

# State- Bureaucracy-National Security

Dr. Dr. Tryfon Ch. Korontzis

Rear Admiral of the Hellenic Coast Guard (ret)

Collaborating Teaching Personnel/Hellenic Open University

Programme Leader of Shipping and Maritime Studies, Metropolitan College (Hellas-Attica-Marousi)

<https://orcid.org/0009-0001-2494-0617>

**Abstract—Three of the most basic concepts and institutions that concerned and still concern all states are the State, Bureaucracy and National Security. These institutions are characterized by interactivity, but they are also the main body in each state, so that through their effective organization and operation, the main goals set by each government can be achieved, and at the same time, the maximum possible satisfaction of the citizens from their optimal functioning.**

The organization and operation of these institutions varies from state to state and from era to era, but in any case, over time, the ultimate goal is the optimal functioning of the state, both domestically and internationally, ensuring the interests that in each case are prioritized by the respective government. This study examines these concepts based on secondary sources and answers the question of what is the main role of the bureaucracy in a democratic state and who controls it.

**Keywords—State- Bureaucracy-National Security**

## 1. Introduction

Among the most important dimensions that determine at a high level the functioning of societies and more broadly of the state is the relationship between politics and bureaucracy. More specifically Weber elaborated the most important definitions of the modern state by emphasizing two characteristic elements of its history: territoriality and violence. The legitimacy of the newer state is based primarily on "legal authority," that is, adherence to a code of legal regulations. The officials of the newer state demand obedience because of the power they exercise by virtue of their office which the people generally support or accept. The administrative apparatus dominates among the institutions of the state: a vast network of organizations run by appointed officials. Although the dominance of officials is not inevitable, bureaucrats gain considerable power through their experience, information, and access to secrets. This power according to Weber can become "overwhelming". Politicians and political may find out that themselves dependent

The State and the bureaucracy that staffs its Services, in order for the first to function not only smoothly but also as constructively as possible for the citizens, contribute to the formation of the National Security policy, under the instructions and control of

popular sovereignty, such as this is expressed through elections with the choice of political leaders. An important part of the implementation of the National Security policy is entrusted to the Armed Forces of each country.

In this brief study, the concepts mentioned in the subject will be analysed while a brief reference will be made to the political control of the Armed Forces.

## 2. State

The state is the central space for the development, assurance and contribution to the reproduction of other social power relations, by which it is often determined, or is even dependent on them. At every stage of its historical development, it represents not only repression but also creation or production, at least for the dominant social group or class (Kotzias, 1993), (Kotzias, 2000), (Poulantzas, 1978).

The definitions for this decisive institution of modern society can be placed in four categories:

(A) the first defines the state based on its function within a system of social relations. It is the most widespread group in the non-conservative literature. The definitions belonging to it are limited to three functions: oppression, suppression and organizer of the system.

(B) the second includes all the cases that define the state on the basis of the relationship it has with society, and not having as a starting point the functions of the state. This group has many elements in common with the third (C) since it refers to the state's relationship with the dominant part of society and the role it plays,

(C) the third category is analogous to (B), with the only difference that its reference point is not society, but a class or social group – for the most part – the ruling class,

(D) the fourth category is summarized in the definitions that distinguish, as a more essential element, the process of organization and movement of state existence and activity, and finally

According to Kotzias Nikos "the state is a special set of institutions, mechanisms and activities, a totality that forms the peculiar doubling of society in the public sphere and in society. It is the main means of domination and directed reproduction of the oppositions of society, or otherwise of relations as the general will of society and seeks to implement the general needs in a way that serves the dominant

social portion. It is the lever for transforming economic sovereignty into politics. It implements political power through special mechanisms, which are organs of the social group it dominates, whose unity and alliances it ensures. The state, in other words, is the special institution that results from the doubling of society into state and society and transforms the dominance of a class (or social alliance) into a general will, legitimizes it and helps to secure its consent to it, thanks in the mechanisms it has and the functions it performs"(Kotzias, 1993, p.p. 92-93).

The state consists of institutions and mechanisms that have specific functions and are driven by civil servants. The way of co-articulation and the relations between them are the defining element of the internal structure of the state. The structure of the state is analysing into three levels. The first level is its horizontal structure. We refer to the structures of the central state apparatus, to the institutions and mechanisms at the central level, a level that is often understood as the state. The second is administrative decentralization, the structures of the state within the geographical area (e.g. regional governors, local government, etc.). A third way of analysing the structure of the state is to identify the internal administrative structure of its mechanisms and institutions.

