

УДК 316.2

Management and Self-Management in the Conditions of Globalization

Sergey P. Dureev*

*Krasnoyarsk Institute of Economics of the St. Petersburg Academy of Management and Economics (NEI HPE),
70a Kirenskogo st., Krasnoyarsk, 660100 Russia ¹*

Received 14.08.2009, received in revised form 21.08.2009, accepted 28.08.2009

In the given article we prove that ontological society is an integral system and presents by itself a self-governing system on any stage of historical development. Management is an inevitable feature of any society. This feature has a general character and results from the society's system nature, from the social labour of society's members, from the necessity of communication in the process of labour. In the conditions of globalization, human society management is not already connected to the evolutionary processes, when inheritance (traditions, folkways, customs) play a dominating role with regard to variability, but is connected to the processes, when there happens a forceful demolition of old mechanisms of inheritance and western values acquire the dominating meaning, they change the basis of historical human being.

Keywords: being; creature; existence; object; subject; activity; management; self-managemen; globalization.

Point

After the Cold War had finished, USA and Western-European countries decided, that a wide-scaled distribution of the market economy principals and implantation of the Western democracy model can become a regulating and system-forming factor in the whole world. In these conditions, the attempts to implant artificially democratic institute of power and management have become the instrument of changing of the historically formed humane existence mode. In this connection, it becomes important to address the question of management organization and the place of a person in this process.

Lying in the basis of humane historical existence and development, labour activity specifies humane essence and is always performed within the frames of public production. Man cannot produce or be engaged in labour activity, if he does not directly or indirectly enters social relations, which summation forms the society.

We have to underline, that we are speaking about the entire aggregate of social relations: material and ideal (ideological), present and bygone. This position has an important methodological meaning, whereof it proceeds, that man must not be understood from material or idealistic point of view, but dialectically. In other words, he must not be narrowed down only

* Corresponding author E-mail address: serge@krkime.com

¹ © Siberian Federal University. All rights reserved

to «the economical man» or only to «the rational man» and so on. Man is a creature, who is, at the same time, both producing, and rational, and cultural, and moral, and political and so on. He accumulates in himself all the spectrum of social relations in more or less degree and, thus, realizes his social essence. On the other hand, in his broad sense, man is a result of human history; he is a result of social-historical process development.

At the same time, man is not only the result of society and social relations, he is also their creator, and consequently, he turns out to be the object and the subject of social relations at one and the same time. In man there is realized the entity, the equality of the object and the subject. There exists a dialectic interaction between man and society: man is a micro society, society revelation on the micro level, and society is a man with his social relations.

Thus, we may speak about man's socially active essence. Man cannot simply be a man, being out of activity, out of social relations and communication (as a form of their realization).

But man is not reduced to his essence. It discloses itself in his existence by its real revelation. And if man's essence is a general characteristic of the human race, then every man's existence is always individual in its concrete-empirical expression and extends further than his essence. Existence is a being of man as of an integral creature in all its variety of forms, kinds, and features of its revelation. This integrity is expressed in the fact, that man is the entity of his biological and his social parts. As a biological creature, man is «in the highest degree a self-regulating and self-supporting, self-regenerating, self-directing and even self-bettering system» (Pavlov, 1951. p. 188). Thus, man is presented as a bio-social system before us. Though, the biological is not a determining part of man. Being proper «human», the social is not acquired

by man from the moment of his birth (due to his biological nature), but it happens during his life: in the course of his activity, in the world (society), having been transfigured by numerous human generations, having been before him. That is why man is a part of the social integrity as a social, communal creature, but not owing to his biological nature.

So, man is a communal, social creature, and his natural (biological) part is only a prerequisite for his communal, social essence realization. This essence is defined, first of all, by its social environment, by a concrete society, wherein this or that man is living and developing. So, this environment forms the qualities and features of a concrete man, which are expressed in various kinds of his activity. Activity is «a specific form of human relation to the surrounding world, which content is world's expedient changing and transfiguring. Activity is a condition of society's existence». (PED, 1989. p. 151).

Management is an obligatory feature of society. «As an objectively existing process, management appears only on the stage of materia social self-movement, i.e. when man and society appear» (Suvorov and others, 1984. p. 6). This feature has a general character and results from the system nature of society, from the social labour of society members, from the necessity of communication in the process of labour and in the course of exchanging of products of original nature's «processing». In human society, management is connected not only to the evolutionary processes, when inheritance (traditions, folkways, customs) play a dominating role with regard to variability, but is connected to the revolutionary processes, when there happens a demolition of old mechanisms of inheritance, and variability (innovations) acquires the dominating meaning, as far as these innovations do not affect the minor features, but the most part of the vital ones.

The theses about management birth, which happened in the result of social labour division into physical labour and mental labour (K. Marks) and which brought to separation of the management and the executive activities, does not correspond the reality. In the infancy of mankind, there were already features of management, when the members of the tribe (commonalty) followed their leader not because of their conscious attitude, but in force of their natural program of expedient behavior. Such expedient behavior provided their lives' security, and later it was scientifically supported and explained. That is why human labour is divided into management labour and executive one. In other words, in society there are managers (management subject), who lead other people, and there are performers (management object), who execute the managers' decisions (hired workers). Thus, management labour, starting from some level of social organization, becomes the labour of social significance. So, initially all the society turns out to be in dependence on quite a narrow circle of managers of national responsibility level, and in the modern, globalized world – in dependence on the Euro-American conglomerate.

