

ACTA UNIVERSITATIS SZEGEDIENSIS  
DE ATTILA JÓZSEF NOMINATAE

---

ACTA JURIDICA ET POLITICA

Tomus XVIII.

Fasciculus 6.

ISTVÁN SZENTPÉTERI

**Approaches to the organization by the science  
of general and ramified administrations**

SZEGED  
HUNGARIA  
1971

Redigunt

GYÖRGY ANTALFFY, ÖDÖN BOTH, ANTAL FONYÓ, ISTVÁN KOVÁCS,  
JÁNOS MARTONYI, KÁROLY NAGY, ELEMÉR PÓLAY

Edit

*Facultas Scientiarum Politicarum et Juridicarum Universitatis Szegediensis  
de Attila József nominatae*

Nota

*Acta Jur. et Pol. Szeged*

Szerkeszti

ANTALFFY GYÖRGY, BOTH ÖDÖN, FONYÓ ANTAL, KOVÁCS ISTVÁN,  
MARTONYI JÁNOS, NAGY KÁROLY, PÓLAY ELEMÉR

Kiadja

*A Szegedi József Attila Tudományegyetem Állam- és Jogtudományi Kara  
(Szeged, Lenin krt. 54.)*

Kiadványunk rövidítése  
*Acta Jur. et Pol. Szeged*

1. The theory of organization itself — like that of ramified organization — is composed of two theories considered as independent from each other. One of them is the legal *normativistic* science of (public) administration, the other is that of (private) *administration*. The site of the original development of the first trend is Continental Europe, while the origins of the theory of (private) administration are traced back to USA and Great Britain. In our days, these trends are intertwined with each other in the most countries, resp. we can say that one of the approaches is gradually completed with the properties of the other tendency. The trends cannot be marked off easily from each other, even if we are knowing the historical roots and the different properties of States. This is so first of all because even the interpretation of the word „administration” has been developing, and there are still essential differences between the students of social sciences concerning the content of the word. The difficulty of the interpretation of this category is increased also by the fact that it is to be defined in relation to some notions like organization, leadership, etc. Nowadays it is a standpoint represented by a lot of researchers that *administration is a notion of exactly the same content like organization*. The organization of administration is, therefore, not a theory of ramified organization but *the unique theory of general organization itself*.

This interpretation deserves important credit *for beginning and, for the most part, also performing the generalizations between ramifications*. The entire identification of administration and organization, however, took place by narrowing the notion of organization that we — for reasons to be given later — cannot accept in every relation. This is why we consider the *organization* (or theory) of *administration* as a *theory of ramified organization*, putting into the notion of organization also components of different type, in addition to the administrative structure in the sense mentioned above.<sup>1</sup>

(a) The most important topics of a *normativistic* theory of administration are the macro-administrative systems being organized. The norm of administration, as compared with the norms of factory conditions, shows different properties. The work-measuring and physiological school wanted to build up organizations in a rational way, developing them quasi *upwards from below*, from the simple organizations to the more complicated ones. This conviction

<sup>1</sup> István Kovács exposes the essential differences between the normativistic (legal) and organizational or administrative theoretical trends in connection with the *definition of state administration*. His statements are of fundamental importance, apart from the theme in strict sense, also from the point of view of characterizing and evaluating generally the bourgeois and socialist trends of the theory of administration. Cp.: István Kovács: *A definition of state administration*. (Az államigazgatás meghatározása). Bulletin of the Institute of Political and Legal Sciences (Állam- és Jogtudományi Intézet Ertesítője), Budapest, 1957, vol. I, No. 1, pp. 67 et sq.

was fully comprehensible and logic, having dealt with organizational relations on *micro*-levels that it correctly believed to be rationally fully perspicuous. Among the social conditions of the last century, too, some large *complex organizations* appeared in the private and still more in the public administration, etc., that — even according to the social scientists — could not be organized on rational bases by the pattern and method mentioned above. The great administrative structures meant in themselves such a force and power that the scientific approximations have undertaken a more modest programme for reforming them. *Each branch of the theory of administration* set itself a task seeming to be „simpler” compared to the rational factory organization raising the question: on the basis of what principles and methods an existing macro-system can be *made more rational*, however little hope it may have to be *fully rational* (like the end product of Taylorism, the automatized machine system). The procedures must be found by the help which a freer play can be given to rationalism in the „natural systems”, in the macro-structures developed spontaneously.

The industrial organization on its most developed stage has got to being regulated mathematically exactly, *its laws getting therefore the most general validity*. The theory of administration was, to be sure, more modest concerning the validity of the scientific regularities, as well: it went all out for concretizing scientific regularities placed on the line between the norms *giving a real form to administration* and the *mathematical formulae*. The Taylorism was confronted with the traditional human working processes (like accustomed „norms”); in the administration, however, the „spontaneous organization” is formed by several kinds of norms considered generally to be „more rational”. The regulated administrative organizations are mostly a function of a „written” sort of legal norms expressing the conditions.

The typical norm of administrative conditions can be compared to the traditional norms of the effectuating work like, in the field of the state organizations, the *written law* to the *customary law*. In the industrial organization, the normative force of custom (tradition) has gradually been supplanted by more rational forms of regulation — among them also by ramified legal rules — while finally, on the level of automatization, the technical norms of operations in mathematical formulae were reached. The conditions of industrial organization are purely technical problems: in the relation of object to object (machine), and mostly also in that of man to tool, as well. The industrial organization picks out of the „man”, in the latter case too, components that can entirely be formalized and made part even of a formula of mathematical exactitude. In the field of the industrial organization, therefore, the scientific approximations have started from the more informal formations of norms, going nevertheless „farther” than in the administration, as to the precision and validity of norms. All this is due mostly to the relatively simple connections of basic level inside these organizations.

*The modern administrative conditions were created, anyhow then and in the same way as the law, the basic form of the regulation of human relations, became itself rationalized.* The qualitative change in the form-system of regulation is expressed by legal science by substituting the „written” legal norm for customary law. The attributive adjective „written” says rather little for anybody having no legal education, and even its content is sometimes misunderstood in jurisprudence. The expression „written” means only that this type of

rules, is forming the conditions rationally, *according to a blueprint premeditated*, its main function being not only stabilizing and preserving the concrete conditions but also raising them to the level of a form according to some logical framework. The norm of a customary law is always a function, expression, of the force relations of the concrete organizational power. The existence and content of norm has depended upon the nature of the existing conditions, the quality of the determining organizational component. Before the age of administration, the norm was some *representation* of the conditions of a system created on a *functional* basis, even if it reflected the appearance of the most intensive subjective intention of forming.

The execution was, however, not rationalized immediately by the written norm but through the conditions of leadership. The „written law” has formalized, during its historical appearance, the *system of representation*, resp. the governmental function, advancing thought its transfer towards the conditions of execution (meaning administration and not the solution of a particular task). The rationalization is, therefore, absolutely depending on the rationalization of the norms concerning the level of leadership, as well.

The written legal norm is the most efficient measure for *rationalizing* the conditions of administration. It is, however, shown by the development of the bourgeois conditions of administration that the administration may have been organized, developed on *another* sort of basis, as well. In the systems of the institutions of private undertaking and institutes there isn't any written law in the sense mentioned above. Also these conditions of organization are *regulated* — and even they are showing a very high efficiency, as experienced — we are, therefore, to be clear also with *nature and peculiarities of this regulation* of „other sort”.

The problem whether or not the science of administrative law belongs to the *science of organizing*, or is connected with it, is decided by the literature of the bourgeois science of administration tacitly in the negative direction. On the one hand, also the students of legal science themselves gave cause for that because belonging to the jurisprudence they didn't want to jeopardize their appreciated results realized there by connecting them to the uncertain fate of a newly established science. On the other hand, however, also it is true that the later *theory of administration* has felt the *normativistic way of thinking*, that is so characteristic of lawyers, to be so strange to the theory of organization that it left out of consideration the works of such aspect in the literature of the theory of organization. In our opinion, at any rate, the *science of administrative law* is a sort of the *theories of administrative organization*. The difference between the science of administrative law, theory of public administration and that of administration is not in the different ways of approach — since each of them is a science of formalistic origin — but rather more in the level of *abstraction* and in the size of the forms of organization investigated. We have therefore to give anyway some evaluation of the sciences of public administration from an aspect of the general theory of organization, all the more because the creation of the theory of public administration itself cannot be understood, either, without knowing its historical connections with administrative law.

(b) The two branches of the normativistic theory of administration (or public administration), the lines of *administrative law* and that of *administrative theory* took on roots in Europe, at the sites of the development of the up-

to-date bureaucracy (in France, Germany, etc.), fighting a long struggle with each other.<sup>2</sup> The laws of the development of state organs have been dealt with, since the middle of the last century, generally by two branches of science. The delimitation of organ types from each other, and the problems of parliamentarism have been treated of by the science of public (or elsewhere constitutional) law, resp. by that of politics (or general theory of state). On the other hand, the mechanism of administration, increasing more and more in size and importance, has been treated of by the *administrative law*, grown up from public law. For the latter one, the most important subject was the legal norm creating and forming the administrative institutions. The first particular way of approaching administrative law — after the administrative law of purely descriptive character — was *legal dogmatics*, as all the classical legal sciences (criminal law and civil law, as well) achieved their remarkable great results in that period with this method. The students of administrative law, although they have felt from the beginning that dogmatics in their case cannot deal with a „basic topic” as exact as that of the sciences mentioned above, kept on endeavouring to enforce without any change the principle that the *norm* is alpha and omega of the essence of administrative organization.<sup>3</sup>

The first, evident scholar of administration is accordingly the creator of norm which function was imputed wrongly to the lawyers. The lawyer „creates” the legal norms, of course, not himself but he only prepares the bills and text-

<sup>2</sup> The development of the trends of public administrative theory and public administrative law, as well as the differences between them are treated in details by Lajos Szamel: *Fundamental legal problems of the leadership in state administration*. (Az államigazgatás vezetésének jogi alapproblémái). Budapest, 1963, pp. 5—21. et sq., as well as in his *Hungarian Public Administrative Law* (Magyar Államigazgatási Jog), General Part. University Manual. Ed.: L. Szamel. Budapest, 1966, pp. 39 et sq. Lajos Szamel considers the science of Cameralistics and policing as a predecessor of public administrative theory, writing that „between them and the theory of public administration there is a continuity, that is to say, the scientific investigation of public administration not exclusively from a legal point of view has never ceased to be, only it sometimes fell into the background” (Op. cit. p. 9.). We don't wish to take sides here in this question of the history of science because, from the point of view of the theory of administration, only the trends of administrative law and administrative theory by the turn of the Century may count. In this period, however, — Lajos Szamel is agreeing with Magyary in establishing the theme though disapproving of the motivation — the administrative law on the Continent was already much stronger or in reverse order: the spiritual influence of the older great scholars of the administrative theory (Cp. L. Stein) decreased. (Cp.: Op. cit., p. 9.).

<sup>3</sup> The theory of public administration as compared to the law of public administration was doubtless more sociological in view. (Cp. Lajos Szamel: *Fundamental legal problems of the leadership in state administration*. Budapest, 1963. p. 12, resp. the evaluation given about Magyary's school, p. 22.). Nevertheless, I don't consider the works belonging into the framework of the theory of public administration as sociology of administration. L. Stein's theory of administration could't reveal entirely the structural role of the *administrative* form and its social connections, as yet. The overwhelming majority of the literature of the science of public administration could not reconcile deliberately its theses with some sociological system as — particularly after the results of Max Weber's activity — it would have become possible, the theoretical sociological connections being already cleared. This does not mean, anyway, that in the bourgeois science of administration — first of all in the recent American literature — a real sociological approach of the administrative theory would be fully missing. I regard as such a work of administrative theory, e. g.), the work of H. A. Simon—D. W. Smithburg—V. A. Thompson: *Public Administration* (New York, 1956).

plans, elaborates the possible variations of regulation, etc. The basis of regulation is, however, always a *political decision*, even in the preparatory period. Content and direction of the legal work have anyway been determined by the preliminary and definitive decisions.

