

Managerial Relations and the Subjects. Executive Government

Malkhaz CHAKHNASHVILI*

Abstract

Social relationships and everyday interactions among individuals, natural and legal persons are held with the help of different types of social management. Variety of social management is based on the classifications of managerial relations. Executive government with its system, indications and prescribed obligations is very important, but only one type of state government. In modern Georgia administrative law state government and executive activity of state bodies have identical essence, because in both cases it concerns with managerial interactions between subjects of law. Government (management) is the method of achievement of final goals, used by every branch of state authorities to regulate, carry out and protect social relations by means of laws and by-law.

Key words: Managerial relations, system of management, state government, executive government, subjects of executive government.

Social management, as a social-political phenomenon exists everywhere, when even two persons have to act reciprocally for achievement of common task and is carried out with the help of managerial systems. A state is the largest managerial system, while a family or group of friends, consisting of two individuals are the smallest one. In spite of their scale managerial systems of any size have similar structure and indications. But they differ from each other with their sphere of activity and legal status. Universal character of the managerial systems underlies its classifications, while differences among them predetermine their types.

Every managerial system has a mission of putting in order certain types of managerial social relations, which have different sphere of operation, sources of legal regulation and types of inter-coordination. Relationship among individuals bears managerial character and is carried out with the help of managerial system. Classification of social management is based on the variety of managerial systems derived from multifariousness of social interactions.

Direct connection between the classifications of social relations and social management is evidently clear, but if we compare them, we find, that they do not coincide with each other completely.

The theory of administrative law knows many types of classifications of legal relations, but first, we have to define some specific features of managerial relations and those, which are common for all types of social relations.

In the juridical literature social relations, which take place in the sphere of state government are defined as administrative-legal relations. But state government is only one type (but very important) of social management and its indications do not reflect completely the whole range of features of the social

management, which is wider and more significant phenomenon, including an operation of all types of managerial systems. In scientific literature next features of managerial relationship are indicated:

- one of the side of these relations must be the subject of administrative authorities (state body or public officer);
- managerial relations appear on the initiative of (1) one side, (2) third side or (3) against the will of the side of interaction;
- any dispute can be resolved in administrative order or by the court;
- in case of breaching of the order of behavior established in the sphere of state government may cause juridical responsibility for offender.

All above mentioned characteristics deals with state government, but for social management they are somehow limited, i.e.:

- subject of management may belong not only to the executive bodies, but to any branch of authorities as well as to none of them, because social government covers an activity of the whole state apparatus and takes place among citizens;
- a dispute or conflict in some kind of managerial system, like public organization or family can be resolved on the ground of corporative rules, moral rules and traditions. In this case, offender is responsible to the certain subject of managerial system (i.e. director or father), but not to the state body and its officer.

In juridical literature there's no agreed position concerning with the classifications of managerial relations. We can distinguish two main conceptions. In accordance with the first managerial relations:

- appear during the process of management;
- state body is an obligatory subject of these relations;
- these types of social relations are based on the principals of powership and submission and is characterized with juridical inequality of the sides.

Origin of this conception goes back to the twenties of last century. V. Kobalevski divided public and private law and said: "In private law both sides of legal relations have equal rights, but in public law on the one hand we have state body and on another citizen.... Law gives priority to the first, so called "active subject" in their relations with citizens, because citizens mostly act in compliance with their interests. This difference between active subject and citizen is reflected perfectly in his ability to exercise state powership with the help of unilateral orders and decrees, administrative coercion and exclusive legal protection" (V.I.Kobalevski "Субъекты правовых отношении" М.1927.р.107). This concept was developed by U.Kozlov, who said: "Administrative law regulates social relation, which take place during managerial process and is characterized with inequality of the sides, when one obeys to another. That's why, administrative regulation deals with powerful-decreeing method and managerial relations are relations of powership and submission" (U.M.Kozlov "Административно-правовые отношения" М. 1982 p. 41).

The second concept appeared in 50th of the last century because of critical analysis of the first one and determined that administrative relation:

1. Appear in the sphere of state government;
2. May take place among all subjects of administrative law;
3. Proceed from the comparison of rights and duties of the sides, relations are

divided into two groups:

- a) relations, where one side is submitted to another;
- b) relations, where sides are not submitted to each other.

