EXPERIENCE OF DEVELOPED COUNTRIES IN PUBLIC SECTOR MANAGEMENT IN THE ECONOMY

Toshpulotov A.A.
Russian-Tajik Slavonic University, Tajikistan

Annotation. The study of the experience of state participation in the economic development of the advanced countries of the world is interesting and informative in itself. At the moment, the acute problem of our state is its role in the economic system. There is also a serious problem – the development of its market and the expansion of the economy. In all economic systems, the state regulates the economy. Such regulation in the modern market economy is carried out on a much smaller scale than in the administrative-command system. Nevertheless, even here the economic role of the state is great. The article deals with such concepts as the public sector and state ownership, as well as the experience of developed countries in managing the public sector in the economy.

Key words: public sector, public administration.

In addition to the state's participation in the economy as a regulatory force, it also acts as an independent economic entity – this is the so-called public sector.

Usually in the literature, the public sector is understood as a complex of objects of state property, i.e. objects belonging to the state. This interpretation of the public sector gives grounds for identifying it with state property [2, p. 37].

Currently, various interpretations of the concept co-exist in regulatory acts and law enforcement practice of economic management "the state sector of the economy". In accordance with the most complete the definition of the attitude towards him of the state unitary enterprise (the right of economic management and operational management) government agencies, business companies (open joint-stock company) with a share of state ownership, more than 50% of the share capital, as well as open joint stock companies with state participation, in which the state has the right on the "Golden shares" [3].

The concepts of "public sector" and "state property" do not coincide in our understanding. On the one hand, the public sector includes not only enterprises based on state ownership, but also economic societies where the relations between the participants are regulated by mandatory rights. In addition to the ownership relations arising from the ownership, use and disposal of State-owned unitary enterprises, in the public sector there are relations concerning the participation of the State in the management of share capital, which are governed by the rules of the law of obligations, and not by property rights. On the other hand, there are public facilities that are not directly related to the public sector.

The current state of public sector management indicates that there is no specific mechanism for managing State-owned enterprises. The real situation of unitary enterprises is no different from the situation of economic entities in the private sector. Their relations with the state are limited to the transfer of tax payments to the budget (and for state-owned enterprises-additional payments from profits).

The management system of joint-stock companies with a predominant share of the state in the total number of voting shares does not allow to identify there are no significant differences between the position of the state-shareholder and private shareholders, since the property rights of the state-shareholder are regulated in the general order by the norms of the legislation on joint-stock companies [1].

The nature of the interaction between the state and state-owned enterprises currently corresponds to the nature of its interaction with private enterprises. At the same time, a significant part of state-owned enterprises will need state assistance for a long time, and in this regard, it is necessary to interfere in their activities according to certain rules.

It is obvious that the management methods of state unitary enterprises and corporations with a predominant voting share of the state should be different. In our opinion, special attention should be paid to the creation and functioning of state-controlled holdings and financial and industrial groups as the most promising and viable structures whose activities will ensure and support sustainable economic growth.

One of the most promising areas for the development of the public sector is the creation of vertically integrated structures in which the parent organization is under the control of the state. Since there is no legal prohibition on the creation of a network of subsidiaries controlled by private capital by such structures, this is universally implemented in practice. According to some economists, the predominant state involvement in the parent organization is sufficient for the company as a whole to remain under state control.

However, in our opinion, in such structures, despite the formal compliance with the legislation, there is a natural conflict of interests that generates a whole series of legal and semi-legal schemes for removing the corporation from state control.

It is extremely difficult to determine the amount of state property. Indeed, how can it be measured if the market is not able to correctly assess the capitalization of enterprises? There are many questions of this kind, and there are almost no answers to them. After all, the inventory of state-owned enterprises and state property in the country and abroad the procedure has not yet been carried out. Thus, public sector statistics are reduced to measuring the amount of revenue that

actually goes to budgets at all levels, as well as subsidies, subsidies and subventions. And this is just the statistics of public sector finance.

The range of components of the public sector is very large: from purely state-owned enterprises to mixed ones, from the finances of the central government to the finances of local authorities, from direct ownership of enterprises by the government, manufacturing firms (i.e. state-owned business activities) to purely legal ways of influencing private firms, from purely national to international organizations and finance. Hence, it is clear that the scale of the state (public) economy is huge, although it is difficult to determine it with high accuracy.

The history of the relationship of the American state with the market, with free enterprise, is unique. In America, in its own way there are ideal conditions for the formation and development of capitalism, for the formation of a state that grows and becomes stronger together with the rooting of economic principles in economic life. In other words, the state and the market in the United States were gaining strength simultaneously, although the economic function of the state was most pronounced only in the first half of XX century. From all the variety of factors that determine the nature and causes of America's wealth, we will highlight the role of the state and try to identify the driving forces of the active position of the state in critical periods of the development of American society. Back in the 19th century, economic crises in the United States did not pose a threat of significant destruction, and the economic role of the state was determined by the general logic of the country's economic development – the strengthening of industry, the construction of railways, the formation of large corporations, and not "extinguishing" the outbreaks of cyclical crises. During this period, the state stimulated the development of the national economy by various methods, provided private business with freedom of initiative and targeted support. By the end of the XIX century, the rapid growth of industrial and banking "giants" forced the state to start developing and implementing antitrust legislation to support the competitive mechanism of the national economy and ensure national economic security [4, p. 119].