The *jurisprudence* as separated from the functions of practising lawyers either has accepted the administrative norm or has „challenged” its origin with vague allusions what meant that the students of science did not identify themselves with the content of norm. The theory of administrative law was always between the upper and the nether millstone; if it has considered the legal norm as a product of the most developed scientific aspect of the age, then the public opinion, besides recognizing the failures of norm, will contest its „scientific wisdom”. When, on the other hand, it criticizes a norm, it rebukes also the political decision itself. That may result, even in the most subtle forms, in severe consequences, e. g., that it cannot participate any more in preparing the norms. The conviction of power was that a lawyer (or legal scholar) that has challenged a decision does not understand the connections of political conditions, is a formalist, or is aspiring a power position. The „overscrupulous” lawyer like this has often been displaced by the leading structure of the bourgeois state, that looked for jurists behaving exactly as it was required from them. The lawyer „with great pretensions in the field of science” may, therefore, easily have fallen into disfavour with the leadership.

*In the field of the legally regulated conditions the first scholar of administration was always a lawyer*, but he „has cleft in two” as the antinomies of practice and theory became strained. In „one of his halves” he limited his scientific ambitions and pretensions for preserving his good connections with leadership, resp. „practice”. His „other half”, however, began evaluating regularity form a scientific point of view differing from the framework of the norm. But every trend that is quering in some degree the scientific quality of a regulation in force could be considered as „illegal” from the point of view of legislators and the legal students supporting them. This opposition to the legal regulation could derive from very different motives. Behind the criticism may have hidden the intention to serve the structure of another interest. It can be decided only on the basis of having analysed this role of serving another interest if it may be considered as a positive or negative one. The criticism of the existing legal regulation, e. g., may have come also from the feudal side and then the opposition was obviously reactionary. On the other hand, somebody can profess in all good faith, without being interested personally, that a legal norm must be confronted with a scientific value order of higher level. To be sure, an excellent theory of administration was separated from the science of administrative law first of all by jurists who opposed the outlook of the „legal science” for one reason or another.

The trends of administrative law and administrative theory have anyhow opposed each other, and even they could change their roles according to the alterations of the power structures. In spite of the differences between them that were allegedly significant, they were reconciled in a common opinion about *considering the scientific regularities of administration to be norms that can and must be expressed in a legal way*. On this basis both trends were in agreement with each other that the most important and indispensable scholar of administration (organization) has remained the *lawyer* skilled in the administrative relations.

The theory of administrative law was regarded as the more orthodox normativistic branch, although even that didn't uphold stubbornly in everything its opinion for the old normativism. It was more and more emphasizes that the substantial and even organizational-procedural regulation of administration — in spite of any protest and opposition — was transferred more and more from the hands of legislating organs into the power of the central administrative organs. It was thus documented *formally*, too, that the regulation of administrative conditions *does not take place on the legal principles and methods considered so far as classical*.

Even a part of the researchers starting from normativistic origins recognized after having compared thoroughly the legal rules with the relations of real administration that *there may have been also „other“ regularities in the development of administrative conditions than those expressed by the legally formulated will*. The trend supposing such „regularities“ of the administration has considered these norms to be at least equally valid as the legal norms or even stronger than they are. This equally normativistic branch that was separated from the science of administrative law was denominated *the theory of public administration*.<sup>4</sup> The theory of administration in the last century was, however, itself a „legal“ trend in such a high degree that we can regard it only as an ameliorated — but sometimes rather more corrupted — variety of the science of administrative law. After simplifying the situation we can consider *the two branches as an internal debate of jurists about the problem who can comprehend and express the legislative will „better“ in the field of the administrative relations*. The theory of public administration has usually represented the „momentary opposition“ to the „official“ trend of the science of administrative law. This oppositionary sentiment was, however, readily substituted for by the position the student of „legalistic“ trend so far criticized, and then they often became normativistic ones in the same degree as their opponents criticized were.

<sup>4</sup> Lajos Szamel emphasized in connection with L. Stein's theory of administration its *non-legal* but sociological character, representing a „unitary political science and sociology“. (Lajos Szamel: *Fundamental legal problems of the leadership in state administration*. Budapest, 1963, pp. 12—13).

The science of administration wanted, however, to be a science of legally regulated conditions: „it wanted to draw into its sphere also the scientific cultivation of administrative law“. (Op. cit., p. 12).

The fact that the theory of public administration was a *normativistic* trend if even in another sense than the outlook of a public administrative law, is still more supported by what Lajos Szamel mentions among the results of the public administrative theory: „it preserved the opinion of the theory of police that also the politics of public administration must be a topic of the theory of public administration“ (Op. cit., p. 14).

The development of the policy of public administration, its separation from the public administrative law, has meant the „ought“ (norm) being doubled. The science of public administrative law is dealing with the *consequences* following from the order of the public regulation. The policy of public administration, however, supposes that there may exist „better“ or „more perfect“ norms than those expressed in the given law.

That the theory of public administration cannot be considered as a science fully different from that of public administrative law, is documented by Szamel just with the radical difference between the theory of public administration and the American theory of administration. (Op. cit., p. 16). That is to say, it seems rather so from his exposition that the theory of public administration *can less be ascertained* to be a „twin-brother“ of the American theory of administration than that of administrative law.



The difference between the branches of public administrative law and that of the science of public administration rested, therefore, not so much on serious antagonisms of principle but rather on a different perception of the relation between scholars and practice. The science of public administration had more *critical components* towards the norms of public administration or, on the other hand, it had a greater heritage of natural law with which they have attempted to turn the positive law towards some „ideal” (right) law. But also the criticism of the science of public administration was a criticism inside the *system* what means that the law may be criticized but, after all, only by the lawyer, his function being to build up an administrative organization that is still more perfect. This is verified partly by the fact that the founder of the theory of public administration in the last century regarded as their chief task just to reveal the peculiar character of the legal norms concerning the organization of public organization and to demonstrate that the science of administrative law had started from a *bad legal* outlook and that, in fact, they alone can restore the scientific reputation and respect of law. The old branches of the theory of administrative law have completed their method either by *positivism* or by *sociologism*, etc., by preserving the normativistic legal basis, i. e. the opinion that there isn't to be created any administration standing above legal norms. The outlook of the theory of public administration was, however, containing *some reserve against the legal norm*. A partisan of the public administrative law has identified himself absolutely with the essence of the administrative organization constituted by the legal norm; a student of the theory of the public administration, however, already begins opening a possibility for the „*proper laws*” of administration, and then already only the law taking these into consideration is „right”.

Since the middle of the last century, in the more developed continental European States the trends of administrative law and the theory of public administration kept several times alternating like leading trends. The latter one could never win a „decisive victory” over the „orthodox” legal outlook,<sup>5</sup> if only because that made the most necessary reform steps still in due time, resp. the conceptions of theoreticians proclaimed with such a great „*élan*” did not prove to be very wise proposals. It was enough if there appeared one or two more sophisticated minds on the more conservative side of public administrative law for arresting the spread of the science of public administration. It was not difficult for them to verify that the theories of some adepts of the science of public administration were shallow, their proposals were not wellweighed in their consequences, showing frequently some *dilettantism* that was generally not characteristic of the outlook of the students of administrative law who were in connection with function and practice of the positive law. The periodic spread of the trends of the science of public administration has, therefore, after all not resulted in the development of a generally acknowledged theory of administrative organization under bourgeois conditions. There can be demonstrated al-

<sup>5</sup> Lajos Szamel is writing: „the position of the science of administrative law in Europe has not been shaken by the pushing forward of public administration — first of all concerning the «chair» science — in the spirit of the principle seeming unchanged that jurisprudence is touched by public administration only in its legal relations” (*Fundamental legal problems of the leadership in state administration*. Budapest, 1963, p.20).

most no connection between the theory of Max Weber about democracy as a theoretical basis of the administrative organization of State and the conceptions of the science of public administration.

2. Another way of the development of the bourgeois social administration and a scientific approach connected with the conditions of this type have developed in Great Britain and the United States. In these States in the last century there wasn't any strong central bureaucratic apparatus like in the leading States of the Continent, therefore we would be looking, of course, in vain for a corresponding *science of administrative law*, as well.<sup>6</sup>

Here came the administrative relations to light first of all in various forms of *undertaking* and developed to be a more and more complicated systems. These organizations being in private ownership, *these relations were not formed by a central legal regulation* — particularly owing to the rule of the liberalistic ideas before World War. I. The Anglo-Saxon theory of administration *was anxious to generalize the multifold experimental material* produced by the organizational forms of production of the capitalistic mode of production. This theory of administration *couldn't be* in any way a *legal trend* because the structure of every undertaking was determined by the *norms of owners* being fully different from one another; and the frameworks of administrative organization were developed by the managers, to the „best of their knowledge”, within the compass of these decisions. In this situation, the „norm” itself had a much less authority before the student — knowing how shallow, subjective factors had frequently a role in the decisions about organizational frames. One looked much more for the *constructive organizational processes*, „fixed often not even on a paper”, because an engineer, an economist, etc. did not want to leave sources for a future generalizing work but he solved simply a concrete organizational problem „without any formalities”. The Anglo-Saxon theory of administration considers itself as „democratic” since it has undertaken to collect the good organizational practice, the innovations of anonymous organizers, and regarded also the results of the science of organization as some *collective empirical wisdom*. This organizational practice was always preferred by the Anglo-Saxon scholar of administration to the almost always bureaucratic central way of organizing and its main weapon, the law. The branch of the theory of administration, as it spread its own recognized regularities, preferred organizing the communication of organizational experiences to an „administrative pressure” put on to units to be regulated.