Example

Let us take Russia for example: the system of state management is being reformed, as far as the state itself and the social relations are being reformed. The reforms are caused by a certain necessity; they are performed under a control and the situation in the country is changing. Sometimes, mass media and various political technologists demonstrate quite convincingly changes for the better. But in reality, they are trying to change the picture in the people's conscious about the situation in Russia. At the same time, the structures of state and local power distance themselves from the people, prioritizing

international obligations. In the result of reformative activity, this «gap» becomes deeper and more painful for the society and for the state on the whole.

It happens because the relations with the people are built in «reality» and «in fact». And these very relations «between «the reality» and the life «in fact» put significant bounds to the very possibility of reforming. As far as reforming is performed in «reality», but in fact there is no reforming at all, but there is something else, which is implicit, not spoken about and not expressed in the language of the theories, lying in the basis of those reforms. The state will continue the reforms in «reality», and in fact, people will still consider it to be a new Moscow trick, but not a sincere act, aimed in fact for collective betterment of Russian life» (Kudashov, 2006. p. 107).

In Russia, power vertical building and local self-government reforming must be directed *in reality* so, that to find the most effective (from the point of view of social development) inter-connection, and *in fact* the idea of local self-government has become a part and an instrument of the administrative system and a form of the democratic camouflage.

In «reality» the state power belongs to the people (RF Constitution), and *in fact* the power is in the hands of «economical elite». And the biggest part of the state property and now of the municipal property as well, after its privatization, voucherization and corporalization, belong precisely to them. And property is the basis, the substance of power (A.G. Anikevich and others, 2001). That is why the ownership of property brings the representatives of big, less frequently of medium and small business to power. For them, local self-government is not only the sphere of citizens' self-organization, but also a specific level of power. They quite understand that, the organs of local self-government are rather important as organs of power in the system

of state management, as a channel of the country government.

Here, we should remind that, while forming the Moscow state in Russ, «*in reality*» there was built a power vertical, but *in fact* this vertical «rested on the basis of the communal form of social life organization», besides, the society «was preserved by the state as a condition of existence on the whole» (Olejnikov, 2001. p. 130).

One can manage any objective process only, if one knows all the inner and outer factors, which condition the course of the process, and that, in most cases, allows to bring an objectively developing process to the aim, having been subjectively chosen from a lot of objectively possible variants of that very process development. This is the main in the notion content of «management». Management is possible only when we are dealing with objectively existing processes (objects). If there is created an illusion of an objective process existence, then there also appears an illusion of the management process.

That is why organization of state management and of local self-government must be always built not as managing system's one-sided influence over the managed one, but as a dialectic interaction of management subject and object in the process of human activity. This interaction must consist not only of various direct connections, but also of inverse links as well, and that will provide evolutionary development of society and its betterment on the basis of nature development objective laws.

Management subject and object's existence, their interaction are the main content feature of management human activity. Besides, on one hand, man is a management subject; on the other hand, he is a management object. Management object, as one of the parts in the system of management activity, is rather similar to management subject. This similarity

is caused by one the same magnitude of their social nature. That is why there is no subject and object in the system of management activity, but there is two subjects' interaction: managing subject and managed activity subject (executive subject). Thus, management activity object (of management) is the subject of any other kind of human activity, including local self-government principals' realization.

That is why organization of local self-government must be also built «bottom-upwards» and must proceed from people in the form of society management power devolving. People reserve the main management function – power devolving execution control. In this case, there is built a responsibility on every management level, and there is formed a power vertical in the state. This is the management, built on the principals of grass-roots democracy, on the principals of self-regulation and self-management. These principals are hardwired in man and lie in the basis of any social education.

Resume

In Russia, it is inevitable to develop management and self-management only in the spirit of Russian originality, in the tideway of its own historical traditions. The great Russian philosopher I.A. Il'in has marked on the subject: «...Everything great can be told by a man or a people only in their own way and everything genius can be born precisely within one's national experience, spirit and pattern, ... national depersonalization is a great disaster and danger in the life of a man and people on the whole. We must struggle with it persistently and with inspiration. And this struggle must be led from the very childhood» (Il'in, 1993. p. 291). If Russia sticks to its historical way of development, it will successfully solve all the rest of the problems: both as its own, so the global ones.

References

- I.P. Pavlov. Complete Edition of Works, V. 3, Book 2. / I.P. Pavlov – Moscow-Leningrad: Publishing House: AS USSR, 1951. – 438p.
- L.N. Suvorov, A.N. Averin. Social Management. Philosophical Analysis Experience. / L.N. Suvorov, A.N. Averin. – Moscow: Mysl', 1984. – 232p.
- V.I. Kudashov. Russia in «reality» and in fact. / V.I. Kudashov // Theory and History. 2006. № 1. p. 95-108.
- A.G. Anikevich, V.G. Jakovlev. Power: Social-Philosophical Analysis. / A.G. Anikevich, V.G. Jakovlev – St. Petersburg: Institute of Management and Economics, 2001. – 256p.
- Ju.V. Olejnikov. Natural Factor of Russian Historical Being. / Ju.V. Olejnikov // Philosophy of Society. 2001. №3. p.123-140.
- Philosophical Encyclopedic Dictionary (PED). 2-d edition. / The Head Editor A.M. Prohorov. – Moscow: Soviet Encyclopedia, 1989. – 815p.
- I.A. Il'in. The Way to Obviousness. / I.A. Il'in – Moscow: Respublika, 1993. – 430p.