

UDC: 35.078

Poltorak S.T. PhD in Pedagogy, Professor, candidate for a doctor's degree of the Training Research and Production Center of the National University of Civil Protection of Ukraine

PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION OF FORMATION OF THE RELIABLE ADMINISTRATION OF THE ARMY OF UKRAINE

Summary. The purpose of the scientific paper is the theoretical analysis of the dialectics of the formation of army and political process in modern Ukrainian society as well as identification and formulation of the issues which arise in the course of this analysis in public administration of the Armed Forces of Ukraine and possible ways of their solution. In accordance with this, in the article the place and role of the modern army in the system of institutes of political power of Ukraine are defined; the main tendencies of the modern political process development and peculiarity of their manifestation in the Ukrainian army are revealed; directions of the army strengthening and the mechanism of the stated problems solution are formulated.

Keywords: public administration; political institutions, armed forces.

Problem setting. The main content of the present stage of the economic and socio-political reform in Ukraine is determined by the objective needs of a new social model. The transition of any society to a new qualitative state is naturally associated with the fundamental structural changes in the economy, social sphere, politics, and spiritual life. Simultaneously, there is a radical change of goals, means and methods of activity and therefore the functions of the institutions of the state and society. These changes could not but touch one of the most important institutions of political power – the army.

Recent research and publications analysis. Since 1991 a number of scientific papers devoted to the problems of public administration of the Armed Forces of Ukraine and which revealed a wide range of the special tasks connected to the

contents of certain areas of the state security at the present stage have been presented. There, a fairly complete description of the main historical, theoretical, methodological, methodical and applied problems of the theory and methods of ensuring the public measures has been provided, the main tendencies and perspectives regarding the implementation of public administration of the formation of the reliable administration of the Ukrainian army have been identified [1-5].

Paper objective is to analyse the state of the army as a component of public administration.

The paper main body. Nowadays a radical social transformation is taking place in the Armed Forces of Ukraine – the transition to the army of a democratic state and society. This requires a major reconstruction of the whole range of relations between the army and the state, the army and society.

The army is a state institution of a fairly stable, conservative character. A definite order established in the state is the most acceptable form of military life: it has developed respect for the law, organization, certainty and painful rejection of dual power. Certain isolation of the army from the civilian population, statutory regulation of all types of service relationships have some consequences. These circumstances create a special corporate spirit in the army. Therefore, it is quite understandable that even in a situation of social cataclysms, the army as a state institution retains its integrity and clarity of action for a long time. These factors determine the extremely important role of the army in the socio-political life of the society. With the help of the army the existence of the obsolete political systems is restored or prolonged, the old forms of political life are destroyed and new ones are approved, the direction and character of socio-political and economic development of the country is reoriented [4].

The relationship between the army and politics is interpreted quite differently – some interpretations are based on the fact that the armed forces are an integral part of the political system of the society and consider their existence outside of politics as impossible. Others, considering the army only as a power tool, believe that it is politically neutral and should be out of politics. Still others are inclined to reckon that

the political and non-political nature of the army has some certain subjective facts from which, if desired, one can choose any. Proving the relationship between the army and politics, there is clearly not enough reference to the fact that the army is created and improved by the state policy, is managed by the political decisions, serves as a means to achieve political objectives [5].

As a counterargument can be used the fact that the content and the principles of the army are objectively determined not only by the policy but also by laws of violence, technical factors, the development of military equipment and weapons. And, as it is well known from our recent history, the arbitrariness of policy in military construction turns out to have significant flaws. In addition, not all means that are created and used by policy become of domestic agenda. Thus, for example, nuclear weapons, being an instrument of politics, are the weapons whose qualities are determined by the laws of physics, chemistry, and mathematics.

It should be borne in mind that the politics can be brought from the outside. To give an objective answer to the question of the relationship between the army and policy, it is necessary to identify whether the army in itself is an internal political phenomenon. The political nature of the Armed forces is primarily determined by the fact that they are built in accordance with the laws of such socio-political phenomenon as war which is the most acute form of political struggle. The army is the main subject of the struggle as the war is a direct continuation of the policy and every warrior embodies one or another political line by the force of arms. Politics is the inner sense of the armed struggle that defines its character, ways and forms [3].

The army functioning is a kind of political activities since in the result it carries out the activity of protection of power relations both within the country and at the regional and global levels. The Armed forces cause the direct influence on the political reality, precondition the political outcomes. Military victories or defeats, successful or erroneous activities have an exceptionally significant political outcome.

Political analysts note a certain tendency which acquires the character of regularity – the reduction of purely military tasks facing the armies and their increasing use for other internal and external goals lead to a decrease of their politics. Thus, from

the late 80s to early 90s, the US Army was shifting towards a number of domestic tasks which included the law enforcement and order enforcement, the elimination of the consequences of natural disasters, environmental disasters, and assistance to local authorities. Only in 1992-1993 the land forces of the National Guard were used 300 times for these purposes. In France such actions are called humanitarian actions. This is assistance to victims of natural and man-made disasters, military conflicts, provision of medical services during the outbreaks of epidemics [4, c.6].

Although the legal documents and scientific publications on the problems of the army activities emphasize that it serves to maintain and strengthen the internal stability and security, to increase the authority and popularity of the military among the population, in our opinion, it is not the political component of its activities to the extent as it appears, it does not demonstrate the armed power.