The structure of the state is consisting by institutions that ensure its operation and presence in society, as well as the various decision-making centres in which the participants fulfil various state functions. At the top of the state structure are the institutions of supervision, direction, control and legislation of its orientation and execution of the relative decisions (President of the country, of the Government, the Council of Ministers, other governmental schemes, etc.). Great structures of the state are the bureaucratic mechanisms organized and directed by the ministries. Next to the political-bureaucratic structure, justice and its economic mechanisms play a big role in the fulfilment of its duties.

In normal circumstances, the main reason for the direction of the state is held by the government that arises from the Parliament which has been elected by the people/citizens. However, there are also cases where the government is formed following military coups by decisions of extra-parliamentary mechanisms, such as the army, secret services, etc.

The government directs the mechanisms of the state steadily but its direction does not have the same essential value and capabilities. It depends on the presence of two tendencies within the bourgeois state: one tendency is to shift the real power and the essential decision-making centre from the legally competent body, to its executive, within it, to institutions and bodies that are less visible, are subject i.e. less subject to the direct control of public opinion and which do not emerge directly from a direct electoral process. The second trend is the movement

from elected publicly transparent mechanisms to institutions that are as little accessible as possible to the dominated, that do not experience disturbances due to changes in the balance of power, or because this movement gives greater legitimacy and hypothetical objectivity to actions that they are usually coercive in nature.

The direction of the state implements the decisions through the state mechanisms, by passing the representative bodies. Thus the bureaucracy acquires the right to perform tasks that replace the role of elected bodies.

The function of the state is political, since the state is the political institution of society, the institution through which the economic power of a society is transformed into political sovereignty. With its political function and the basic repressive mechanisms it includes, the state implements sovereignty and adapts the dominant culture to the needs of the productive mechanism. According to Weber, the state is a monopoly operator of organized violence in the existing political relations.

The political function is the penetration of mechanisms, personnel, authoritarian methods of the state into social relations. Repressive mechanisms play an important role in the dominance of the ruling class. Their control by the respective government is important in the enforcement of its authority/power.

### 3. Bureaucracy

Bureaucracy<sup>1</sup> (Makrydimitris, 2002), (Serafetinidou, 2003), (Mouzelis, 2001) (Kotzias, 1993) constitutes a type of organization that prevailed in the modern era, it formed a general organizational and administrative "rule", which expressed and also greatly influenced the corresponding social behaviours in almost all areas of social action in the political, economic and cultural spheres.

The relationship between politics and bureaucracy is a relationship that has been thoroughly analysed. According to Weber, who is considered a classic on this subject, in a modern state a fully developed bureaucracy "always has the upper hand". What prevails in the entire area of public responsibility is the subordination of politics to the technical abilities of bureaucratic management. The confrontation between political leadership and bureaucratic technocracy is almost inevitable.

---

<sup>1</sup> Morstein Marx attributes the coining of the term bureaucracy to an 18th-century French minister of commerce, Vincent de Gournay. The first compound of the term (bureau) originally referred to the fabric with which the state official covered his/her work table and gave it the status of state or official authority. With the addition of the Hellenic origin of the second compound of the word, the term indicated the status of operation and sovereignty of the officials of this kind. In the Hellenic the term is attested from 1856.

The politician fights for his dominance not only in the parliamentary or electoral arena but also in the bureaucracy. The day-to-day exercise of power is in the hands of the bureaucracy. But the dominant role of the bureaucracy is to organize and not to guide. Modern bureaucracies have leadership but not leaders. Bureaucrats are supposed to be appointed to faithfully carry out the orders of the political leadership. They can indicate to the political leadership that their decisions are wrong, asymmetric, but in any case the orders should be carried out with accuracy. Government bodies like all other organizations in the private sector carry out orders given by leaders and staffs from a higher authority.