The social basis of the trend of administrative theory is the *Anglo-Saxon* world, nevertheless the first great attempt of *generalization* has not come from there but from one of the citadels of bourgeois bureaucratism, France. This fact can be explained, among other factors, by the practical way of thinking and generally by the early *antipathy to theories* that are so characteristic of the English speaking countries. Although the scientific approaches have from the beginning been prepared by the circumstances of social organization towards the tendency of a „theory of administration”; this has only *become a scientific*

<sup>6</sup> As regards the circumstances of the development of the trend of administrative theory, i. e. organizational theory in strict sense, cp. István Kovács: *A definition of state administration*. (Bull. of the Inst. of Pol. and Leg. Sc. Budapest, 1957, vol. I, No.1) p.69.

school after the bases of principle had been created for that by the continental theoretical sense. In the 20th Century, however, the situation has changed and a bureaucratic central apparatus has developed in the Anglo-Saxon States, as well. On the other hand, the demand on theory grew in a high degree also in these States. Accordingly, the normativistic tendencies (of public administrative law) have developed necessarily in the science.<sup>7</sup> Nonetheless, the thesis has generally remained valid that the private administration was the basis and the relatively stronger field of administration and, accordingly, the theory of administration was the dominant trend in the science of administration.<sup>8</sup>

(a) The bourgeois literature of general organizational theory is considering the theory of administration as the other branch of the classical science of administration (the first one was Taylor's school). This is called the theory of administrative organization or departmentalization, as well.<sup>9</sup> Here means the adjective „classical“ not so much that this school were indicating common bases with Taylor's system but that its roots are — in proportion to the short past of the organizational theories — comparatively deeper than those of „modern“ theories. The theory of administrative organization is differing definitely both in its organizational conception and in its way of outlook from the physiological trend of the organizational science. Taylor and his followers have practically only touched the administrative organization of factory considered only secondary as compared to the organizational problems of the productive work. In case of Taylor this was anyway understandable as then the administrative apparatus was still on a level comparatively less developed in size in the producing organizations. The administrative apparatus was necessarily increased by the concentration of the ownership of the instruments of production; and also the demand on being specialized that occurred during the adoption of „scientific leadership“ exerted its influence in the same direction. The trend of the theory of administrative organization, therefore, presented itself so late in time partly because the administration of productive organization developed and became more and more distinct after the process of the organization of the concrete productive working processes. It is not accidental that the separation of the legal function of organization from „the“ function of organization began in the organizations of production and not in the public administration. Although for a while, even in the capitalistic undertaking, the lawyer was the keeper of all the formulae and experiences on the basis of which the internal administration could be organized, nonetheless, here presented itself earlier a claim to an in-

<sup>7</sup> In the Anglo-Saxon science of administration, there is recently drawn a parallel between the descriptive and normativistic methods of approximation. Among the organizational scientific branches of normativistic aspect there are enumerated politics and science of public administration. Cp.: W. R. Dill: *Desegregation or Integration? Comments about Contemporary Research on Organizations*. Published by W. W. Cooper—H. J. Leavitt—M. W. Shelly II. *New Perspectives in Organization Research*. New York—London—Sydney. 1964, p. 46.

<sup>8</sup> Instead of the differences between private and public administration, the recent American literature is emphasizing rather their being similar, the differences being solved. By emphasizing the resemblance of the two forms of administration they want to diminish the role of ownership and its importance in connection with the character of administration. H. A. Simon—D. W. Smithburg—V. A. Thompson: *Public Administration*. New York, 1956, pp. 7 et sq.

<sup>9</sup> This denomination was given to the other branch of the classical school of organizational theory by J. G. March and H. A. Simon. *L. Organizations* (New York—London, 1959), pp. 22 et sq.

*dependent administrative organizer*. In the economic organizations there was namely more and more maturing the experience that the normativistic outlook of an organizational work building with legal formulae is often more rigorous than desirable in an efficient economic administration.

The demand on developing an *organizational science* on a higher level than that of legal sciences has appeared — understandably — on the side of *non-jurists* as they always hoped to eliminate the mistakes by making their methods more perfect. The founder of the organizational theory of administrative science was H. Fayol (1841—1925), an *engineer*, just as Taylor. At first, he performed a successful work in exploiting the French coal estate, later he was transferred from his technical function into the mechanism of the coal-mine administration. There he recognized extensively the multifold administrative problems of the direction of mines and had great merits in generalizing the undertaking on the verge of bankruptcy. He worked in the mine management — in higher and higher positions — till being retired, and then he dedicated the remainder of his life to an entirely theoretical work, constructing the educational and instructive system of administrative leaders.<sup>10</sup> Generalizing his experiences obtained in the administrative work at the mining company, he expounded his opinion about administration for engineers, first in 1900, then in 1908. His classical work containing his whole conception was published, entitled „*Industrial and general administration* (Administration Industrielle et Générale), in 1916. An important monograph of his is „*The administrative theory of State*” prepared for the II<sup>nd</sup> International Conference of the Administrative Science in Brussels (1923).<sup>11</sup>

Although H. Fayol in the beginning of his activity — just as Taylor — had dealt with the problems of the technical work organization and research, his intellectual horizon soon became broader as he met the economic and inner organizational, etc. difficulties of the mining company. He could learn that the life of an undertaking may become critical even in case of a good work organization of the mine. H. Fayol investigated the organizational problem from the field of the organization of productive work, raising it on a *higher* — administrative — level than Taylor. It was a common opinion of both of them that the principles of the organization of work, resp. administration are *general*, i. e., they are valid in any organizational relation. They both can be considered, therefore, as the pioneers of the general problem of organizing.

H. Fayol had — as compared to Taylor — a deeper demand on *theory*.

<sup>10</sup> From the enormous material of the bourgeois history of organizational theory concerning the life and activity of Fayol, cp.: B. M. Gross: *The Managing of Organizations*. London, 1964, vol. I, pp. 128 et sq.; J. L. Massie: *Management Theory*. Published in the ed.: *Handbook of Organizations* (Chicago, 1965) pp. 387 et sq.; beyond Fayol's activity, the characteristics of the whole trend of departmentalization are summarized by J. G. Marc—H. A. Simon: *Organizations* (New York—London, 1959), pp. 22 et sq.; A. Lepawsky: *Administration*. New York, 1952, p. 4.

<sup>11</sup> From the other branch of the classical school of organizational theory, first of all from the Hungarian literature discussing Fayol's activity cp.: Zoltán Magyary: *Op. cit.*, pp. 4 et sq. In that place, Magyary is discussing mainly some ideas of L. Gulick. With Fayol's theory about administration he is dealing on pp. 32 et sq.

Lajos Szamel is referring shortly to Fayol's five components in connection with the purpose of administration. (*Fundamental legal problems*, etc., p. 66). Ferenc Dallos considers H. Fayol's activity as two phases of the historical development of the bourgeois organizational science. (Cp.: *The councils are organs of the socialist democracy*. Budapest, 1964, p. 324.).

This can be understood also from his approaching the organizational problem with another method. Taylor made the foundation of the conception of „scientific leadership” with empirical investigations, time and work studies. H. Fayol did not believe that the functioning of the administrative apparatus of the mining company could be measured in the same way like the process of productive work. The function of administration is not characterized generally by processes of work organization disintegrated into components that could be measured exactly. On the other hand, the administration raises first of all on macro-levels a lot of problems that cannot be perceived immediately from the point of view of the micro-organizations on a basic level. It followed therefore from H. Fayol's approaching method that his conception was built upon a broader theoretical demand. Although he investigated the organizational problems during a long period of his life and activity from inside, from his leading position of the concrete leadership of administrative work, he always emphasized the role of *theory*. And in the last years of his life, he urged strongly on creating a research basis for investigating the administrative organization that is *separate* from the practice. He considered the lack of an administrative theory as a basic reason of not teaching this important function of *forming the organizations*, however evident its importance is before everybody. And therefore are the leaders functioning in the administrative positions not systematically educated. After beginning a theoretical study of administration, he considered as a very important task to organize the *education and extension training* of leaders.

(b) H. Fayol's conceptions about the functioning of administration have developed first of all from a generalization of his observations and experiences collected inside the place of his work, at the undertaking. One of his experiences was that the organizational differentiation of the undertaking took place because in the course of the „practical” functioning of undertaking the *efficiency* was ensured by a division of labour of higher and higher degree. He thought to recognize in the whole functioning system of the undertaking six kinds of essential functions and the corresponding forms of functioning: (1) technical or technological activity, (2) commercial activity (purchasing, sale, etc.), (3) financial activity (research of the optimum allocation of capital), (4) policing activity (protection of ownership and persons), (5) measuring activity (stock-taking, balance-making, etc.), and finally (6) administration, that means for him only to make the *persons* function and not material and tools. Administration does not mean for him a general idea of leadership for he used for this the term *government*. Administration is, therefore, a part of „government” wanting to get optimum advantages out of every suitable source from the subjects, with the measures of leadership. H. Fayol does not speak unequivocally about the relation between administration and the other (the first five) forms of activity; it is anyway not simply „one among the others” as he is speaking about administration elsewhere as a force *unifying, coordinating* the other forms of activity.<sup>12</sup>

Correspondingly to the formerly approach, Fayol later reduces the administration itself functionally to components. The five components of administration are nothing else than the disintegration of the administrative function, considered logically as a whole, into parts exerting a well distinguishable peculiar activity. (a) Fayol's *planning* is a category used in a broad sense, containing also *foresight* and the *course of preparing* the solution of problem. (b) The

<sup>12</sup> Cp.: B. M. Gross: Op. cit., vol. I., p. 130; Zoltán Magyary: Op. cit. pp. 33 et sq.

meaning of *organization* for Fayol was to develop a structure of undertaking in which the instruments are put into the service of the ends of the plan. The organization is a form given to the whole, setting all the details to rights, forming a framework in which the wanted content can be realized. (c) The former two components may be considered also as a preparation of functioning; the function of the organ begins, to be sure, with *commands*, issuing the acts for carrying out the plan. (d) In the process of functioning, a harmony of the details of structure must be brought about, i. e., their activity must be stood into the service of the general purpose. This function takes place by *coordination*. (e) The last component of the administrative process is control, i. e., a comparison of the results produced during the process of the function of organization with the tasks predetermined by the plan. The former five components of administration are valid; according to H. Fayol, both for the private and for the public administration, these forms of activity can be found in any particular administrative activity, though the connection of some function-components may occur.<sup>13</sup>

Another important field of H. Fayol's activity significant for the organizational theory was the creation of the so-called *administrative* (organizational) *principles*. He formulated these principles by generalizing the administrative experiences. The principles of administration are always to be understood and applied in an elastic way. In the administration there isn't any absolutely valid principle to be treated in an unchanged way in any situation, that is to say, everything there is a question of proportion — says Fayol. He is enumerating 14 principles: the division of labour, authority, qualification, unity of command, unity of control, subordination of private interests to the general one, rewarding of persons, centralization, chain of connections, fairness, stability of the tenure of office, initiative, and finally the „esprit de corps”.

This enumeration is not considered by Fayol as taxative; in addition to these, he acknowledged the justification of other general principles, as well, if required by the given structure, resp. situation. Like „general principles”, he stands before the leaders values the efficiency of which is verified by the simple empirical conditions. Considering, however, the validity of them as depending entirely on the given particular situation, he made them considerably *relativistic*. Some of these principles had doubtless in the organizational conditions of his age — however simple and even primitive the „principle” was — some authoritative role. There was such one, for instance, the principle of the unity of *command and control* expressed in another way so that „one body has to have one head”. The recognition of the development of the structures of leadership was contained in his proposal that the administrative leader — even if he has an authority to leadership — has to develop a *staff* beside himself and make his decisions as relied on the opinion of this body of specialists. The admi-

<sup>13</sup> About components of the administration, cp.: J. L. Massie: Op. cit., pp. 380 et sq.; B. M. Gross: Op. cit., vol. I, pp. 129 et sq. It is important to notice the fact that some translators of Fayol's works into English have translated the term administration with the English word „management”. As B. M. Gross has established, this was a „highly unfortunate” solution, having caused and is still causing terminological troubles. Management is not at all identical with administration as to their content. Therefore, reading the literature in English, we must re-interpret the terms found so often in Fayol's works like e. g., the „principles of management”, understanding instead of them the principles of administration.

nistrative leadership works first of all with *formal* procedures, and not only the degree of authority but also the direction of the connections of communication are determined by the structural position. To be sure, Fayol himself considered as necessary here and there to break through or shorten these formal processes. It is a blunder, he says, to deviate unnecessarily from the authoritative lines; it is, however, even a greater blunder to stand rigidly by these lines if their breakthrough is offered by the trade process. He is mentioning as an example, how circuitous the communicative procedure is on the basis of formal connections between two persons working on identical levels but at different parts of the undertaking. For this case he proposes to create a *binding bridge* between persons like these but even then it must be specified what sphere of cases the deviation from the line of formal authority is allowed for.

