as its personnel is the one that always underlines this.

What is certain is the fact that being the government's creation, it transfers the decision centers to the top of the pyramid.³⁴ We can observe then a sense of impotence of the bureaucrats if starting a reform at the base of the pyramid. But worth looking at is the process through which this transfer of decision to the centre takes place. We could call it *the pyramid effect*. The decision is in the power centre, being the government's creation. Counteracting this process can be easily solved through local autonomy, at a decentralized level. The stronger and more comprehensive the base of the pyramid is, the problems that will turn to the center will be less. For example, the United States of America is organized as a federation of states. At the federal level, as well as at the state level, there are two types of legislative, executive and juridical organs. Thus, a reduction of the problems represents the objective of the federation represents the way in which the decentralized administration is made more responsible, determining the amplification of structures and an attempt to obtain a greater responsibility from the base of the public administration. The centre will intervene only when the solutions to solve the problems won't be found at the local level. This is why the attempt to turn the European Union in a federation was supported by most of the European states. The accession to the EU, especially starting with the latest waves and the states that didn't offer the guarantee of functional economies and a lawful state based on democratic principles, was made through imposing clear economic and political criteria, closely monitored by the European Commission.³⁵ This allowed the approach of some European

³³ Here are valuable the ethical principles, the moral qualities, the public servant's training and the most important, the cultural and political history of that country. Fayol thought that a manager should possess many qualities. Thus, among the knowledge that comprise specialization and experience, a manager has to be educated in the full sense of the word, to possess culture, physical and moral qualities. See **Norman Cuthbert**, *Fayol and the principles of organization* in **John C. Wood, Michael C. Wood, Henri Fayol: critical evaluations in business and management**, Ed. Taylor & Francis, 2002, p. 12-13; in the same context, Woodrow Wilson indicated that, without discrimination between women and men, the public servants have to have high moral values. See **Woodrow Wilson**, *The study of administration*, 1887, reedited by Political Science Quarterly 56, December 1941, p. 20;

³⁴ **Ioan Alexandru**, *Politica, administratie, justitie*, Ed. All Beck, Bucharest, 2004, p.136;

³⁵ The reality is that, besides the founding states, that are not considered because the unification interests were in a more complex frame, the other accession waves had economic interests as objectives, as most of the former communist states in

principles within the public administration that were traditional in the western liberal democracies. Considering that the EU didn't dispose but imposed only the objectives the states had to obtain in order to reach a final capable administration that can guarantee the community acquis, most of the reforms aimed at the decentralization of the public administration.

This is why we have to indicate the fact that the administration retains always a certain conflict between bureaucrats and politicians. If the politicians are the ones that initiate the reforms, the bureaucrats are the ones that complete them in the next mandate as well, and most of the times the change of the political color brings in a reorientation of the options and the government visions for the new mandate. So, the new occupants of political positions can opt for another vision that becomes more and more of a certainty, when there is information that can lead to ceasing or modification of such reforms. In this case, the new government will solicit different expertise, information and vision of the same subject from different agencies, case in which "it is not unusual to find the bureaucrats on one side and the politicians on the other side".³⁶

Olsen showed that it cannot be a process of "administrative convergence and singular evolution towards bureaucratization", according to Weber, as well as we cannot talk about a process of de bureaucratization, not to mention the process of re bureaucratization. According to him, we are witnessing a process marked by ups and downs in bureaucratic organization, with lack of economic performance, budget deficit, implementation deficit and inadequate to globalization and socio-economic forces, because "the bureaucratic organization is not susceptible to function well when confronted to events that disturb its order, with new problems and criteria of good performance, as well as changing the power distribution". In this context, there have been some opinions that sustain the above mentioned: bureaucracy resisted as a form of organization because of the functional necessity and because "the society hasn't found yet something else that can function better in coordinating complex actions".³⁷

Another cause for which bureaucracy is considered to be excessive, but this time in a motivating manner, is determined by the political context, in which a form of government that is highly centralized, absolutist, left behind a poor administrative culture, lacking a juridical and institutional frame, a totally unmotivated political class, together with unprepared public servants and untrained, in order to face immediate challenges.³⁸ The search and transition periods towards a functional way to

Central and Eastern Europe were very poor and very centralized. This is the case for some of the states that adhered in 2004 (Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia and Hungary) and in 2007, Romania and Bulgaria.

³⁶ The imposition towards the bureaucrats is sometimes facilitated by the silence of the bureaucrats determined by the existence of administrative ethic codes and this takes advantage of the politicians rule to call the media in. But these care cases represent only slight softening of the bureaucratic power. See **Eva Etzioni-Halevy**, *Bureaucracy and democracy: a political dilemma*, Ed. Routledge, London, 1985, p. 59;

³⁷ See **Meier, K.J., Hill, G.C.**, *Bureaucracy in the twenty-first century*, in *The Oxford Handbook of Public Management*, edited by E. Ferlie, L.E. Lynn, jr., C. Pollitt, Ed. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2005, pp.31-71; **Kettl, D.F.**, *Public bureaucracies*, in *The Oxford Handbook of Political Institutions*, edited by R.A.W. Rhodes, S.A. Binder, B.A. Rockman, Ed. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2006, pp.366-384 quoted by **Johan P. Olsen**, *The Ups and Downs of Bureaucratic Organization*, Centre for European Studies, University of Oslo, Working Paper, No. 14, September 2009, ARENA Working Paper (online), p. 24-26, <http://www.arena.uio.no>;