At first sight, distinction on the first point does not exceed the bounds of terminological problematic, because terms: “**sphere**” and “**process**” frequently are considered as identical. “**Process**” deals with an activity of state bodies and corresponding managerial relations cannot arise outside of this phenomenon and without participation of state bodies. The terms “**sphere**” is used with wider sense and indicates that managerial relations arise not only in the process of operation of the state bodies, but also in the sphere of the administrative relationships.

This conception does not cover all types of managerial relations. As we already mentioned above, managerial relations appear during the process of activity of all subjects of social government. Every legal and natural (physical) person, which carries out the functions of the subject or object of managerial system, can be one side of these relations.

As to the problem of subordination and equality in rights, interconnection between the sides may have different character both in the sphere of social and state government. Of course, interactions between subject and object of managerial system as well as between managerial systems of different level have inter-subordinated character, but relations among the object of management (i.e. among public officials of the same organization) and managerial systems of the same level (i.e. between two ministries) mostly are equal in rights.

In spite of these distinctions, social management and state government have common indications. One of them is **authoritative** character of managerial relations that implicates a submission of an object of management to the subject. It is the most important indication of managerial relations.

In juridical theory and practice, clear views on authoritative relations with juridical inequality of the sides have been formulated. So, we have to remind you about powerful character of law. Proceed from the nature of social government we must underlie an existence of the subject of management with priority of his will in managerial relations. This will has a clear purpose to arrange object's activity with the help of orders, decrees and commands. Interactions of this type can be determined with the formula: “**Authority submission**”.

A government (management) naturally conforms to a powership. Every branches of state authority exercise a powership. That does why latter bear an authoritative character. Authority is a general feature for all types of social relations, regulated by legal rules. Powership is the certain instrument regulating managerial process and the will of its participants. Management always implicates participants' obedience to the common managerial will.

Another indication of managerial relations is its **organizational** character. Organizational activity is a fundamental feature of all types of social management and deals with arrangement, putting in order and unification. Authority tries to unite and arrange joint activity of the members of society. The same organizational influence is exercised by public, religious and business organizations with the help of their managerial bodies. So, **authority** is the next indication.

Interconnection between rights and duties underlies classification of

managerial relations, but we think that types of relations can be distinguished on the ground of other indications, like: **social rules, used for the regulation of certain relations** (legal, public-corporative, religious, private informal relations), **legal status** (formal, official relations, carried out by official managerial systems like the state, ministry, party, family and informal, unofficial relations, carried out by informal managerial systems like unofficial political party, group of friends and etc), **place of arising of relations** (internal managerial relations and external managerial relations), **nature of interests of both sides** (public managerial relations and private managerial relations), **operation in time** (relations for defined term and relations for indefinite term), **juridical character of interactions** (vertical managerial relations and horizontal managerial relations).

Majority of managerial relations are of vertical type and are held among mutually subordinated subjects (V.Loria საქართველოს ადმინისტრაციული სამართალი, Tbilisi 2002, p.42). They reflect an essence of managerial regulation and subordinated links. It is what we call powership relations. They arise between mutually subordinated sides that exempt any equality in rights among them like it is in civil law. But mutual subordination must not be understood formally. Verticality means, that one side has authoritative competence, while another does not have it at all (i.e. citizen) or competence is limited (i.e. subordinated organ). In vertical relations subjects of management realize its managerial influence.

First of all, this kind of legal connections is typical for state government in spite of some reformation caused by transition of society to free market relations, when objects of government get more and more operative independence. Nevertheless, authority is authority, hence, an authority of subject, which is realized in managerial relations, doesn't lose its juridical-authoritative nature.

The practice of social management defines next indications of vertical relations:

a) Priority of the view on inequality in rights of both sides; concentration of juridical- authoritative power in the hand of managing side; impossibility for the object to govern such subject;

b) Inequality of both sides logically implies an obedience of one side (object of management) to the will of another side (subject of management);

c) Submission is not always clearly expressed. For example: citizen or commercial structure is not always directly subordinated to the subjects of executive power. State institutions mostly are not structurally subjected to the supervisory bodies;

d) When we talk about submission (obedience), we have to take into consideration first of all organizational submission as key characteristic of the managerial vertical and is reflected in the features of connections between upper and lower bodies;

e) Vertical type of relations often take place between non-subjected sides as well. But even in this case, one side has right to issue juridical act, which is obligatory for opposite side, especially in case of functional management. Here we have specific type of submission **coordinative submission**;