The organizational "rule" of bureaucracy exhibits the following general characteristics:

- A formally structured system of social behaviour in the public or business sphere, within the framework of which actions and responsibilities are defined in a clear and binding manner to achieve specific goals.
- In such a type of social organization answers a series or sequence of positions that are arranged in a hierarchical manner and are governed by a network of precise and binding rules and provisions.
- Power and control in this organizational system derives from the offices and jobs (the "offices") and does not belong to the natural person's executives or employees who hold them or occupy them for a certain period of time. Person's exercise their responsibilities within the framework of their formal roles, the content and nature of which are primarily determined by the organization, i.e. the rules and authority system that applies to it.
- The action of the persons who carry respective formal roles within the functioning of the bureaucratic organization is governed and characterized by formality and procedures that delimit with relative precision their behaviour and action in the organization. Thus, uncontrolled or arbitrary action is avoided or limited and certainty, objectivity and predictability are enhanced in the overall operation of the organization. And this regardless of likes, dislikes, favor or prejudice.
- This organization usually lasts for a long time, relies on its technical superiority over other pre-bureaucratic types of organization and achieves its results with stability and reliability.

Bureaucracy is a special form of organization, which corresponds to the legal-rational method of legitimization and is produced by the secularization of social life and the industrialization of the production process. Bureaucracy, as developed in the Weberian analysis, constitutes the truest form of concretization and exercise of legal authority. Bureaucracy is offered as a mechanism of power and is the most effective method of exercising control.

It constitutes a precision mechanism, which lends itself to many and multiple uses and in particular to

the effective execution and implementation of options or substantive decisions identified at the level of the political process.

According to one of the classic descriptions of the phenomenon, bureaucracy is nothing but the system of organization and administration by a certain category or class of officials, the "officials" and "bureaucrats", who also possess the necessary power, technical knowledge and possibilities. This system of governance delineates the political opposite of democracy, in the sense that the administration of bureaucrats is not subject to external forms of control and evaluation by the political process (parties, parliament, political leadership), pressure groups and courts. In its extreme form, this system leads to the decisive concentration of power and authority in bureaucratic organizations (administrative, business or even military type) and the maximization of their organizational autonomy with a corresponding reduction in the forms, methods and possibilities of external control and intervention.

The relationship between bureaucracy and politics, due to the possibility of accumulating specialized knowledge and technique within the bureaucracy, holds a position of strategic advantage in the process of shaping political or even social choices, e.g. in the specific application, but also in the preparation of public policy programs, which ensures a significant degree of autonomy vis-à-vis the political forces that in fact control and guide it. Defending the importance of state secrets is a distinct achievement of the bureaucracy, which fanatically defends this concept. Even in the face of the political control of the parliament, the bureaucracy puts forward a barrier of secrecy and opacity regarding its internal operation procedures. In these cases, the question arises, i.e. whether the bureaucracy is a means and a tool, or the one who decides and chooses in the final instance.

The latter from a theoretical point of view, a typology of relations and interactions between politics and bureaucracy can be distinguished. Specifically, when there is weak or ineffective political control over the bureaucracy, the latter tends to turn from a means and instrument for the implementation of policy, into an instrument of political dominance. Instead the governance being done by politics and bureaucracy, is done by bureaucracy without necessarily politics and politicians. The administrative system then widens the margins of its discretion, is neutralized by external controls and independently determines its course.

A typical example is the so-called "deep state" of the bureaucratic-military-diplomatic establishment in Turkey, it is often contrasted and contrasted with the more superficial state, i.e. the facade of the buried representative democracy and the precarious power of parties and transient governments. For historical reasons as well as idiosyncrasies, political power is shared between elected politicians (government, parties, etc.) but also unelected bodies, such as the



army, bureaucrats, diplomats, who determine important political and economic decisions of life.

Conversely, when political control is strong, then the bureaucracy tends to become dependent and subservient to politics, losing its own functional specificity and relative autonomy. The intermediate category of moderate political control and accommodation to that control by the bureaucracy is presented as an alternative strategy, perhaps better suited to the conditions of contemporary political life. The main method to rein in the bureaucracy's tendency to autonomy should, according to Weber, be sought in strengthening and qualitatively upgrading the institutions and processes of parliamentary control, so that the bureaucracy implements, as faithfully as possible, the real policies decisions and choices.

A strong and effective parliamentary process, according to Weber, contributes to the achievement of three goals: a) provides the institutional means for continuous control and the reduction of bureaucratic autonomy, b) is the natural field for the emergence of a responsible and capable political leadership that directs the bureaucracy and c) ensures the means and manner of control for effective accountability, i.e. consolidates the parliamentary responsibility of this political leadership.