Fayol set out in details in several relations his ideas about administration and its principles. The former ones were only summarized by us, giving some examples, too, concerning the terms of some principles, because these have exerted an inspiring effect at the approaches to the general organization, too, even if they were considered in their original form as valid first of all in one of the *branches* of organization, the administration.

(c) Following H. Fayol's method of approximation, a great number of researchers have strived to explain the organizational relations. We may rightly speak about a *second main trend of the classical school of the theory of organizing* created by the participation of his followers. In the United States J. D. Mooney and A. C. Reiley, in Great Britain R. H. Haldane and Sheldon belong to the major authors following him. The most acknowledged development of the greatest effect of Fayol's doctrines is anyway the work of L. H. Gulick (USA) and L. Urwick (Great Britain). In 1937. they edited a volume entitled „Studies about the science of administration“, containing eleven monographs, in two-two ones of which they expounded their own opinions. The formal outlook, obvious enough already at Fayol, was still affirmed by them all, although they took already into consideration here and there also the role of informal factors in the organization.

This branch of the classical school of organizational science may be named rightly — after H. A. Simon — the *trend of departmentalization*. On the formal side, they brought into connection all the structural problems of the organization with establishing the regularities of the *formation of organizational parts*. They departed from the fact that, recognizing the *general purpose* of an organization, one can determine the *partial task-units* that are necessary for fulfilling the whole purpose. These units of task demand various forms of activity (e. g., productive, supplying, controlling activities, etc.). A fundamental distributed in compliance with these detail tasks, what kind of groups are to be formed, what is to be done on ground level, when units of vertical subordination are to be created to realize the tasks with the possibly lowest expense-effects. The details of organizational structure are, therefore, in fact always a kind of apparatuses serving for realizing some *peculiar task*. The main problem of organizing is thus first to establish rightly in principle the task—units (activity forms) needed for realizing the general purpose. But only then comes the „real“ part of work: to develop the departments in the way that their *optimum* efficiency is ensured. The development of horizontal and vertical departments

is always a problem of determining the *optimum*, and that is meaning a great note of interrogation for organizing.<sup>14</sup>

Fayol has attempted to solve the first part of the problem outlined above by elaborating the five components of leadership. These are namely, in fact, a *disintegration of administration, considered as a general whole, into its components*. The administrative departments must be formed according to the components of administration. L. Gulick has distinguished seven categories of the administrative activity instead of the formerly five one. Concerning the English initial letters of the single components, these together are named POSDCORB. L. Gulick has performed, therefore, more differentiations in the general process of administration — as compared to Fayol.<sup>15</sup> The main tasks of the executor (administrator) are, accordingly, as follows:

(a) *Planning*, a work through which one can establish by and large what is to be done and what kind of measures are needed for performing the aim of undertaking.

(b) *Organizing* means to develop the formal structure of authority, through which in a definite field exact and coordinated working departments are formed.

(c) *Staffing* work of a specialized body helping the leader being a personal function by which through the collective work the favourable conditions of work develop and can be maintained.

(d) *Directing* means a continuous task of deciding, containing the particular and general directions, as well as instructions, by which the undertaking is led by the leader.

(e) *Coordinating* that means the tasks of developing the inner connections between the various parts of work.

(f) *Reporting* about the state of things, informing those who the executor is responsible to. Reporting is containing all the informations gathered by himself resp. by the subordinated persons on the basis of reports, researches, and investigations.

(g) *Budgeting*, taking into account the execution of plans in financial form.

L. Gulik took over, developing the components of administration, three of Fayol's five components in original form (planning, organizing, and coordinating), instead of commanding he speaks about *directing* — but about with the same content like his predecessor. Fayol's *control* is contained partly by *reporting*, partly by *budgeting*, and finally the function of *staffing* (by the body of specialists) is separated from Fayol's category of *organizing*. The POSDCORB-system of administration has soon spread on a large scale. At any rate, parallel

<sup>14</sup> As to departmentalization as a problem of designation, and as to the theory of departmentalization, cp.: J. G. March—H. A. Simon: *Op. cit.*, pp. 23 et sq.

This trend of organizational theory is named by Zygmunt Bauman an organizational theory dealing with the „theory of the competence of organizations”. *General sociology* (Általános szociológia). Budapest, 1967, p. 442.

<sup>15</sup> The above part of Luther Gulick's work was published in: A. Lepawsky: *Op. cit.*, pp. 22—23.

The components of the organization that are discussed above are named by others a *function of leadership*. Cp.: Dr. László Szabó: *An interpretation of leadership in terms of the organizational theory*. (A vezetés szervezésméleti értelmezése).

Published in the work *Leadership knowledge* (Vezetési ismeretek), I. (Ed.: Dr. János Susánszky). Budapest, 1967, p. 55.



with that, a lot of authors have attempted to exchange somewhat the content of one or the other component and to make more perfect the entire system.<sup>16</sup>

The partisans of the branch of administrative organization have tried to embetter also the other main group of Fayol's theses, although holding in respect the general bases. They have dealt more detailed with the problem how could the formal principles of organization be formulated still more properly and precisely. J. D. Mooney has established five principles of organizing. On the other hand, Gulick and Urwick have investigated the most important seven principles of administration. A great deal of these principles are named according to Fayol, at others smaller or larger alterations were performed in denominations, resp. concerning the content of the principles.<sup>17</sup>

The fundamental great problem emphasized by the trend of the trend of the science of administrative organizing is, therefore, the *departmentalization*; that gave the other denomination to this trend. *A lot of experiments were carried out for determining the optimum size of department* that is necessary to perform the tasks. Recently rather *mathematical* methods are applied for that, and there were some attempts by using the „*theory of game*” etc., as well.

The other branch of the classical school of the theory of organizing — that of the theory of administration — developed, therefore, in the Anglo-Saxon world and reacted upon the continental science of organizing. Fayol met only little understanding in the France of his age, and his ideas passed almost unnoticed in the continental science of administration of normativistic outlook as they were published.<sup>18</sup> In our days, however, the trend of departmentalization has grown into one of the strongest and most dynamical branches of the European bourgeois science of administration. Its European spreading took place because the bourgeois States are hastily looking for the secrets of the organizational practice of the United States, and on the other hand the American science is consciously propagating the superiority of its organizational theory and its leading role in the service of the world-imperialism.<sup>19</sup> The European propagation of the trend of administrative science has necessarily exerted its effect also on its intertwining with the trend of the science of public administration, resp. that of the public administrative law.<sup>20</sup>

(d) The trend of the administrative-organizational theory of the classical school has doubtless a *more theoretical demand* than Taylor and his followers had. In the administrative relations of macro-character the employment of empirical methods is much more difficult and the possibility and technique of the measurement of administrative work are standing on a rather uncertain soil in our days. With a little exaggeration we can say that, *nolens-volens*, they have to turn themselves towards the opportunities of *generalization* as they have recog-

<sup>16</sup> Cp.: I. L. Massie: Op. cit., pp. 403 et sq.

<sup>17</sup> Cp.: Gross Op. cit., vol. I. p. 144.

<sup>18</sup> Cp.: István Kovács: *A definition of state administration*. Bull. of the Inst. of Pol. and Leg. Sc., Budapest, 1957, vol. I, p. 68.

<sup>19</sup> Lajos Szamel: *Fundamental legal problems of the leadership in state administration*. Budapest, 1963, p. 17 is calling the attention to the economic and political connections of the penetration of the American science of administration into Europe.

<sup>20</sup> Dr. József Varga is calling the attention to the economic and political connections of the penetration of the American science of administration into Europe.

Cp.: Dr. József Varga: *Idea of the socialist state administration*. (A szocialista államigazgatás fogalmához). In: *State and Administration* (Állam és Igazgatás), 1968, No. 2. p. 162.

nized that it is impossible to proceed on the old traces. The *theory* of the science of the administrative organization is, nevertheless, grounded on an *empirical material generalized on a not too high level* and on the results of observations that are frequently not exact enough. The outlook of the overwhelming majority of authors belonging to this branch have been limited in some sense restricted, by the experiences of official and expert work performed in the field of private and public administration for a long time. Their theoretical demand has remained on a level where they first quasi described the experiences coming from own and foreign observations, and then they have drawn of them *some generalizations*. This procedure made the impression of novelty, in proportion to the contemporary state of organizational theory — particularly if compared with the trend of administrative law. The *theoretical* level of this school of organizational theory was, nonetheless, of very low degree in many respects. If in case of the trend of administrative law we can raise the objection that it breaks away only very slowly from the normativistic outlook concerning the organizations, then it is right to heap reproaches on the trend of the theory of administration because of drawing shallow empirical generalizations under the pretext of a „theoretical” approach.<sup>21</sup>

The weak quality of the theoretical approach is the most obvious in case of the so-called administrative or organizational *principles*. Even it is fully confused what they call a principle. From the structural lines, procedural requirements till describing the empirical facts and till the entirely empty logical formulae they consider everything a „principle”. It is not made clear, either, why is the so-called principle a „principle”. They give either the reason that it is „general” or that it is „peculiar” or „absolutely valid” or even „inevitable”, etc. Among the „general principles” of organizing, the definitions and argumentations of an author are later followed by the exactly opposite „principles” of others. These principles are named by H. A. Simon, an eminent bourgeois critic of the classical school with good reason „wisecraces” in a sarcastic sense. These „house wisdoms” are bumptious stupidities, mysticism and slogans „meaning nothing more than the explanations of the wizard („doctor”) Ubangi about the diseases.”<sup>22</sup>

The effort to determine the single components of the administrative activity is praiseworthy and it is doubtless that this trend has got to recognizing a greater differentiation of organ functions than other scientific approaches did that had dealt with organizations. It can hardly be said, however, that we succeeded in finding a systematization producing administering. The idea of authors is influenced also here more than necessary by the field of administering (private, public or economic, resp. military, etc. administration), where they have obtained the most of their immediate personal experience from.

If we have so far missed the real theoretical character, at the attempts for defining the optimum of organizational unit — at least at the most recent ones —

<sup>21</sup> A great individuality of the „modern” American science of organization, H. A. Simon began reevaluating critically both branches of trend of the school of departmentalization. (Cp.: H. A. Simon: *Administration Behaviour*. New York. 2nd ed., 1965; J. G. March—H. A. Simon: *Organizations*. New York—London, 1959).

Others, however, are already striving to reconcile the classical school with the „modern” ones, building a bridge between the two camps.

<sup>22</sup> H. A. Simon's critical expression is quoted by B. M. Gross: Op., cit., vol. I. p. 182.

we can, vice-versa, object to the *irreal speculative character* that is practically in fact unjustifiable. The new approaches of departmentalization by mathematical formulae are supposing besides the formulae the knowledge of such empirical and particular conditions that the question may be raised: *is the formula giving, in possession of these, really still any plus?*

In contradiction to the trend of the science of administrative organization, as compared to the school of organizing the work, we can raise with still more reason the critique that it is dominated by a more and more one-sided *formalism*. This means that the considered more and more as a problem outside the theory of organizing. The science of administrative organizing accepts finally a fully *narrow, formalistic interpretation of organization*, omitting the investigation of the essential problems of organization (e. g., the dehumanizing effect of a formal organization, bureaucracy, etc.) from the field of its examinations.

