

## WEBER M. ABOUT BUREAUCRACY: TO THE PROBLEM OF THE PROBLEM

Belova T.A.

GBOU VPO OSMU MinzdravaRossii, Omsk, e-mail: belova.t.a@mail.ru

---

The article deals with the concept of "bureaucracy" in the understanding of M. Weber. It was he who led this term into scientific circulation. However, the concept of "bureaucracy" originates still in the ancient world, and the term appeared in the middle of the XVIII century. M. Weber distinguished two types of bureaucracy: patrimonial and rational. In the article the author gives a characterization of these two types of bureaucracy. In conclusion, the author notes that the bureaucracy (just rational) is characterized by M. Weber purely theoretically – as an ideal type, having the character of a "model", with which reality must then be compared.

---

**Keywords:** bureaucracy, type of bureaucracy, official

First, we must determine the meaning of the concept of "bureaucracy". In the beginning, of course, we should draw our attention to the Western experience of research on this problem [1, P. 5-8.] According to a sociological comment by Bruder: "When considering the phenomenon of bureaucracy, it is necessary to draw a clear line between the mass consciousness perceiving it mainly critically – as a mechanism of public administration, and, on the other hand, sociological and political approaches. In accordance with these approaches, bureaucracy is characterized as a specific form of social organization, not limited solely to the official sphere of social life" [2, P. 142].

The term "bureaucracy" is given many meanings. We will only present some of the meaning of this term: government officials, public administration, the system of professional administration, organizational effectiveness, etc.

The concept of "bureaucracy" dates back to the ancient world. In ancient Rome, coarse wool called "byurra". This word has been borrowed by the French – "byurr" and then became "bureau" as a kind of woolen cloth. In the XVI century table designated by this word which was covered with a cloth, and in XVII century. They began to call the office, where there were tables. The term "bureaucracy" first appeared in the middle of the XVIII century. thanks to the French Economist de Vincennes Gurnay [5, P. 77]. He added the word "bureau", which meant that as an institution, as well as a desk, part, derived from "manage" the Greek verb. "Bureaucracy" means power officials. Initially, this word was used only in relation to government agencies, but its importance is gradually extended and now applies to all large organizations. The scientific revolution, the term "bureaucracy" came thanks to the work of Max Weber. However, the term "bureaucracy" has purchased from Weber positive nature and attitude to the organization in general. The

main difficulty, which presents the theory of bureaucracy, Max Weber, is primarily the work of "Economy and Society", which describes the system of government in Germany in the early XX century.

Sociologists distinguish two types of bureaucracy: patrimonial and rational. The term "patrimonialism" was taken from ancient Rome, where it literally means "personal treasury of the emperor". For patrimonial bureaucracy is characterized by insufficient development of rational features and the personal character of the relations of power in the governance structures. Power base patrimonial bureaucracy, above all, leaves the assignment of officials positions of wealth and privilege. However, the trend towards the assignment of officials controls leads to the gradual disintegration of the bureaucratic organizations. At the same patrimonial bureaucracy is converted to the rule of "class" type, which is already a non-bureaucratic.

According to Max Weber, but in the West as a result of optimizing the management process develops a patrimonial nature of the relationship between monarch and officials. Western bureaucracy of the absolutist state acquires the power not as a result of the decentralization of the political regime, and due to the presence of officials from professional abilities. Therefore, it is in the West for the first time there is a transition from a patrimonial management to the bureaucracy of the modern type. Thus, M. Weber, patrimonial bureaucracy is seen as regressive, negative element of society. Weber also quite actively uses the example of the Russian bureaucracy when characterizes patrimonial type of bureaucracy. According to him, Russia before and after the reforms of Peter the Great was the patrimonial state. The bureaucratic apparatus of the XVIII century in Russia. Weber compares with the Chinese bureaucracy, both in Russia and in China, the public service and was a source of political power, and also made

it possible to enrich the material. Differences is that the nobility in Russia are not only government officials, as well as masters of their estates. But, despite this, the occupied status in Russia is directly dependent on the civil servant. Weber notes, "Peter the Great abolished the previous titles and privileges of the Russian nobility in favor of two simple principles: 1) Chin appropriated only for the service on the patrimonial-bureaucratic positions (civil or military), and it is dependent on the relative position of the person in the patrimonial-bureaucratic hierarchy fourteen ranks. Since the nobility did not have a monopoly on the post, and for their occupation is not required mandatory possession of landed property, but was required – at least – in theory – a certain level of education, there is, apparently, there is a similarity with the situation in China. 2) the nobility right is ineffective in two generations, if their owners did not receive the service. It is also reminiscent of the situation in China. But the rights of the Russian nobility included, among other privileges, the exclusive right to own land, populated by serfs. Therefore, the nobility was associated with the prerogatives of the manor patrimonialism of this kind, which was completely alien to China. Practice noble title deprivation in the absence of a ceased service reign Peter III and Catherine II. But the rank remained the basis of social prestige, and at least a temporary service in public office is a status convention for young nobles" [4]. Weber does not characterize the transition from patrimonial management system to the bureaucracy of the modern type in Russia. In "Economy and Society" description "of the tsarist patrimonialism" brought only before the end of the XVIII century.

The second type of bureaucratic organization Max Weber presented an ideal model of rational bureaucracy. Ideal type – this is an abstract description, which strengthened some of the features inherent to real cases. The main characteristics of a rational bureaucracy are such indicators as, for example, submission to official duties, availability of service competencies, professional qualifications and monetary maintenance, etc.

So, Weber pointed out that in bureaucratic organizations the ability to rationalizing ac-

tivities, clear separation of functions, hierarchical system of relations and control over the activities of officials, submission of work to the formal rules, the ability to implement a professional selection of applicants the public service. "The true profession of the official ... should not be a politician. He must "manage" primarily impartially ... Sine ira et studio – without anger and passion he has to administer affairs. So ... the official should not do exactly what has always and necessarily must make policies – as the leader and his entourage – to fight" [3, P. 666].

According to the researcher bureaucracy G.V. Pushkarevoy: "Weber formulated the basic principles of bureaucratic organization and dichotomy "politics – management" were those methodological premises, which have provided a special niche in the bureaucracy of social and political knowledge. Thanks to these premises bureaucracy was relatively easy to isolate from the political elite, from other social groups, thereby turning into an independent object of study" [5, P. 79].

Thus, bureaucracy (namely rational) characterized M. Weber theoretically – as an ideal type having a character of "model", which should then be compared reality. However, according to the just remark of modern domestic researcher of M. Weber M.V. Maslovskogo "... ideal-typical model of rational bureaucracy ... is only one element of a more general theory of bureaucracy, developed by the German sociologist. Only in the 70th years, with the beginning of "Weber renaissance" begins a series of Western authors attach greater importance to those aspects of the sociology of Weber's bureaucracy, which had hitherto been in the shadows.

## References

1. Belova T.A. Study of bureaucracy by foreign researchers: to the formulation of the problem. // Omsk scientific herald. – 2014. – № 4 (131).
2. Bruder V. Bureaucracy (Dictionary of Political Concepts). // Polis. – 1991. – № 5.
3. Weber M. Politics as a Vocation. // Weber M. Selected works. – M., 1990.
4. Weber M. Royal patrimonialism. // URL: [http://soc-net.narod.ru/library/authors/Maslovskiy/Burocracy/burocracy.htm#\\_ftnref2](http://soc-net.narod.ru/library/authors/Maslovskiy/Burocracy/burocracy.htm#_ftnref2) (reference date: 02.01.2017).
5. Pushkareva G.V. The state bureaucracy as an object of study. // Social studies and the present. – 1997. – № 5.