Protection of the individual and society from violence is one of the main functions of the state. However, it is the state that organizes and carries out the most extensive forms of violence (wars, mass repressions, redistribution of the property, the impact on the public consciousness, deformation of the environment, etc.). Some state institutions created to protect rights and freedoms of both the individual citizens and society as a whole are the tools of violence. They are dangerous not only for subjects against whom they are directed but also for those who they are called to protect. The army is among these institutions, originally intended to protect individuals, society and the state itself from the external attacks but which uses the methods of armed violence while performing its functions. This phenomenon requires careful humanitarian understanding.

The concept of “army” (from the Latin *armare* – to arm) is used in a variety of meanings:

- general military education, consisting of a number of connections;
- the army as a combination of only the land forces (in the word combinations “the army, air force and navy”);
- the army as the union of all branches of the armed forces of the state.

The concept of “army”, as well as a social phenomenon that it reflects, is in a

state of change, development. For a long time the definition of the army given by F. Engels was generally recognised in the literature: “The army is an organized association of the armed people, maintained by the state for the purpose of offensive or defensive war”. This definition, covering the basic characteristics of the army, retains its value even today. At the same time, many researchers believe that it needs to be clarified, and suggest that, given the contemporary social role of the army, to consider it as a body of the state designed to ensure the military security of the country [2, p. 140].

Modern science of public administration refers to these attributes, first of all, the fact that the army is a part of a particular society and accumulates the totality of its social, including political, relationships, directly depends on the nature and extent of political, economic and spiritual development of the country. The army acts as the derivative of the interests of this society, the power of the forces it represents. And in this respect it can act as an object of policy, the instrument (tool) of the policy, and under certain conditions it can turn into the subject of politics, to acquire an independent political activity.

The second important characteristic of the army as a political institution of public administration is its organic connection with the state. The army is the state organisation that embodies its social nature. It acts as an instrument of the state policy, the most important and quite acute state instrument of the political and military violence especially in the sphere of foreign policy. It is the state with its socio-political essence that determines the image of the army and its objectives. As an integral part of the political system, the army is determined by the nature of the existing government, the military policy of the ruling regime [1, p. 14].

The next essential characteristic of the army is its purpose. As a public institution it is designed to ensure the military security of the state, i.e., it is capable of waging the war in the name of achieving certain political goals. For this purpose, the army has the necessary number of troops, specific quantity and quality of equipment, definite level of professional training of the officers and the degree of training of the personnel. These characteristics turn it into an effective material means of the armed violence with the

monopoly on possession and use of weapons. The nature of the army's purpose as an instrument of armed violence is defined by the defense policy of the state.

An important feature that distinguishes the army not only from the majority of public authorities but also from its related structures (which also possess the weapons) law enforcement institutions (Ministry of Internal Affairs, National Security Agency) is the ability to conduct the offensive or defensive wars, independently solve strategic tasks. It is well known that the war is one of the most important social phenomena, being genetically the continuation of the policy of the ruling regime, it requires the mobilization of all forces and means to achieve victory over the enemy, in some cases jeopardizing the very existence of the state. Consequently, the army as the main subject of the war takes an exceptional position in the society and the public administration system and is also in need of the constant care and attention.

The characteristics of the army as a military organization designed to perform all forms of the armed violence against the political opponents allows specifying the contents of this category. In this case, we point out the state military organization – the Armed forces of Ukraine. Thus, only those institutions that have a direct relation to a war, armed struggle are included in the army – Armed forces. These include government, military associations, military units, military institutions, military-educational institutions.

The internal institutional structure of the army forms a set of objects of the military activities (military personnel, military units and teams) connected by the system of military-social relations. These are the essential characteristics of the army as a social organism, a specific political institution. Their consideration allows, and in this we agree with the position of modern scholars [3; 5], to come to some important conclusions and generalizations:

- the army is an institution of the state and not of the society as a whole, it is created and maintained by the state and is primarily a means of ensuring its security;
- the army has a considerable potential for violence, the basis of forceful methods of exercising the political power and therefore is always the object of critical attention of different political forces;

- quantitative and qualitative analysis of armament and organizational structure of a particular army can give a clear idea of the nature of both the foreign policy objectives of a particular state and domestic opportunities and trends in the development of the corresponding political regime;

- understanding and explanation of the essence of a particular army can be achieved by considering it through the prism of analysis of the nature, character and orientation of a particular political regime. The change of the political regime invariably entails a corresponding change in the roles and functions of the army, its place and role in the system of political power, and vice versa.

Conclusions of the research. Thus, the nature of the army, its social role and the mechanism of public administration are primarily manifested in its functions which can be defined as a set of system-forming relationships between the army and society that ensure the integrity of the society. The study of the army functions cannot be conducted in isolation, without taking into account the objectives of the political regime, the main core of which is the state that creates and maintains the army to solve its internal and external problems. The fact is that these functions are inherent in any institution including the state. The latter, implementing its purpose, creates special bodies, giving them a part of its functions which in relation to this public institution are attributive in nature, and express the meaning of its existence. Consequently, the functions of the army are not only in the full compliance with the definite functions of the state but in a dialectical relation with them.

References

1. Матюх М. Професійній армії в Україні бути // Військо України. - 2001.- №3-4.- С.13-15.

2. Юрьева Т.В. Новая роль ЕС на международной арене / Юрьева Т.В. и др. // Какими станут внутренние и внешние политики ЕС в результате вступления в силу Лиссабонского договора. -М.: Европейский учебный институт, 2009. -С. 135-144.

3. Baranets V. Lessons from Caucasus: One Year Later / Baranets V. //