3. It is shown by the development of bourgeois societies that a more and more large field of administrative conditions have got under the rule of *state regulations*. The idea of liberal state has been broken through more and more since the beginning of the 20th century, and particularly after World War I, by the regulating intervention of States. This direction of the economic development of bourgeois society is partly promoting the *legal* trend of the theory of administering. The more „private conditions“ the legal regulating process of the bourgeois State is extended on, the more the perspectives of a „full victory“ of the *legal normativistic* trend develop apparently. The spread of bureaucracy observed under modern conditions is pointing not only on the continent but also in the English speaking world to the development of some kind of a general (normativistic) science of state administration.

Nevertheless, this generalizing tendency did not render fully unnecessary, resp. unseasonable certain *theories of the ramified administration*; on the other hand, it did not prevent the development of *newer* modern sciences of the ramified administration. It was therefore in vain that the state regulation subjected to its domination more and more fields; apart from the general science of state administration also new particular sciences of administering have survived, resp. developed.

Formerly we have referred only to the main lines of the problems of the general science of the organization of state administration. In addition to that, the theory of the *special branches of administration* is a separate problem. Among these the *organization of army*, resp. the *military administration* has a great past but a rather obscure present. There have always belonged to the jealously guarded secrets of States the data concerning their war potential, their military organization, because if they get into „unauthorized hands“ the successful application of the planned organizational solutions may be questionable. A demand on the standing raising of the level of being organized is, however, an elementary interest of States. After all, it is small wonder that the armies were the first class fields of experimenting and applying the new organizational principles and methods. The military organization always played, therefore, a leading part from certain point of view among the theories of organizing the ramified administration as to its development. For explaining this we have to mention particularly two circumstances. One of them is that the armies were also before the spreading of bourgeois customs, and later too, a kind of *macro-*

systems<sup>23</sup> in which, beyond the role of individual heroism, the permanent preparedness for unexpected situations, the fast mobilization of forces, a good strategy and tactics, etc. have nevertheless a decisive importance — all of these being factors that could be taken into consideration with proper organizational solutions. It was always verified by the armies above all that a medium of great number of persons cannot be moved in a durable way expediently and efficiently unless taking into consideration the best principles and methods of formal organization known in that age. Thus it is not a mere chance that one of the first fields of the bureaucratic organizing (apart from the Catholic Church) was the military, and these methods were only later transferred to the field of the „civil” public administration.<sup>24</sup>

Another cause of the high development of army organization is that it has been treated by the existing political order as a natural definitive guarantee, its standing reinforcement has been considered as a constant task, every material, etc. sacrifice being given for it first of all when the existence of State was at stake. An immediate danger of war, resp. the state of war itself always gave

<sup>23</sup> Zygmunt Bauman — on the basis of J. Wiatr — is emphasizing at the macro-organizational character of army the line that there other lines characteristic of other organizations are shown more clearly because the relations are produced magnified. „The army anyway — writes Z. Bauman — is worthy of attention also from another point of view: some properties occurring in every organization there appear with an exceptional clarity and can be noticed very easily owing to their being magnified. Therefore, investigating some characteristics of the military organizations, we can better recognize some phenomena that are characterizing also other organizations — functioning in the other fields of social life”. Later he is repeating this idea: „A result of the particular social role of army is that it can be considered as a «sample pattern» of an organization ensuring the maximum output of a co-ordinated activity. The components of this pattern can be found in another organization, as well, but less pregnantly or only «in embryo».” *General sociology*. Budapest, 1967, pp. 451—452, 454. Z. Bauman makes, therefore, here not clear that army is an organization, existing as a typical „field of application” of the *administrative* (bureaucratic) organizational form in most of the developed industrial States. By considering the army as a „sample pattern”, he is referring yet to seeing in the organizational form of an up-to-date army some *general* organizational structure. But Bauman is investigating the problem of army structure in a simplified way, without any sharp distinction between the „industrial societies” organizing armies of administrative type and the undeveloped societies, resp. revolutionary movements organizing armies of people’s character (militia). The latter ones are characterized by organizational solutions that entirely differ from the armies organized according to an administrative pattern.

<sup>24</sup> Max Weber is clearly demonstrating that the organizational form of army was earlier the „private factory”, just as in the economic field. „A bureaucratized war factory can get a form of private capital just as every other industrial activity”. „The semi-official enterprises of naval war (like the «manoa» of Genoa) and the army organization belong to the first «giant factories» of the private capital with a considerably bureaucratic structure”. (Max Weber: „*Economy and Society*”. Budapest, 1967, pp. 281. 282). The demand on a bureaucratic organization has developed, among other things, because „the possibility of mechanizing a war factory demands the properties of a technician from the commanders” (Op. cit. p. 281). According to Max Weber, in the West it lasted till the beginning of the 19th Century” to equip and administer the armies by the private capital”. The „nationalization” of army took, therefore, place generally already in a time when the civil administration (governmental bureaucracy) was comparatively very undeveloped, as yet. (Op. cit., pp. 281—282.).

newer and newer pushes to develop the military organization.<sup>25</sup> It is said essentially with good reason, if also somewhat exaggerated, by a few bourgeois authors that nearly every really new and efficient method and principle of the present science of organizing the capitalistic States (e. g., net-planning, procedure of simulation etc.) had been produced under the „urging conditions” of World War II.<sup>26</sup>

The military administration has, of course, highly increased being regulated since World War II., as well. This is first of all result of that a *coordinated* activity of the various departments is demanded by the modern weapons and military equipments in a higher degree than ever.<sup>27</sup> All the norms of military organization are secret, it can however be ascertained without any peculiar insight that, besides the typical legal norms concerning the military units, number and weight of technical norms have increased.

Another characteristic and so-to-say „classical” theory of the particular administration of bourgeois States has developed in connection with the *financial* organization of the State. The budget system of the bourgeois State, the central treatment and control of a lot of financial affairs have meant another basis of the modern state bureaucracy.<sup>28</sup> The science of financial organizing has been and is an organizational theory of expressly *juridic character* in Europe. Financial law is a typical organizational kind of law containing also some material relations.

A thoroughly new science of organization, developing, to be sure, extremely dynamically, is under bourgeois conditions the *organization of science*. Since Burnham's book having been published,<sup>29</sup> the term *scientific and technical revolution* has spread, being a prediction of the world-wide significance of future organizing. Burnham formulated an ideology that was very favourable for Capitalism. Diving the variations of social evolution into three groups, he considers, of course, the last one — his own — as a theory that has alone recognized

<sup>25</sup> „World War II — writes Sándor Szalai — made Imperialism and especially the United States, that got connected with the active warfare only with some question, put into the scale material, resp. technical and organizative efforts that simply made inevitable the development of a thoroughly new method and technique of the operative (i. e., operational) leadership” (*Leadership and Administration: A vezetés és igazgatás*, p. 54).

<sup>26</sup> Cp.: Dr. Géza Márton: *Chapters from the field of mining organization*. (Féjezetek a bányászati szervezés köréből). Budapest, 1967, p. 5.

<sup>27</sup> The bourgeois literature of the science of organizing is, even to-day, taking much advantage of the amounts spent on armies. In the United States, the various administrative organs of the army often entrust research institutes with solving organizational problems. The performance of these tasks is generally not made public. On the other hand, the military units are often also areas of empirical organizational experiments, and the theoretical consequences of these organizational investigations may be published. Cp., e. g., Merrill Roff: *A Study of Combat Leadership in the Air Force by Means of a Rating Scale: Group Differences*, and A. W. Halpin: *The Leadership Behavior and Combat Performance of Airplane Commanders*. Published: C. G. Browne—T. S. Cohn: *The Study of Leadership*. Danville, Illinois, 1958. pp. 158—169, 350—356.

<sup>28</sup> „The bureaucratic State... — writes Max Weber — registers all the national administrative expenses in its own budget, and supplying the subordinated authorities with a circulating fund it regulates and controls their appropriation. With a view to «economy» of the administration this has the same consequences as in case of a capitalistically centralized giant factory.” *Economy and Society*. Budapest, 1967, p. 282.

<sup>29</sup> The title of James Burnham's book is: *The Managerial Revolution*. New York, 1941.

the ways of Future. The first group of predictions said that capitalism would survive essentially unchanged for an underterminable time. The second supposition is that Capitalism will be substituted for by the socialist society. He proposes — as a third solution — the development that he thinks to be practically already in progress, substituting the managerial society for Capitalism. He regarded the policy of New Deal in the United States as a turning—point when the development of the society of managers had started. The managerial group consisting of administrative specialists, experts, controlling engineers, the leaders of production, specialists of propaganda, technocrats is — he says — the single social stratum the members of which seem to be sure of themselves.<sup>30</sup>

Burnham has become very popular in the American capitalistic world owing to his former thesis of expressedly ideological nature, because he represented a „variety of development“ that could be accepted by the leading strata of imperialism without prejudice to their fundamental interests, and even in a way as if they demanded any „revolutionary“ change. Burnham, in addition to his serving the American bourgeois ideology, is a theoretician of the „revolution of science“, and, therefore, one of the fathers of the organization of science, as well.<sup>31</sup> The necessity of the organization of science was first of all recognized, too, because the up-to-date research has proved to be more efficient in typically large and complex organizations. The solution of such a great research purpose like the construction of *atomic bomb* was born from the coordinated activity of scientists (research departments, etc.) of so far unimaginable number.<sup>32</sup>

The demand on dealing with the administration of science in the bourgeois States is explained by the more and more *increasing share* of the national income turned to scientific investigations, as well. So high amounts are turned to support scientific research both on governmental level and also by various capitalistic associations that make automatically necessary a complicated administrative work which — with the points of view given to the estimation of plans, the variative suggestions for the allocation of money, and by analyzing the ratio between the result of research and the amounts used — is today already indispensable for the leadership. The mechanism of the administration of science in the leading capitalistic States is growing more and more. The contrast of public and private administration is existing in the administration of science just as in the direction of economy, as well. The capitalistic associations of undertakings themselves spend huge amounts on the investigation of the prob-

<sup>30</sup> The quotation from J. Burnham's book is published by A. Lepawsky: Op. cit., p. 13.

<sup>31</sup> It must be mentioned that the bourgeois scientific sociology has earlier created monographs revealing much deeper connections than Burnham's paper. Particularly Max Weber's sociology of science is worthy, and the role and significance of the intellectuals is treated of also by K. Mannheim much more thoroughly. The „simple“ (i. e., often very primitive) reasoning of Burnham's book was initially propagated by the American scientific communication nevertheless with a much greater elan.

<sup>32</sup> It is perhaps a consequence of organizational failures caused by emergency, resp. the lack of experience that according to some Americans the atomic bomb was rather anyway „discovered“ instead of being really the result of the execution of a plan—programme in the present sense of the term. They are referring to that the co-ordination was entirely amended by a lot of „unexpected“ discoveries in details. The rational arrangement was highly influenced by the *spontaneous* formative influence of the unexpected results of researches. Cp.: E. E. Jennings: *An Anatomy of Leadership*. New York, 1960. p. 29.

lems of production and technical development and consider as natural that these scientific results are their legal due. The „socialization” of science and its administration is an accelerating process in the imperialistic States. The allocation of the immense amount given to the scientific institutes from the state budget must be controlled by Government in some degree, and even Parliaments have dealt with it. And the realization of the tasks of military nature and of those connected with space research is built up in principle on being financed by the budget; therefore, a standing national organization is to be constructed for directing science.