If we try to define an economically efficient state, then in the most general form we can say that this is a state that it protects its national interests and ensures its national economic security in conditions of unlimited international competition.

Quantifying this definition is equivalent to determining the optimal balance between the openness of the national economy and the support of its producers in the domestic and foreign markets. In this regard, the economic role of the state as a whole is considered in a new way. Since the conditions for the development of the world economy and the American economy at the end of the second millennium differ significantly from the conditions of the beginning and even the middle of the XX century, it become sit is possible to study the economic role of the state

not by the degree of intervention in the market mechanism, but by the degree of participation in ensuring the internal and external conditions for the functioning of the national economy. In other words, the state can be economically efficient only when the economy itself is efficient. But even with a "bad " state, there can be no "good" national economy that develops on the basis of market principles.

Relying on private property in all its manifestations, the American economy has gradually expanded its base, which owes its stability to a variety of forms of ownership and organizational types of entrepreneurship. If the existence and development of a particular form of ownership in a country are determined by economic reasons, and not by purely administrative restrictions, then the prerequisites for illegal business are eliminated, and any entrepreneur can count on the protection of the state, to whom he pays taxes, if necessary. Obviously, from this point of view, the state can be considered economically effective only when the country retains the opportunity for the effective functioning of any type of business within the framework of the existence of economic legislation.

The official setting of the tasks of creating an indicative planning system in the CIS countries cannot but draw our attention to the practice of a number of countries with developed market economies, where indicative plans have proven to be effective as one of the most effective ones, means of macro-regulation. Among these countries, we will single out France, because the French system has had a stimulating influence on the development of macro-regulation in the UK and Germany.

The system of indicative planning is based on a high share of state ownership in the national economy. Already in the late 40s of this century, a unique "democratic planning system" was developed and began to be implemented in France, which allows public authorities to regulate economic proportions in such a way that " the state the bureaucracy did not suppress the effective functioning of market actors. " The planning, which was approved from the bottom up, was based on the principles of consultation and coordination and included representatives of various "interest groups" on an equal basis: civil servants, entrepreneurs, trade unions, consumer unions, etc. According to the system under consideration, the plan was born as a result of multi-stage iterations, and all participants were interested in the consensus of its implementation. At the same time, the planned indicators were not directive, but were primarily in the form of as economic indicators-carriers of information about the expected economic situation [4, p. 117].

Nevertheless, the role of the state in the management of the economy in France is still considered to be one of the most significant among the industrialized countries of the world. Indicative planning remains an element of public administration and regulation of the French economy.

References

1. Anokhin, L. M. Teoreticheskie podkhody k analizu gosudarstvennogo regulirovaniya ekonomiki [Theoretical approaches to the analysis of state regulation of the economy]. - 2003. - No. 6. - p. 113-116.

2. Kononkova N. P. On the question of the state sector of the economy. BUL.MOS. UN. SER. 6. ECONOMY. 2011. No. 2 – - pp. 37-45.

3. Lambaev Zh. T. "GOLDEN ACTION" AND THE LIMITS OF ITS APPLICATION. Actual problems of Russian law. 2016, (9): 93-100.

4. Shmatkova E. M., Foreign experience of state regulation of the economy / / Socio-economic phenomena and processes. 2013, - No. 9. - pp. 116-121.

ЭФФЕКТИВНОСТЬ ГОСУДАРСТВЕННОГО СЕКТОРА ЭКОНОМИКИ РОССИИ И ПУТИ ЕЕ ПОВЫШЕНИЯ

Халгаев О.А.
Астраханский государственный университет, Россия

Аннотация. В статье рассматриваются вопросы эффективности государственного сектора экономики России и пути её повышения. Обобщены научные подходы к экономической категории «эффективность государственного сектора». Исследуются существенные виды эффективности государственного сектора – экономическая, социальная и социально-экономическая. Приводятся основные показатели для оценки эффективности государственного сектора экономики в социально-экономической системе.

Ключевые слова: социально-экономическая система, национальная экономика, государственный сектор, общественные блага, эффективность, ресурсы государства, виды эффективности госсектора, социальный эффект.

В современных условиях национальная экономика всех стран мира представляет собой смешанную, гибридную социально-экономическую систему, в основе которой лежат государственный и предпринимательский секторы, а также домашние хозяйства. Такая система характеризуется симбиозом и, прежде всего, тесными взаимосвязями, взаимовыгодными социально-экономическими отношениями между всеми элементами системы в процессе ее функционирования.

Государственный сектор функционирует на основе государственной собственности, управляется со стороны государственных учреждений и полностью контролируется государственными органами или органами местного самоуправления. В нынешних условиях развития государство «…заинтересовано как в эффективности общих результатов, так и в обеспечении коммерческих результатов…» [4] своего предпринимательства, которое осуществляют различные государственные корпорации. Но в то же время, через структуры, составляющие государственный сектор экономики,