f) Controlling supervisory activity is widely used in government where subjects of relations are the side of these relations. For example: administrative supervising, which is carried out by special supervisory bodies. Supervisory powers bears juridical-authoritative nature and covered non-subordinated objects. Here we have one more type of submission-**controlling - supervisory submission**;

g) In accordance with the law in force, subjects of power have right to use their juridical-authoritative will to the citizens, public and business organizations, which are not subordinated to them;

h) In spite of variety of submissions they have the same basic indication - inequality of sides. Submission is logic result of unequal state of those, who manage and those, who is managed;

i) The most important indication of verticality of relations and inequality of the sides is that all vertical relations express juridical dependence of one side on another, that is predetermined by concentration of corresponding power in the hand of subject;

Horizontal managerial relations are those, where sides are legally equitable. In this case one can not find juridical-authoritative will of one side, which is obligatory for another. These types of relations are not widespread, but possibility of their appearance really exists. Equality of sides somehow contradicts an essence of managerial relations, but we must take into the consideration next conditions, that create a possibility of arising of horizontal relations:

a) real juridical equality of the sides, which is possible if they belong to one and the same legal level and there's not any form of subordination;

b) existence of both above mentioned conditions, because absence of mutual subordination does not mean always juridical equality;

c) absence of managerial and juridical will between the sides.

Managerial practice defines, that next managerial relations can be classified as horizontal:

a) Relations, anticipating managerial influence as pre-condition of vertical relations. In practice they create necessary conditions for authorized decisions. These are connections, which take place between the sides of one and the same legal level. For example: relation dealing with enacting of joint normative act or carrying out of joint and coordinated measures;

b) Relations, which appear just after carrying out of managerial influence and create condition for accomplished of authorized decision (i.e. creation of joined commission);

c) Administrative-procedural relations, dealing with resolving of legal dispute (i.e. any case of administrative offence);

d) Relations, dealing with administrative agreements, which have character of different agreements.

Beside vertical and horizontal managerial relations in juridical literature we can distinguish **basic** and **non-basic, subordinate** and **coordinative** relations are distinguished.

Basic relations directly reflect an essence of management, while non-basic

relations have some connections with the essence, but they do not reflect them directly. The first type belongs to relations, which must be define with a formula: “**order-execution**” or “relations between upper and lower bodies and public officials, between state bodies and citizens”.

The second group of relations (subordinative and coordinative) has the function of assistance to the main principal group of relations. The meaning of the first is clear: they are based on authority of the subjects of government, while “coordinative” relations deal with an absence of authority in relations with non-subjected bodies. But in different types (classifications) of social management coordinative relations have different characteristics. In the state government coordination has authoritative character. For example, the Government coordinates activity of local authorities with the help of corresponding governmental normative acts. But in this case, coordination again has authoritative character; while in other types of social management coordination have character of interaction and collaboration.

Basic and subordinative relations obviously have identical signs with vertical relations, as well as non-basic and coordinative - with horizontal relations. So, we can acknowledge vertical and horizontal relation as the most important types of social managerial relations, which ensure purposeful collaboration among people. We can conclude that social management is the method of interconnection or interaction for achievement of agreed purposes. It is the method of reproduction of economical, administrative-political, social-cultural and spiritual spheres and transmission of corresponding values from generation to generation. It is a system of independent social institutions and relations, which create condition for self-realization of individuals and groups of people or satisfaction of private and collective requirements and interests. These requirements and interests are defined with the help of such institutions as family, religion, educational system, scientific, professional or other types of organizations and associations.

In Georgian and Russian juridical literature state government is considered as **the form and type of activity** of the certain group of state bodies.

Is it correct to acknowledge government (management) only as an activity of state authority, as a form of realization of authority№

Government really looks as a type of state activity, as well as the form of realization of state functions, because it deals with the actions of the subject of law. **We think that government (administration, management), as subject's influence on the object of management is a universal method of achievement of such common goals, as adoption, execution and protection of law and concerns with legislative, executive and judicial activity.**

We can put a simple question: **can any legislative, executive or judicial body accomplish their tasks without government?** Answer is clear: **of course, no!** **Therefore, government is an universal function of the state and at the same time, a method of realization of this function.**

Any type of state activity consists of **decision, realization (execution) and control**. State apparatus is created and functions on the same basis. Accomplishment of the tasks and functions of the state cause the “distribution of labor” inside of state mechanism. We mean an establishment of legislative,

executive and judicial bodies. Each of them is a certain form of realization of the state authority and is going to carry out this or that kind of activity. For example, legislative bodies solve the most important problems of a state and society with the help of enacted laws, while executive and judicial bodies are engaged in realization and protection of adopted laws and by-laws.