4. (a) The development of the science of administration *under socialist conditions* has taken place not only in a socio-historical framework different from the bourgeois process of development outlined above but it has also *started from entirely different bases*. After nationalizing the instruments of production, the development of public and private administration in two different ways became *ab ovo* impossible. The conditions regulated legally in a socialistic society have anyway the marks of „being public”. For the first moment it has seemed so that in socialist societies there is only a *state* administration. This impression is, however, formed in the observer mainly by comparing our state administration to its civil conditions. With due foresight, even a layman will recognize that in sector of the *non-national organization* of party, mass organizations, associations, etc. the administrative component is developing, increasing, as well. The socialist science of administration consists, therefore, of branches, the basis of its differentiation is, however, not a difference between „public” and „private” administrative conditions.<sup>33</sup> Apart from the science of general administration, each of the sub-systems of the socialist social organization has also its science of particular administrations, for instance, the science of general public administration, that of economic administration, of science organization, etc.

The development of the science of socialist administration and its inner differentiation have depended upon the social need that hastened the development of the administrative structure itself. The administrative organization has developed in the several sectors of the socialist social organization in historically different periods and even today it is not on the same level in the different fields.

In socialist societies the most obvious phenomenon is the development of the organization of public administration in a more and more accelerating degree with a more and more increasing differentiation of the organizational system. The way of development of the organs of the general and ramified public administration is showing particularly pregnantly the steps through which the principle of *professional* organization has progressed inside the socialist state mechanism. After the development of the supreme executive organization, in

<sup>33</sup> Concerning the differentiation of public and private administration, as fundamental types, being fully senseless under socialist conditions cp.: István Kovács: *A definition of state administration*. Bull. of the Inst. of Pol. and Leg. Sc., Budapest, 1957, vol. I. No. 1. p. 84.

He is illustrating the sectors developed in the socialist mechanism of administration in Op. cit., p. 98. The „private administration” represented there is only a remainder, coming from the capitalistic relations, that becomes more and more *unimportant* in size and theoretical sense, as Socialism grows stronger.

the organs carrying out the inner and outer protection of the socialistic system (organs of state security, military) has developed so-to-say from the *first days of revolution* the administrative organization built up according to the principles of a *close organization* that was one the guarantees of the planned and efficient organic functioning in the periods of civil war and intervention. A still more differentiated picture is, however, shown, as to the numbers and types, by the administrative mechanism realizing the *economic organizing* function in the socialist countries. The creation of the organization of public administration and its development at an accelerated pace was carried out as a result of national acts, with the measure of *regulation*. The content of „organizational will” was fixed in legal *formulae*. The socialist organization of State performed a *regulation* of enormous size and of extremely forced pace generally and in the public administration particularly, as well. This *central* method of organizing can be compared, merely externally, with the organization of the French and German administrations but concerning the level and degree of their *organization* it has been much more intensive than these. This central way of organizing has endeavoured to evaluate any better initiative experience of local organization and to raise on the level of norm the distinguished procedures and it makes them *general* in this way. The upper *regulation* of the single organizational conditions became, however, gradually of such size that every effort of the local organs was directed to the mere fulfilment of the content of norms and at these normative requirements the local organizational initiative was relegated to the background. Another disadvantage of the central normative organization of administering showed itself later in the fact that also the good local organizational procedures for which the conditions could elsewhere mostly not be found were made general requirements on *norm-level*. The method, proposed by Lenin, that considered as a necessary first step to form „pattern organizations” and later to make general this pattern, has brought after a time much formalism into the practical organizational work. Not at all because of the idea but because during its execution it was *exaggerated*, the necessary and desirable gradualness and elasticity being not applied. In the development of the socialistic social conditions, the employment of legal measures on a large scale was anyway favourable for confirming the *normativistic* outlook of organizational theory.

The general juridic science of the national organization that has developed the organ types of socialist States, separating them from one another in their functions, was *public law*. The more the power and administrative organization were separated and the more a specialization of the public administrative organization developed, the more the legal science of public administration became independent, with a more extended choice of topics.

This process of separation took, however, place in every socialist State only in longer or shorter time after the revolution; public law, even after the science of public administrative law had developed, persisted in its character of a science organizing the State.

Both branches of the Soviet legal science were *normativistic*, and they became that even more as a result of the personal cult.<sup>34</sup>

<sup>34</sup> In connection with the legal normativism taking place in the public organization, the various scientific approximations are reflecting very different opinions. On the side of jurisprudence, one emphasizes with good reason that in the relations of State the legal form is the most efficient loop in the hand of leadership. „Therefore, a



It was attempted to develop an *organizational science* of not legal character in the first years both of the creation of RFSR and that of the people's democracies. In Hungary, in the years after the Liberation, Magyary's school of the theory of public administration was — even after having lost its leader — the strongest trend. Till the year of change, this tendency of sociological character was almost alone dominant.<sup>35</sup> It is no mere chance that after the year of change this trend of the theory of public administration or organization crumpled up fully. Magyary's conception of the theory of administration was more progressive than the works of juristic character about the administration but the organizational and legal problems of the socialist change could — understandably — not find a place in it.<sup>36</sup> On the other hand, the group of Marxist jurists that began to go in for an organizational (sociological) science of administration was „too early” — just as a century ago, under the bourgeois conditions, the trend of the theory of public administration. The non-juristic attempts of a theory of organizing were „out-of-date” after the socialist revolutions, announcing organizational programmes and procedures that were controverted by the official conception, expressed also in legal norms. In the unstable situations after the revolution even the „most scientific” conception that did not promote immediately the execution of the *normative plan*, was stigmatized first as a *superfluous* intellectual „gallantry”, later as a suspicious intriguing of questionable value against the system (the leadership given) or even as a disguised ini-

negative evaluation of that the public organization is «too» legal in character would mean that the leadership renounced its most efficient and important measure. (By emphasizing the role of the legal means used in the state organization we don't think, of course, that an organization could be ameliorated by issuing more and more rules without any critique). The critique exerted in the nineteen-sixties on normativism by the partisans of administrative law is, therefore, often misunderstood, as speaking about «exaggeration of the role legal means». (Cp.: József Varga: *Idea of the socialist state administration*. State and Administration, 1968. No. 2, p. 165.) Here is the source of failure not at all the „exaggeration” of the legal form but that the science of administrative law was, as a result of objective and subjective causes, less and less suitable for perceiving the consequences of changes performed in the social reality and for using the scientific capacity to promote the reform of normatives. Concerning the general role of the legal normativism, the critique of rigidity became really seasonable and right after that the political leadership began liquidating the failures of dogmatism, making thus anachronism the rigid insistence on a kind of normativism.

<sup>35</sup> Cp.: Lajos Szamel: *Fundamental legal problems of the leadership in state administration*. Budapest, 1963, pp. 22 et sq. The same was set down as a fact also by József Varga: „Looking over the papers, articles and publications of educational aim edited after the liberation, we can ascertain that the cultivation of the science of public administration after the liberation happened not mainly from legal point of view”. (József Varga: *Idea of the socialist state administration*. State and Administration, 1968, No. 2, p. 166.) Then the works of public administrative law reflected the intention of preserving the old legal state when a perspective of the full change of the whole legal order was just developing. „There appeared in the literature here and there — writes Lajos Szamel — one or two isolated representatives of the trend of the science of public administrative law, as well, without achieving any success or even producing a sensation.” (Op. cit., p. 23).

<sup>36</sup> Between the trend of the public administrative theory and the science of public administrative law there wasn't any significant difference in principle or contrast in this country, either; this is shown by the fact that although the trend of administrative theory was liquidated, for its partisans it was enough to accept the new legal outlook and methods; acquiescing in that, they were immediately classified into the camp of the socialist science of administrative law. The „deviation” inside the Marxism concerning the organizational theory had generally much graver consequences.

mical activity.<sup>37</sup> The non-legal science of organization has always criticized the normative system anyway and „wanted to be more clever” than the act of regulation expressing the conceptions of leadership. The branches of the *theory of organizing* that developed following the socialist revolutions, like scientific tendencies, did not become the „victims of the beginning personal cult”, as it is an objective regularity in a revolutionary situation that a deviation from the revolutionary normatives will anyway be eliminated from the science even in case of the best intentions. It is of course inexcusable that the partisans of these branches were personally persecuted and often liquidated. In this respect, the leadership committed then a fault unpardonable.

After precedents like these in the U. S. S. R. — so-to-say, for a whole generation — the *problems of administering* (organizing) *were investigated and taught exclusively from a legal, i. e. normativistic aspect.*<sup>38</sup> In the people's democracies and among them in this country, as well, following the years of change, after a longer or shorter time, this tendency became dominant and decisive everywhere. From the years of the middle of the nineteen-fifties, however, as the damaging consequences of personal cult began being eliminated, there increased more and more the number of jurists raising the question of a necessity of substituting *administrative theory* for administrative law. The character of this theory would mean to insert extra- or supra-juridical point of view of organizing, among the approaches of so far overwhelmingly normative outlook, only since the 20th Congress of the CP of U. S. S. R.; and the question comes into the limelight: „What is the difference between the theory of administrative law and a science of administering in fuller sense under socialist conditions?”<sup>39</sup>

Since the nineteen-sixties the students of administrative law have already felt so strong the demand on an approach through the theory of organizing that more and more of them have taken sides in international symposia and publications for transforming the theory of administrative law into a *science of public administration*. This programme of founding a science of organizing was, however, not accepted by every partisan of the socialist public administrative law, so that finally a lot of varieties of positions taken up by the lawyers in this question have developed.<sup>40</sup>

One of the groups of the students of administrative law *has refused categorically* any approach to the trend of a science of administering or organizing.

<sup>37</sup> There can be ranged among the students of this „early” Marxist science of administrative organization in this country e. g. János Deszkás.

<sup>38</sup> The legal normativism was made an official trend of administrative science by A. J. Vyshinsky. Vyshinsky delivered his report determining the whole Soviet jurisprudence in the first all-Union Conference in 1938. (Cp.: G. J. Petrov: *Soviet law of state administration*. (Szovjet államigazgatási jog). Budapest, 1963. p. 32). A typical legal normativistic work of the theory of public administration is also the book of S. S. Studenikin: *Soviet state administrative law*, published also in Hungarian language (Szovjet államigazgatási jog. Budapest, 1951).

<sup>39</sup> Lajos Szamel establishes in the sentence following the quotation that „The raising of question is formally enormously similar to the opposition of the theory of public administrative law the science of public administration...” Lajos Szamel: *Fundamental legal problems of the leadership in state administration*. Budapest, 1963. p. 24.

<sup>40</sup> The different opinions appeared plastically side by side in a Symposium arranged under the title „*Tasks of the science of state administration in socialist countries*” in Pécs (Hungary), May 7—9 1963. The basic report and the contributions to the discussion are contained in No. 33, *Studia Iuridica Auctoritate Universitatis Pécs Publicata*. Budapest, 1964.

The most conservative ones simply said that the administrative law was always a science of organizing. Everything being so far a so-called peculiar organizational formula has already obtained the light due to its weight and character, therefore the relations between the parts of topics of the discipline need not be modified, either.<sup>41</sup> Others have considered the theory of administrative law to be a little *normativistic*, they thought *nevertheless that we have to persist in principle in the juristic character of the science* — only taking into somewhat more consideration the recent organizational requirements. The science can meet these requirements by forwarding more perfectly the method of dialectical and historical materialism.<sup>42</sup> The most of the students have, perhaps, shared the opinion that the science of public administrative law *has to assert both the legal and the organization-theoretical aspects alike, so-to-say equally*, solving that in the framework of the so-called science of public administration.<sup>43</sup> The proposals for ac-

<sup>41</sup> The point of view that the unique and fundamental science of public organization is the public administrative law was represented by a lot of participants in the Symposium in Pécs. Joseph Litwin said as follows:

„In the West, the jurists have already acquiesced in making «lawless» the general theory of administration. The West-German professor, Werner is speaking, for instance, about that «The jurist has to surrender because his juridical method seems to come to a deadlock at recognizing merely the borderland of the material opposite to the reality of administration». In my opinion, the most main and side-questions of the science of administration can be revealed by the student of administrative law still with a better result than by the representatives of the so-called «adjacent» sciences who partly cannot survey at all the aims of the administrative activity and the concrete needs, partly investigate the satisfaction of them with empty words, without any real solution”. (*Tasks of the science of state administration in socialist countries*). Material of the international symposium of the science of public administration, arranged in Pécs, May 7—9 1963. Budapest, 1964. p. 19).