A summary of the ideas of Weber, who along with Wilson and Taylor shaped management thought, is as follows:

- In the democratic system of government there must be a dominant centre of power so that the political society is governed in a manner consistent with the principle of popular sovereignty.
- The more diffused or fragmented political power is, the more difficult it becomes to ensure accountability and control in its exercise.
- The constitutional structure of a country determines the constitutional position, the emergence and constitution of the centres of political power and influence, as well as the procedure for enacting laws, formulating policy and controlling the administration concerned with its execution and implementation.
- The political process has the operational specialized role and competence to determine the tasks and mission of the public administration function, which must be outside the scope of political confrontation.
- The hierarchical structure and the corresponding structure of the professionally specialized administration and bureaucracy is a condition for its effective operation.
- In a system of democratic governance the elected representatives of the people must be in a state of absolute supremacy over the administration and the bureaucracy, precisely because they express

the popular sovereignty on which the whole architecture of representative democracy rests.

#### 4. National Security

National security is a term broader than foreign policy or national defence policy and is inextricably linked to territorial integrity and the defence of the vital and fundamental interests of a state (Liakouras, 2002) (Gikas, 2002) (Mposi, 1999). It is treated as an institution of public law, in the sense that it represents a certain regulatory field governed by rules of law and characterized by the coordinated operation of institutions of state power. The definition of national security depends on a number of factors. It raises the organized response to the threat, imposes the integration and coordination of individual responsibilities and operations, as well as activation of the country's potential. The determination of the threat to national security is assessed by the state and based on the current conditions, according to its perceptions of existing, immediate or potential threats to its sovereignty, integrity and peace.

It includes rules and state functions, related to the country's international position and defence. It constitutes a multi-level institution of public policy, which is constituted in external and internal dimensions. It contrasts, however, with the internal Public Order based on an operational criterion: while the Public Order concerns the smooth functioning of the internal legal order, as determined by the Constitution and the applicable law, National Security has as its object the position of the Country in the international environment, which in addition to bilateral relations also includes participation in institutions and organizations of international law.

Today the threat is not only associated with war in its traditional form. But new concepts have entered national security, such as terrorism, organized crime, asymmetric threats, weapons of mass destruction etc. The threat defines the relations of each state with other states, and also its attitude towards the international community. Dealing with threats is the responsibility of the political authority, so there is a need to be organized a special government body. National security is essentially high strategy and is understandably addressed at the highest political level.

It requires the coordination of political, economic, social and military forces against existing or potential external or internal threats that endanger the integrity and peace of the state. The participation of the military in matters that do not belong to national defence is also considered necessary (the participation of the military depends on the defined national objectives, the nature of the threats and the respective policy field).

National security is thus intertwined with international and universal situations, which establish an international legal order and establish an international system of mutual collective security.

Therefore, threats to national security are not limited only to threats against the independence and integrity of the country, but also to threats against the international security system, the disruption of which gives birth to an international criminality, capable of shaking a safe and legal international environment. They are broader than the concept of defence.

National security is linked to threats, in internal or from abroad when they originate. From this point of view, National Security, as an institution of Public Law, combines the distinction between internal and external sovereignty. It aims to protect the country in the international environment.

From what has been mentioned, arises that national security is an issue that falls under the responsibilities between government agencies. Naturally, the need arises for the creation of a coordinating and governmental body that will assist the prime minister or president in the exercise of his/her duties. At the same time, this body should have relative autonomy and flexibility. This is how the birth of an institution is observed with the institutionalization of the National Security Council. This institution is observed in countries such as Israel, USA, Turkey, etc.

The concept of national security includes the planning and control of the day-to-day activity of international relations, the collection and processing of information, the formulation and manipulation of policy. A necessary element of the organization of national security is the controlling role of the political power over the entire potential of the state, the army, the national defence, the repressive forces, as well as the close cooperation between the political and official leadership of the involved foreign and defence agencies and mainly the army.

The definition and distribution of the responsibilities of the competent bodies regarding the formulation and implementation of the national security policy is provided for by the Constitution of each country and is specified by its legislation. Decisions are made by the government depending on the system of government of each state. In states that follow the system of presidential democracy, the main decision-making body is the president of the republic. In parliamentary democracies the main body is the prime minister through the competent ministers.

The Constitution contains basic principles for the defence of National Security, which arise from the network of relevant provisions. In particular, the defence of National Security is governed by the following main principles:

A) the principle of international peace of the state and

B) the principle of political control of the armed forces.