The place and role of above-mentioned bodies in the mechanism of “distribution of labor”, is evidently clear. They are characterized with general principals, forms and methods of activity, as well as, with their own specific indications. For executive bodies we can indicate such functions of such, as **execution or executive activity (accomplishment of law and by-laws)**. Managerial principals, forms and methods are an instrument of carrying out of these functions. We can name this form of state activity as **executive government**. Under this term, we mean, from one hand, certain type of state activity and concrete purpose of subject of law and from another hand such instrument of accomplishment of this purpose, as “**government**”. It is undisputable fact, that each body of executive authority is a system of management with its subject, object and connections between them. Government (management) is the functional indication and obligation of executive body. Nevertheless, government is clear characteristic of all types of state body. Nor legislative, nor executive or judicial organ can accomplish their tasks without managerial intercourses between subject and object of management. **Government is not a type of activity of certain group of authority, but systematic method of accomplishment of tasks and goals, faced to every type of state bodies.** This method bears systematic character, because it may be carried out only with the help of managerial system. Such indications of managerial system, as organizational character of activity, mutual submission between subject and object, are perfect and universal method for purposeful actions of natural and legal persons.

Limitation of the state government with a form of state activity is serious mistake in administrative law of Georgia. **Goals are achieved by government and this method is overwhelming.** Though the concept of social management is wider, than of state government, but latter involves not only executive activity, but all spheres of life.

Executive government is a type of state government. It has concrete function to provide everyday activity of those bodies, which are known in juridical literature, as the bodies of state government. The most important and remarkable indication of executive managerial activity is **executive-ordering character** of actions. Execution (realization of laws and by-laws) is realized by using of authoritative power in the form of oral or written orders and different types of legal acts adopted by themselves.

As we already mentioned above, executive government, as a type of state activity, has its own and common indications, principals, forms and methods like any subject of state authority.

General analysis of executive government is impossible without determination of those persons (both, natural and legal), who are authorized with rights and duties in legal relations. Traditionally, in this case, we have to use the term “**subject**”, but we meet with certain difficulties. Concept of “**subjects of**

executive government” has different meaning, than the definition of “ **subject of legal relations**”, known from the theory of law. Subject of executive government is not only a side of managerial relations, but first of all, it is a physical or legal person, who is authorized with the state power in the sphere of executive government. At the same time, physical persons, like citizens, aliens and persons without citizenship, as well as public organizations cannot be considered as the subjects of executive government, because they do not have necessary authoritative powership. We think, that a concept of “ **subject of executive managerial relations**” is wider, than concept of “ **subject of executive government**”, because involves all physical and legal persons, as participants of managerial relations, like executive bodies, their officials, public organizations, citizens, aliens and persons without citizenship.

Usually, in accordance with their legal status in state government, natural persons take a part of an object of government in managerial relations. Georgian legislation enables them with remarkable extend of rights in the sphere of state government, but their intercourses with the bodies of executive power and its officials has subordinated character (there is an exception, when a state authorized them with necessary rights for the short period of time ,i.e. public patrol in emergency state or detaining of offender at the place of crime in accordance with the article 143 of Criminal Proceeding Code of Georgia).

Managerial powership of **public officials** of the bodies of executive power is wider, than those of natural persons. These figurants of executive government carry out executive activities by executive competence, because without their facilities each body of executive authority is a nominal system of governing. However, as the subjects of executive government we can consider only those public officials, who are engaged in the bodies of executive branch. These are public officials of budgetary bodies. A list of them is given in the law “on Public Service” of 1997:: Georgian governmental bodies and their units; the state representatives of the President of Georgia and their apparatus; legislative and executive bodies of autonomous republics of Abkhazia and Adjara; local bodies of government and self-government, city halls, municipalities and so on. So, the state-political functionaries, public officers, auxiliary and part-time staff officials of executive bodies, who are appointed or elected on the staffs, are engaged in executive activity. Extend of their managerial competence depends on the occupied position in the hierarchy of executive power, as well as, on the belonging to the category of representatives of authorities. Latter fact enables operative personnel of public officials with necessary competence. Consequently, **the Prime-Minister, State Ministers and Ministers of Georgia their deputies, legal persons of public law, leadership of Governmental bodies of autonomous republics and their departments, representatives of the President and public officers, employed in these organs carry out completely functions of the subjects of executive government.** As to the auxiliary and part-time staff officers **they are subjects of executive managerial relations and not of executive government**, because their activity does not arise any juridical consequences. Their legal status is almost similar with a legal status of citizens, but not identical. Legal status of any kind of public officials is wider, than those a citizen because of

the character of their activity.