According to Gerhard Schulze: „The control activity of state is an activity regulated legally. It is therefore no more necessary to co-ordinate each other legislation and the activity of content-control, to consider our public control activity as consisting of two components: legal and extra-legal ones or legal and political ones.” (*Tasks of the science of state administration in socialist countries*. Material of the international symposium of the science of public administration, arranged in Pécs, May 7—9, 1963. Budapest, 1964. p. 53).

But perhaps Jiri Hromada took sides the most definitely for the necessity of a single science of legal organization. „The law has, in my opinion, an expressedly organizational character. It is a measure of organizing. Its task is, to realize also legally the organizational purposes and methods, if possible. The technical organization can be regulated and realized, as well; cp., e. g., the acts of technical content and the technical norms as legal rules. And I am asking again: Is it right after these to separate the science of administration and the theory of organization from the public administrative law?” (*Tasks of the science of state administration in socialist countries*. Mat. of the intern. symp. of the sc. of publ. adm., Pécs, May 7—9, 1963. Budapest, 1964. p. 84).

<sup>42</sup> Tudor Draganu said: „In case of employing strictly the method of dialectical materialism in the field of administration the science of administrative law cannot be an exclusively legal science. The mere fact that the science of the socialist administrative law is investigating the problems of organizing not only in their outer appearance but it examines also their essence and their connections with other social phenomena, preserves it from the mistakes and exaggerations of the bourgeois trend of administrative law and of Lorenz Stein's school.” „In my opinion, at present every kind of the administrative theories ought to have above all a legal character.” (*Tasks of the science of state administration in socialist countries*. Mat. of the intern. symp. of the sc. of publ. adm., Pécs., May 7—9 1963. Budapest, 1964. p. 45).

<sup>43</sup> Mihály Samu pointed to that behind emphasizing a synthesis of the legal and organizational theories a protection of the „earlier” standpoint of jurists was hidden. „In connection with my conclusion concerning the separation of the science of

centuate the organization all character of the science of administrative law have after all touched the whole system of the juridical sciences and even they were in an evident connection with the general solutions of scientific taxonomy. The traditional normativistic legal outlook becoming weaker, there took hold three kinds of conceptions in the science of public administration for taking the initiative in the investigations of the organizational conditions according to new points of view and with new methods.

(a) The science of public administrative law — apart from preserving and protecting its classical function — has to develop its particular *sociological* methods, as well;<sup>44</sup> therefore it needs some change in its character. The science of public administration, however, integrates itself organically with the *system of legal sciences* and may not grow so sociological that its belonging to law becomes dubious.

(b) Besides the science of public administrative law, there may and even should be developed the science of *public administrative organization* that is the *science of ramified organization of administration*.<sup>45</sup> For the moment, there isn't a science of organizing public administration like this, but its development is demanded both by the claims of the practical organization and by their scientific taxonomical requirements.<sup>46</sup> This organizational science of public administration is considered by some of the scholars as a science of *sociological* character;

---

state administration I think so that emphasizing the unity of the state administration and public administrative law we are protecting the earlier legal outlook and impeding the research of the particular problems of state administration." (Dr. Mihály Samu: *The particular branches of political science, constitutional law and public administrative procedural law*. Az államtudomány szakágazatai, alkotmányjog és államigazgatási eljárásjog. State and Administration — Állam és Igazgatás. 1967. No. 12. p. 1084).

<sup>44</sup> This opinion was represented by Sándor Berényi: „The science of public administration is a social science: we are agreeing with that its place is inside the political and legal sciences and that it applies the sociological method. The science of state administration is essentially nothing else than a sociology of public administration." (*Tasks of the science of state administration in socialist countries*. Mat. of the intern. symp. of the sc. of publ. adm., Pécs, May 7—9 1963. Budapest, 1964. p. 80).

<sup>45</sup> Mihály Samu is taking sides for the necessity of public administrative law and the science of state administration. „I consider as inconsistent to include the theory of public administration into the legal science of public administration and profess to be necessary that the science of state administration takes place as a separate discipline among the special branches of the political science." (Dr. Mihály Samu: *The particular branches of political science, constitutional law and public administrative procedural law*. State and Administration, No. 12. December 1967. p. 1083).

„The solution of the present socialist science system is, unfortunately, for unifying the two qualities, and even of legal point of view; we find, therefore, only a specialistic research of the problems of State in jurisprudence. Opposite to that, I profess the necessity of analysing the State by a special science inside the political and legal sciences, investigating the general and particular regularities of building up and functioning of the state organs." (Op. cit., p. 1085).

<sup>46</sup> The problem of administrative science was raised in a very interesting way by the symposium in Pécs. It was historically established that the first study of the science of administration under socialist conditions was the science of „Soviet building". The solution arises that we should develop this area to be the science of administration: „It may prove enough to extend the content of «Soviet building». Nevertheless, he finds more correct in connection with the terminology to use the word *science of administration*, as applied in Lenin's works." (Cp. The remarks of Jerzy Starosciak in the symposium of Pécs: *Tasks of the science of state administration in socialist countries*. Mat. of the intern. symp. of the sc. of publ. adm., Pécs, May 7—9 1963. Budapest, 1964. p. 41).

others did not declare their opinion about its character only about its being necessary.

(c) At last, a number of the students of jurisprudence have regarded as being *necessary* to develop a *general science of organizing* besides the science of administration (theory of administrative organizing).<sup>47</sup> About such a science of organization standing above the branches — they said — we can hardly speak, as yet, being in want of a due number of scientific results; however, both its theoretical and its practical reasons are supported by several conditions. As to the character of the general theory of organization — otherwise understandably — the opinions have also been very much unestablished; anyway, almost everybody made clear so much that this would be a *science of complex outlook* where, e. g., the legal method has its field, as well, but it must certainly function as combined with the methods of a lot of other branches of science.

The science of organizing, in narrow sense, is equal to the *science of administering*. Jurists and first of all the specialists of the public and administrative law have had some potential advantage in participating in the development of this science as in socialist societies a huge part of the administrative conditions are *legally* regulated. In the branches of jurisprudence dealing with these organizations the peculiar legal methods have so strong traditions that the *outsiders* have seen in the theoretical approach of legal *organizing* only the use and possibly the amendment of the traditional methods and not some efforts for a really independent foundation of the organizational theory. On the breakdown of the familiarization of the general science of administration in this country there played a role the scruples of „outsiders” that everything that is „administrative” in character will sooner of later „expropriated” by the jurists, this science being not allowed of being liberated from the framework of legal sciences. This „juristical” science of organizing is condemned by the representatives of other branches of discipline to be one sided methodically and in out-

<sup>47</sup> Dr. István Kovács who had the earliest raised the problems of the theoretical taxonomy of the sciences of organizational theory and outlined the bases of a theoretical arrangement, already in his paper quoted from 1957 (A definition of state administration. Bull. of the Inst. of. Pol. and Leg. sc., 1957. No. 1) had seen the one-sidedness of the approximation of administrative conditions in socialist countries — and thus its failure, too — in the fact that „the general science of socialist organization has not developed.” (Op. cit., p. 74.) In 1965, in his report made together with János Beér for the meeting convoked to Szeged to discuss the programme of a course entitled theory of organizing, he investigated and differentiated in details the taxonomical site of the studies about a theory of organization and its connection with other sciences. „The course entitled Theory of organization, that wanted to be included in the subject-matter of the instructions at the Faculties of Law, is essentially to be comprehended as a topic of *general theory of organizing opposite to the single studies of particular organizations*” — says the first sentence of Report. „The organization of state administration belongs to these studies of particular organizations, and the public administrative law is to be studied and taught independently from that.” (Cp.: János Beér — István Kovács: *A programme of the course entitled A theory of organizing — A szervezés tan című kollégium programja*. Manuscript).

At the symposium in Pécs, Lajos Szamel formulated his opinion in his basic Report as follows: „As to us, we identify ourselves both with the demand of a general theory of organizing and with that of the sciences of ramified organizations.” (*Tasks of the science of state administration in socialist countries*. Material of the intern. symp. of the sc. of publ. adm., Pécs. May 7—9, 1963. Budapest, 1964, p. 14). Sándor Berényi said about the general theory of organizing that „we have to accept its existence as a hypothesis... and, consequently, to develop the scientific research in this field.” (Op. cit., p. 81).

look. Since in the socialist countries the development of the empirical sociological investigations has started, the normativism has been considered from sociological side as one of the deficiencies of the theory of organizing. In the relations of organization, however, the exact establishment of facts must go before normatives because we can avoid only in this way a subjectivism of regulation that neglects the regularities of reality.<sup>48</sup>

The legal point of view has persisted for long, and does persist, at approaching some organizational conditions scientifically. It does it, of course, the most strongly in the systematical theories concerning the organization of state power and that of the public administration with *general authority* (Council of Ministers, councils and their executive committees). In some *administrative branches* the legal normativism has constantly remained dominant. Financial law is, for instance, at present, too, a science of the financial organization of State where the organizational solutions are depending, in principle, on the evaluation of the respective legal formulae. Financial law is, of course, practised also by the non-jurists in the apparatus (economists, etc.); they, however, having no special education, do accept the juridic conceptions.

In some fields of administrative relations, however, the hegemony of jurist has been broken and even typical areas of the „public administration” have been invaded by approaches of other points of view and there developed sciences of non-state controlled ramified administration.

Under socialist conditions, one of the administrative systems developing the most dynamically may be found in the *economic organization*. Apart from jurists,<sup>49</sup> more and more specialists, first of all economists, engineers, mathemati-

<sup>48</sup> It was said by András Hegedüs at the Conference in Gyöngyös of the science of organizing: „In our theory of organizing the normative component is dominant one-sidedly, we do only investigate how the things ought to be and a *descriptive representation of reality* remains in the background, although without knowing this we cannot draw a correct conclusion as to what ought to be.” (*Problems of the scientific organization*. Conference in Gyöngyös about the science of organizing. Ed.: Dr. László Szabó. Budapest, 1965. p. 89).

There is a discussion between the normativistic and fact-finding trends also in the United States, in the literature of the science of organizing. There, however, owing to social structural causes mentioned above, the sociological trend is dominant; it is, therefore, understandable that there the critique of normativism is much more dynamical and comprehensive than in the Continent. As to the contrast between the partisans of the normativistic and descriptive methods, cp.: W. R. Dill: *Desegregation or Integration?* Published in: W. W. Cooper—H. J. Leavitt—M. W. Shelly II. *New Perspectives in Organization Research*. New York—London—Sydney, 1964., pp. 39 et sq.

<sup>49</sup> The jurists have, of course, dealt with the form of undertaking and the legal way of its direction since the beginning of the socialist state building. The problems are, however, raised in a new way by the reform of economic mechanisms for a lot of functions of the administrative organizations were decentralized to the undertakings.

