

HOSTILITY TOWARDS BUREAUCRATS IS AN INDICATOR OF A POOR SOCIETY

Alexander Kustarev



ALEXANDER KUSTAREV

is a Russian historian and sociologist. He previously served as the leading scientific fellow for the Russian History Institute of the Russian State University for the Humanities. Today, he is an independent publicist writer of political essays based in the United Kingdom

The bureaucrat or state official (whether it be an administrator or office manager) is, first of all, a profession and a particular role within society. Like every professional, the bureaucrat has his own specific interests, chances for earning profit within certain quantitative and qualitative parameters, some degree of influence on societal life, a particular way of life, value priorities and mentality. In different views of societal stratification, the bureaucracy and state officials can be interpreted in terms of class, estate, status, or caste, for instance. In other words, they have characteristics that allow each of them to be considered in reference to ideally typical categories.

It is hard to say just how many real individuals are close to that ideally typical bureaucrat in the way he is envisioned. Intuition tells us that, in modern society, there are many more individuals who represent a combination of the attributes of an ideally typ-

ical bureaucrat with those of an ideally typical entrepreneur, scientist, technologist (as a 'worker'), technologist (as a 'free profession'), an unemployed person (as a rantier), one who is unemployed yet again (as a pauper) or a racketeer, than there exists bureaucrats or officials par excellence. In today's Russia, both in public life and in bureaucratic circles, the hybrid of the bureaucrat, faculty scholar in lower position and racketeer indeed prevails.

If the 'middle class' (or perhaps it is better to say 'section') is a category of societal stratification according to ownership of property, then perhaps, the majority of professional (measured in terms of their income) bureaucrats are representatives of the middle class as it was in old industrial rich countries (though this requires verification on the basis of statistics). In poor and badly organised countries, they tend to belong to the upper class.

The poorer the society is and the more difficult life is there, the more hostile people become towards officials. **The vision of bureaucrats as parasites and enemies of society has always had certain well-known grounds and has never actually been realistic/adequate.** The stability of that syndrome and its acuteness in Russia indicates (it doesn't prove, but only indicates) that Russian society continues to live in the conditions of a chronic, low-intensity crisis.

According to Weber, the bureaucrat, as an individual who sees to the fulfillment of other people's decisions, and the **politician**, as the person who makes such decisions, are ideal types. This ideal typology, as a theoretical premise and analytical instrument, has always been and continues to be very important for us at this point in time. It results in the idea that the political sphere requires individuals who can operate in situations when decisions cannot be made beforehand, based solely on rational calculation, customs or law, but are

rather based on their habits, education and personal qualities (psychosomatically).

There is an abyss between political and technically organisational operations and **there is a constant war between the political class and bureaucracy with respect to their respective spheres of competence.** It is worth noting that nowadays, this struggle is a lively topic of discussion in political circles. One should not only make decisions according to a particular agenda, but also determine the agenda itself. The problem in Russia today is that no such reasonable agenda currently exists. The real politician today must be able to determine those problems that require responsible and intuitive problem-solving, rather than simply be ready to take the responsibility upon himself.

Entrepreneurs stylise themselves as the antagonists of bureaucracy and this is not completely unfounded, as an ideally-typical entrepreneur and ideally-typical bureaucrat are indeed antagonists. When we view the situation objectively, various groups of entrepreneurs from time to time appear to need bureaucratic arbitrage. Private enterprise has a large segment that simply cooperates with governmental bureaucracy in joint ventures (formal and informal). Corporate and governmental bureaucracies also always experiencing an exchange in their personnel (in Russia, France or Japan this is more the case, while in the United Kingdom and the USA this is less seen, but is nevertheless omnipresent).

Intellectuals also stylise themselves as anti-bureaucrats, whereas, in fact, the intelligentsia can be seen as a kind of non-systemic bureaucracy. In other words, this means that it is a potential bureaucracy without appropriate job positions and rent. It is a kind of alienated, unemployed, reserve, an opposition bureaucracy – whatever you want to call it. ■

Exclusively for RJ