Among the state-political functionaries we must specify the President of Georgia, as a public official of great importance. In accordance with the article 69 of the Constitution of Georgia his managerial competence is somehow limited, because he is not formally the Head of executive branch of state authority, but if we analyze his real competence in this sphere, we can make sure, that he remains as highest official and head of executive power because he is entitled to appoint the Prime-Minister and affirm an appointment of the Ministers, to resign Georgian Government and the Ministers of Defense and Internal Affairs, to receive a resignation of the Government, member of Government, other officials, to give a consent to the Government on the presentation of the draft state budget in the Parliament, to enact Decree in the sphere of budget and taxation, to hold up or revoke and cancel those normative acts, which contradict to the Constitution of Georgia, International Treaties, Laws of Georgia and Decrees of the President, is a chairman of Supreme Council of Justice of Georgia, is the Supreme Commander-in Chief of Georgian military forces.

This enumeration of presidential competence is not full, but they are so important for the normal functioning of the Georgian state and executive authority, that in spite of formal limitation in his rights the President of Georgia reminds as the Head of executive power.

The main subject of executive government and executive managerial relations is executive body or organization, whose operation concerns with economic, administrative-political, cultural construction in the country. In codification practice of Georgia recently is used such terms, as: "executive body", "managerial body", "governmental organization". First two of them have identical meaning and is used in the law "on the Local Government and Self-Government".

Despite the name, in Georgian administrative law a concept of a body of government is identified with administrative body. But, such important juridical document as General Administrative Code of Georgia exceeds the bounds of generally accepted concept of a body of government, by giving next definition of administrative body: "as all state and local bodies of government and self-government, which carries out public legal proxy on the ground legislation in force"(!). However, public legal proxies are exercised not only by executive, but by legislative and judicial bodies too. **It means that Parliament, court, and sakrebulo are administrative bodies or bodies of state government too.** This is extended concept of administrative bodies, accidentally made by Parliament, than generally adopted identity of the concepts of administrative and managerial bodies in Georgian administrative law. We are sure, that for identification of executive body it is necessary to use such term, which should reflect its functional purpose among other bodies of state apparatus. It can be "**an executive body**", because it indicates exactly to which branch of state power it belongs, but the term "**government**" can not be recognized as the ground for distinguishing of the big part of state bodies. Every organ of legislative, executive and judicial branch of power is a managerial system with subject and objects of government. The President and Government of Georgia, Ministry or Department, University or military unit first of all are executive bodies characterized with such specific

indication, as **“an accomplishment (exercising) “of adopted laws and by-laws, while “government”, which is general indication, rule and method of activity for every type of state bodies.**

Concerning with local bodies of government and self-government we think, that the terms **“Local Executive Body” or “Executive body of Sakrebulo”** may be used for identification of local executive power. Municipalities, Gamgeoba are local executive organs with different quantity of independence from central authorities. They accomplish decisions both central and local authorities. As to the supreme and central executive bodies we can identify them with the help of such terms, as: **“Governmental body”, “Supreme, High and Regional body of Executive Government”, “Central spherical (interspherical) body of Executive Government”.**

Taking into consideration presented conception (and on this stage of research) we can define the President of Georgia - as **“Supreme body of executive government”,** the Prime-Minister, Government and state chancellery of Georgia as **“High bodies of executive government»,** the Ministries of Georgia and autonomous republics as **“spherical (interspherical) central bodies of executive government of Georgia and of Autonomous Republics of Abkhazia and Adjara”,** the Representatives of the President of Georgia in regions as **“Regional bodies of executive government”,** municipalities, Gamgeoba as **“Local executive bodies” or “Executive bodies of local self-government” or “Executive bodies of sakrebulo”.**

How can we distinguish executive body (body of executive government) from other state bodies. Administrative law determines next indications:

- a) Executive-ordering character of activity;
- b) Organizational Character of activity;
- c) Defined tasks of a body;
- d) Uninterrupted and cyclic character of activity;
- e) Competence (rights and obligations), granted by laws or by-laws.