³⁸ This is the case in which many states have been before the accession. As they went through a shorter or a longer way to the beginning of the negotiations and the accession request, the same happened to the stage of stagnation of these states. For example, Greece, Spain or Portugal adhered shortly after they escaped the dictatorship. In Romania's case, the official admission request was issued only on 22 June 1995, as the creation of a national strategy to prepare the EU adhesion, so after a period of 5 years after the communist fall. Considering the Commission's answer in July 1997 on not fulfilling the economic, political criteria and the harmonization in what concerns the community acquis, Romania receives in December 1997 the statute of candidate country and in March 1998 the first accession partnership is adopted. Only in February 2000, the EU

organize the administration always illustrate a plurality of tensions, alimented by the citizens, unsatisfied with the changes that take place with successive reforms, searching for solutions and the bureaucrats themselves, being the ones that adapt the hardest because of the fact that the reforms are being implemented immediately and the training happens, at best, in the same time with the reforms. This is why the failures and the citizen's discontent are accompanied, as an immediate reaction, by a diminished confidence in public institutions. It is followed of course by the sanctions of the political class, by electoral means.

Bibliography

- Alexandru Paleologu, *Despre lucrurile cu adevarat importante*, Ed II, revised and completed, Colectia Plural, Ed. Polirom, Iasi, 1998
- Christopher Pierson, *The modern state*, Ed. II, Ed. Routledge, London, 2004
- Donald P. Warwick, Marvin Meade, Theodore Reed, *Theory of Public Bureaucracy: Politics, Personality, and Organization in the State Department*, Ed. Harvard University Press, 1975
- Eva Etzioni-Halevy, *Bureaucracy and democracy: a political dilemma*, Ed. Routledge, London, 1985
- H. Fayol, *L'Eveil de l'esprit public*, Ed. Dunod et Pinat, Paris, 1918
- Ioan Alexandru, *Politica, administratie, justitie*, Ed. All Beck, Bucharest, 2004
- Ioan Alexandru, *Tratat de administratie publica*, Ed. Universul Juridic, Bucharest, 2008
- Johan P. Olsen, *Democratic government, institutional autonomy and the dynamics of change*, Centre for European Studies, University of Oslo, Working Paper, No. 01, January 2009, ARENA Working Paper (online), <http://www.arena.uio.no>;
- Johan P. Olsen, *The Ups and Downs of Bureaucratic Organization*, Centre for European Studies, University of Oslo, Working Paper, No. 14, September 2009, ARENA Working Paper (online) <http://www.arena.uio.no>;
- Jhon D. Breeze, *Henri Fayol's Centre for Administrative Studies*, in John C. Wood, Michael C. Wood, *Henri Fayol: critical evaluations in business and management*, Ed. Taylor & Francis, 2002
- Jos C. N. Raadschelders, *Handbook of administrative history*, Ed. Transaction Publishers, 2000
- Frederick Winslow Taylor, *The principles of scientific management*, Ed. Forgotten Books, 1913
- Kettl, D.F., *Public bureaucracies*, in *The Oxford Handbook of Political Institutions*, edited by R.A.W. Rhodes, S.A. Binder, B.A. Rockman, Ed. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2006
- Lyndall Urwick, *Papers in the Science of Administration*, in John C. Wood, Michael C. Wood, *Henri Fayol: critical evaluations in business and management*, Ed. Taylor & Francis, 2002
- Luis Villoro, *Which democracy* in M. Cherif Bassiouni, *Democracy: Its Principles and Achievement*, Ed. Inter-Parliamentary Union, Geneva, 1998
- Michael Bruno, Boris Pleskovic, *Annual World Bank Conference on Development Economics 1995*, Ed. World Bank Publications, 1996
- Martin Albrow, *Bureaucracy*, Ed. Pall Mall, 1970
- Max Weber, *Essays in sociology*, coauthors Hans Heinrich Gerth, Charles Wright Mills, Bryan S. Turner, translated by Hans Heinrich Gerth, Charles Wright Mills, Ed. II, Ed. Routledge, London, 1970
- Max Weber, *Economy and Society*. Ed. G. Roth, C. Wittich. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978
- Meier, K.J., Hill, G.C., *Bureaucracy in the twenty-first century*, in *The Oxford Handbook of Public Management*, edited by E. Ferlie, L.E. Lynn, jr., C. Pollitt, Ed. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2005
- Norman Cuthbert, *Fayol and the principles of organization* in John C. Wood, Michael C. Wood, *Henri Fayol: critical evaluations in business and management*, Ed. Taylor & Francis, 2002
- Rolf Torstendahl, *Bureaucratization in northwestern Europe, 1880-1985: dominance and governance*, Ed. Taylor & Francis, Routledge, London, 1991
- R.K. Saprú, *Administrative Theories and Management Thought*, Ed. PHI Learning Pvt. Ltd., 2006
- Peter Ferdinand Drucker, *Management: Tasks, Responsibilities, Practices*, Ed. Transaction Publishers, New Brunswick, N.J., London, 2007
- Woodrow Wilson, *The study of administration*, 1887, reedited by Political Science Quaterly 56, December 1941
- T. B. Bottomore, *A Dictionary of Marxist thought*, ed. II, Ed. Wiley-Blackwell, 1991

opens negotiations with Romania. The pre accession stages and the EU's monitoring them, together with the mobilizing will of the political class indicated on one hand that Romania would have taken the long way to get out of the developed states if these forces wouldn't have brought their contribution, but on the other indicated that only the internal political will led to the reduction in time of this evolution.