The legal problems of economic administration were placed on the agenda of the Congress of International Society of the Administrative Science (Brussels), as well. The regulations concerning the legal status and control of the national undertakings of socialist States were collected till the state in 1967 and also evaluated in an introductory paper with comparative notices by Lajos Ficzer's work: *Legal status of state-owned enterprises in some socialist countries*. Edition of the Institute of Political Sciences and Jurisprudence, Hungarian Academy of Sciences. (Az állami vállalat jogállása egyes szocialista országokban. Budapest, 1967.) Lajos Ficzer treated of the problems of legal projections of the control of undertakings in another paper of his (A vállalat és az államigazgatási szerv viszonya. In: *State and Jurispru-*

cians, etc. are dealing with the problems of economic control,<sup>50</sup> and, after all, the components of the *economic administration* or organization took shape. Also they deal necessarily with the part above that — with the problems of the organizational system, i. e. public administration controlling the undertakings „from above” — but this field is dominated together with the administrative jurists. The organization of undertaking has a lower level that can also be considered, on the basis of the great lot of published works, as a fully separate field; that is the industrial organization.

The laying of upper and lower lines of industrial organization contains practically some problems. It is not at all difficult to draw a theoretical boundary between the organizational forms of the production in state ownership and the organs of public administration having an official sphere of authority; nonetheless, also here exist several organizational problems. E. g., the large undertakings may have such a huge administrative apparatus that may approach and even surpass in size some organizations of public administration. And even, the boundaries between the functions of administration and of the organs controlled may become so indistinct that the management of undertakings can seize legally or illegally some jurisdiction of authorities, as well. The upper boundary of the industrial management is liquid also because the fusion of undertakings — their subordination, so frequent in the past, under the immediate control of an organ of public administration, like a Ministry, the executive committee of a higher council, etc. — and in other cases their „decentralization” makes problematical whether or not there is a boundary of principle between the functions of the organs of industrial management and of the ramified public administration. There arose some impression as if everything were „only a problem of organizing”, meaning that there are more possibilities. The economic changes in the socialist states, the so-called reforms of mechanisms make, however, more and more obvious that between the organizational forms of production (and their administrative functions) and the apparatus of state administration there is a relation of connections and delimitations determined objectively on the basis of which the organizational forms of the social production (undertaking, co-operative) as well as the institutions and institutes — like organizations performing some cultural, sanitary service,

dence — Állam és Jogtudomány No. 4. 1968. pp. 592. et. sq.). The regulations of legal rules in connection with introduction of the new economic mechanism are communicated and interpreted, and thus essentially the normative outlook realized, by the Interdepartmental Committee of the Continuitive Education of Leaders. (*Principles and requirements of the new system of economic control concerning the management of enterprises*. Fasc. I. Budapest, 1967: Az új gazdaságirányítási rendszer alapelvei és követelményei a vállalati vezetésben).

<sup>50</sup> From the approaches of non-lawyer style of the leadership of undertakings, cp.: *Management, organization and planning of industrial enterprises II* (Iparvállalatok vezetése, szervezése és tervezése II. Ed.: Dr. Sándor Varga) Budapest, 1968; Dr. János Fáth: *Up-to-date management of large enterprises* (Nagyvállalatok korszerű vezetése). Budapest, 1966, II. ed.; Ferenc Bihari: *Economic leadership in practice* (Gazdasági vezetés a gyakorlatban). Budapest, 1964. Studies that may be classified in this category are to be found (besides those concerning business organization, industrial sociology, psychology) in the paper-collection entitled *Knowledge of leadership* (Vezetési ismeretek) (Ed.: Dr. János Susánszky), I. Budapest, 1967, as well as in the collection of the Interdepartmental Committee of the Continuitive Education of Leaders, entitled: *General problems of the up-to-date management and organization of enterprises*. (A vállalat korszerű vezetésének és szervezésének általános kérdései), II. Budapest, 1967.

supply — may be treated also as a separate administrative problem, even if the regularities of a supposed general *theory of administrative organization*, identified later, affect them, too.

The *organization of science* has obtained the most easily the position of a theory of ramified administration, resp. organization. Apart from the very great role of science under modern conditions and the parallelly increasing demand on solving the organizational problems of science, also some structural reasons have taken part in that. Among them it is the most decisive that the administrative mechanism of the control of science is of comparatively recent date and the upper direction of this organization from the beginning differed from the organizational solutions of the typical branches of public administration (e. g., agriculture, education, etc.). The influence of government on this area was in the beginning less immediate, even if there existed, then too, temporarily more direct forms.<sup>51</sup>

The main organ of the scientific control at us, the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, cannot at all be identified with the typical organizational forms of the ramified administrations, the Ministries. The Government, founding also a Council of Science and Higher Education, had created a *higher* body of control above the administrative function of Academy but it is a well-known fact that this only happened because the Academy in some period and owing to certain reasons was not fully suitable for making the huge scientific organization function meeting completely the governmental purposes. This was considered, to be sure, as only a transitory solution, and the function of the highest control of science has already reverted to the Academy.

In the field of the control of science, the efficiency of the typical administrative organizational solutions in the organization of state administration has been questionable from the beginning.<sup>52</sup> Although the main organ of the scientific control, the Academy was from the very first „more exempt” from

<sup>51</sup> The limits of the administration (organization) or control of science and the topic of this branch of science could not be cleared inside this short period of development. Others have dealt with themes similar to the former ones under the titles: *sociology of science*, resp. *science of sciences*. In the Hungarian Science there took place a longer discussion about the question in the framework of which science would be desirable to study the problems of the organization of science, sociology, and so on, and how the topics of the new science ought to be determined.

<sup>52</sup> On the one hand, the *sociological* point of view protects the *human* interests of the authors, that is to say, it endeavours to screen the formal components that are indispensable from the administrative point of view but endanger the creative scientific work. This conception was formulated plastically by the paper of András Hegedűs: *Special administration of scientific research* (A tudományos kutatás szakigazgatásáról. In: Hungarian Science — Magyar Tudomány, 1967, Nos. 7—8.) Similar ideas are contained also in the paper written by Jenő Wigner and Károly Ákos, demonstrating in several respects the inhuman tendencies of „big science”. (*Increase of Science — Favourable outlooks and dangers to be expected*: A tudomány növekedése — kedvező kilátások és várható veszélyek. In: Hungarian Science — Magyar Tudomány, 1968, No. 5.) On the other hand, some considerations concerning the *theory of organizing* have been aligned, investigating the rational indices of the amounts invested in the science; the measurements of efficiency and economicalness. They emphasize, last but not least, that science must anyway be subordinated to a stricter governmental control, the way of which is to construct — besides, resp. above the *social-corporative* organs — and administrative apparatus that knows and can realize the governmental points of view. Cp.: József Takács: *Research organization and research control*; Kutatásszervezés és kutatóigazgatás. In: Hungarian Science-Magyar Tudomány, 1968, No. 3.



the influence of the organizational solutions with a legal outlook of administration, it would be difficult to deny that the developing administrative mechanism was indirectly nevertheless formed by this outlook (only if, even in the Academy, the „jurist” was considered as the author). Even besides the here and there more mechanistic transfer of the principles and methods of public administration, the opinion was strong that the administration of science is a *particular* administration in which special organizational solutions are to be found. In hardly a decade of our scientific development it became generally accepted that there is an *organization of science* as a theory of a separate ramified organization.<sup>53</sup>

(c) Knowing the trends of development of the sciences of ramified administration outlined above, and observing the development of administrative conditions of so rapid pace in modern times, we can easily get the impression that in the conceptional sphere of administrative sciences there is room for any theory of ramified organization. The last consequence of this would be that we oughtn't to force the denomination of „science of organization”, either, the *science of administration* containing all the problems to be analyzed rationally that are presented in the organizational relations of any modern social structure.

At the theoretical investigations of the frameworks of the theory of organization to be determined under socialist conditions, we don't wish to follow the outlook being largely valid in the bourgeois states that identifies organization and administration in every respect. There is applied also a narrower interpretation of the term organization that can be identified with administration under our conditions, as well. The organization is, to be sure, a number of categories that cannot be incorporated completely in the conceptual system of organization.

Administration is taking place, in the Marxist sciences too, according to the opinion accepted the most generally, *between* the supreme decisions and the concrete executive work. These highest decisions are not taking place on an administrative level e. g. on party or state line, either. Neither the party congress nor the supreme representative organ of State are administrative organs. The organizational problems of these upper „non-administrative” organs are dealt with inside the science of Marxism—Leninism by the historical materialism, resp. the scientific socialism. The peculiar regularities of the representative system have been investigated inside the science of public (constitutional) law. There isn't, as yet, any science of organization that would investigate with particular methods the *levels of leadership* in the organ-systems. An indepen-

<sup>53</sup> From the more and more expanding Hungarian literature of the organization of science, cp.: Lajos Lőrincz: *State control of scientific researches: A tudományos kutatások állami irányítása*. Publications of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. Budapest, 1966. Nos. 1—2; —: *Central organization for the state control of scientific researches: A tudományos kutatások állami irányításának központi szervezete*. Budapest, 1969; János Klár: *Economic question of research organization: A kutatásszervezés gazdasági kérdései*. Budapest, 1967; György Rózsa: *Problems of information concerning the sociological investigations and the organization of science: A társadalomtudományi kutatás és a tudományszervezés tájékoztatási problémái*, Budapest, 1965.

An extremely comprehensive material is published in a periodical of Library of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences: the *Bulletin of the Organization of Science* (Tudományszervezési Tájékoztató). The monographs published in foreign periodicals about the organization of science, resp. the sociology of science are frequently reviewed in the Hungarian periodical Truth (Valóság), as well.

dent science of politics is rather only trying to force the doors without being generally recognized by the taxonomy of sciences for the time being. In our opinion, at developing a general *theory of organizing* we mustn't leave out of consideration the conditions of these upper organs of „non-administrative” character. The problems presented there are to be inserted in the theoretical patterns of these organizations. (This standpoint is meaning, anyway, to refuse under our conditions the final conclusion of M. Weber's conception. According to us, the functioning of the „supreme” organs with maximum efficiency cannot happen by employing the principles and methods of „administering” that is, for instance, by giving the character as much as possible to representation, but this „organ type” — that is to be characterized later — has peculiar regularities. These upper organs are to be made rational not in the way of the administrative pattern.)

Even if there isn't any *science of political organizing*, this does not mean that the consequences of regularities of these conditions could be disregarded in the organizational theory.

On the other hand, the *lower boundary* of the administrative conditions is formed by the activity of *concrete realization* that cannot be considered as administration, either. For clearing the organizational questions of this activity after having started from the area of economic organizations, a highly virulent science of ramified organization is developing under our present conditions, as well. This science of organizing is dominated, at us too, by the opinions of *industrial* or working organization. The industrial organization can be inserted, from another point of view, also in the broader category of *economic organization* (control). There is in some works a still more indistinct boundary between the conditions of *organizing an undertaking* or a *factory*.

The science of industrial organization in a strict sense is not at all a kind of organizational science that was so far in question — first of all in case of the sciences of ramified administration. (The organization of an „undertaking” is a science of inner administration, as well). The works of industrial organization may and do have, therefore, a projection that is useful from the point of view of the *organizational theory of administration*. Therefore, even if the bulk of its material isn't in connection with the organizational conditions according to our interpretation, the results of fundamental importance of the researches started from this side are to be taken into consideration from the point of view of the general science of organizing, as well.