Executive-ordering character of activity is the basic sign of executive body. We already mentioned several times, that accomplishment of laws and by-laws, their practical fulfillment are the main functions of executive body in the state mechanism. Prof. V.Loria was quite right, saying, that: **“execution is an indication of all state bodies, however, for managerial body it is a priority”** (V.Loria საქართველოს ადმინისტრაციული სამართალი, Tbilisi 2003, p.99). At the same time, we cannot agree with him, that execution is reflected in government. If internal systematic activity is meant aren't legislative or judicial organs using a government (subordinational intercourse) to achieve their purposes.№

Ordering character of activity is necessary indication for executive body. Nor Constitution, nor law can regulate completely all problems of management. That's why the President, Prim-Minister, Minister, local leaders and heads of organizations have right to adopt and enact normative or individual legal acts, to give obligatory orders to subjected objects. This right is derived from authoritative character of executive body and has an aim to solve current managerial problems

and react on each fact of breaching of rules in the sphere of state government. Written or oral acts are imperative and one-side decisions of authorized subjects. They have one purpose – solution of the certain problem with the help of different type of individual and normative legal acts.

Organization or regulatory impact is a general indication of a social management and it's not strange, that an activity of executive body is also characterized with this indication. It should be impossible for a body to realize its own function without arrangement of interactions between the subject and objects of management, without regular influence on them having a single purpose – to solve all tasks, faced to it with the highest effectiveness. In the theory of management organization is accepted as a common function of managerial system, but it is more, than one of ordinary functions. Organization is necessary to every function, like analysis, accomplishment of a decision, control and so on. That's why, “organization” is an indication of social management and not only a function of the managerial system. Every executive-ordering body is established in order to solve certain tasks, which are logically predetermined by entire context of existence and activity of the state and society. As we know, purposefulness is a significant indication of social management. “A **task** of a managerial body is its main purpose, carried out by managerial forms and methods”. Tasks of a certain body have to be a part of purposes of upper bodies and a part of the goals of whole sphere of government. Each task is predetermined by the functions of a body and by those problems, which have to be solved during current activity. A task is a plan of achievement of the purpose and can be a tactical, current, perspective and strategic. There's not any body, which can carry out its function and achieve purposes, without defined tasks and methods of accomplishment.

Executive body carries out his functions **uninterruptedly**. It operates while there is a managerial function. Moreover, a certain body can be liquidated, but its functions have to be transmitted to another body or to a new organ, established instead of old one. Existence of executive functions ensures permanent character of activity of executive bodies accomplished in cyclic order. Continuous managerial activity is divided into **cycles**. Each of these cycles contains some stages: uncovering of the problem; collection of corresponding information and their analysis, concerning the problem; preparation of several draft decisions and selection of the best one; organization of accomplishment of adopted decision (with its own stages) and supervising (control) of this process. At the very moment of finishing of one cycle next is starting.

Operation of executive body is impossible without its authoritative **competence**. Executive-ordering actions and the functions cannot be realized if a subject of state government is not enabled with lawful power, established by the state. For example, police cannot maintenance a public peace if it does not have a lawful right to use variety of compulsory measures or issue different types of acts. However, these rights must bear authoritative character. Namely, an extend of authoritative competence is the factor, which distinguishes executive bodies, their officers from other subjects of state government, like public and religious organizations, citizens, aliens and persons without citizenship. The competence of executive body is determined by normative acts. A body does not have right to

exceed the frame of granted competence, except of the state of urgent necessity.

Conclusion

Despite the fact, that in Georgian and post-soviet juridical literature activity of executive bodies is acknowledged as a state government, we can conclude that a state government is an instrument of realization of legislative, executive and judicial functions. It is a general function of the state and covers both internal and external functions. Every type of state activity consists of decision making, execution (accomplishment) and controlling on the process of realization. State apparatus is created and functioning on the same ground. Groups of bodies, called **“Bodies of executive government”** occupy certain place in it. They carry out basic function accomplishment of the laws and by-laws with the help of managerial principals, forms and methods. **“Executive government” is the type of state activity, concerning with execution (accomplishment) and the method of realization of this activity. Government (management) is a systematic method of accomplishment of the goals, faced to executive bodies and purposeful behavior of natural and legal persons.**