In particular, the political-democratic control of the armed forces is a fundamental principle of every

democratic state. It means that the armed forces constitute a service of the state, which is governed by the general rules of organization and operation of state services, which apply in the context of democratic legitimacy. The armed forces, just like the rest of the public services, are managed by the Government.

The political-democratic control of the armed forces is standardized in the following legal data:

- Defence policy and the role of the armed forces are determined by Government decisions.

- The action and operation of the armed forces is under uninterrupted and continuous parliamentary control.

- The financing of the armed forces is approved by the Parliament and implemented based on the State budget.

- The leadership of the armed forces is chosen by the Government or by official bodies in which the majority are politicians.

- The country's intelligence services and the secret operations related to their activities are under the absolute control of the Government and its parliamentary responsibility.

- Members of uniformed staff who serve as judicial officers in the criminal justice of the armed forces must enjoy guarantees of independence and impartiality.

In contrast to the political-democratic control of the armed forces in Turkey in the past for example, the military used to operate in condition of sovereignty against any institutionalized control, and in fact used to dictate policy to a large extent regarding National Security [see former article 118 of the Law of Turkey which refers to the operation of the National Security Council].

## Conclusions

The political-democratic control of the armed forces (Alivizatos, 1987) which constitute bureaucracy, is a fundamental principle of every democratic state. The Armed Forces constitute a service of the state which is governed, despite the necessary particularities, by the general rules of organization and operation of state services that apply within the framework of democratic legitimacy, and contribute to the maximum extent to the formation of the National Security policy.

The control of the country's defence equipment, the strict hierarchy and discipline of the uniformed personnel do not advocate "one" exception to the existing constitutional order. The armed forces, like the rest of the public services, are managed by the Government and under the control of the Parliament and the Courts. The necessary and appropriate restriction on the exercise of certain individual rights within the framework of the armed forces takes place

only under the conditions permitted by the Constitution as have been mentioned before.

The key question in a political system is always who controls the bureaucracy: the elected politician or the appointed official? The answer for Weber is obvious: in general, the person most likely to impose his views in the long term is the permanent official rather than his/her supposed superior, i.e. the parliamentary minister who is not an expert.

According to Weber the solution to the encroachment of bureaucracy was the existence of a prudent and effective leadership. That is why he supported the establishment of a strong parliamentary polity that would help in this direction. A weak parliamentary system prevented those with leadership qualities from assuming political responsibilities. Instead it encouraged demagogues and mediocrity interested only in petty politics and clientele. A strong parliament facilitates the emergence of a political different type.

What matters in politics as elsewhere is the activation of a small number of persons at the top. In any case, the formation of an oligarchy in any organized, collective effort is inevitable. Therefore, what plays a primary role in this case is the quality of the people who make up this oligarchy. Weber claimed that bureaucratic organization is necessary and above all inevitable because of the rationality it fosters and promotes.

### References

1. Alivizatos, N. (1987), The Constitutional Position of the Armed Forces: I. The Principle of Political Control, Athens-Komotini, A. Sakkoulas, pp. 33 and next
2. Gikas, V. (2002), National Security and Crisis Management - The Institutional Approach, Part One, National and European Security and Crisis Management, Athens, Ant. Sakkoulas pp. 17-58
3. Kotzias, N. (1993), State and Policy, THE DIALECTIC OF THE STATE, Athens, Nea Synora – A.A. Livani, pp. 73-99
4. Kotzias, N. (2000), The Active Democratic State, Athens, Kastaniotis, 2000, pp. 20-24
5. Liakouras, P. (2002), The Organization of National Security: The American National Security Council (NSC) and the proportional application of its model as an advisory body under the Hellenic prime minister, Part Two, National and European Security and Crisis Management, Athens, Ant. Sakkoulas, pp. 66-85
6. Makridimitris, A. (2002), Approaches to the Theory of Organizations, Athens, Kastaniotis, 2002, pp. 39-150
7. Mouzelis, N. (1991), Organization and Bureaucracy, Athens, Sakkoulas

8. Mposi, M. (1999), Security Issues in the New World Order, Athens, Papazisi, pp. 23-34

9. Poulantzas, N. (1978), The State, Power, Socialism, Athens, Themelio, 1978, pp. 13-75, 143-182.

10. Serafetinidou M. (2003), The Phenomenon of Bureaucracy, Athens, Gutenberg, pp. 159-306