

IGNÁC PAPP

## Lenin and the Socialist Public Administration

The aim of this paper is to outline Lenin's major ideas connected with the socialist public administration, in order to compare these with the main traits of the main present-day consideration concerning bureaucracy and socialist democracy and to call the attention to identities and differences. The writing of the paper is in connection with the elaboration of a part-subject of the Government-level subject about the "Development of public administration".

### I.

One part of the administrative organization was taken over from the czar and the bourgeoisie by the socialist revolution in Russia. Lenin emphasized, just therefore, that the work of building the State should be aimed at making better the apparatus of public administration, at developing the socialist order of the administration. From this point of view, he considered as particularly important to ensure the appropriate personnel, employees, in public administration. He expounded, in connection with the administrative activity, that legality should be kept with the utmost rigour in the course of implementing the administrative activity. Just therefore, the official person is obliged to report in writing the violation of the legal framework, necessitated by extraordinary conditions, to the hierarchial organs on higher level. As well as, it is obligatory, to take down minutes about conflicts, frictions, disagreements, misunderstandings or controversies resp. if any of nationals makes a grievance of measures, delays etc. of official persons, and to hand this over to the party to the case, as well<sup>1</sup>. At the end of 1918, Lenin also required to establish exactly the individual responsibility of employees working in the administrative organs (in the corporate organs, departments) for the tasks falling within a fixed competence, for the implementation of these, insisting upon the division of tasks (works) and responsibility. Without this, it is namely impossible, to supervise the implementation of central and local measures (rules of law) in this way, just as to select people

<sup>1</sup> Lenin: Complete Works. Budapest, 1973, vol. 37, pp. 122-3. Cf. Lajos Lőrincz: A közigazgatás kapcsolata a gazdasággal és a politikával (Connection of public administration with economy and policy!). Budapest, 1981, pp. 49-50, 62.

to administrative offices and functions. Lenin regarded, further on, as particularly important to know the departments (sections), offices, sub-departments (subdivisions), the number of employees, the degree of management (number of documents, correspondence etc.), resp. the essence of their work. He thrust into prominence uniting, amalgamating, co-ordinating, merging the administrative divisions for the sake of economy of labour power — on central and local levels (area, town, district) equally.<sup>2</sup>

In 1919 and 1920, he again raised the idea of adopting individual responsibility in order to ensure the implementation of the rules of law. He called the attention to, that the corporate organs cannot be so-called "assemblies of wiseacres." It is important, therefore, to decrease the number of their members, to ensure that their members be informed, as well as the debates should be conducted fast. Exact suggestions are needed, identifying individual responsibility concerning administrators and managers. He supported the participation, co-operation of workmen and peasants — raising their cultural level — in public administration, e.g. through trade unions, so-called supervising groups. He also considered as important to draw into the work old administrative specialists until learning the administrative work. He pointed out, too, that initially bourgeoisie, as well, took over from the feudal classes the employees who knew technique.

In connection with that trained office-bearers took their places in the administration, he calls the opinion to the ways of mastering the bureaucratic excesses. To this is necessary in his opinion that all the members of the representative state organs should absolutely be drawn into implementing a definite administrative work. And the administrative work, performed by them, should be alternated in the way that it gradually includes every branch of administration<sup>3</sup>. He referred to, as well, that the high payment of specialists for their knowledge and from the concrete practical point of view, as well, it is necessary to select the heads of corporate organs, which is fundamental from the point of view of implementing the political direction.

In 1921, he unmistakably cleared that the appointment is generally important in public administration, and in case of the most important appointments in the State, the leading Party should also participate. He considered, further on, as highly important to accept the absolutely important challenge against the bureaucratic excesses, deformities, i.e. against the bureaucracy in pejorative sense. He similarly regarded as necessary as a means of the struggle against bureaucracy, in this period, to increase the supervisory work, to promote the suitable workers, as well as to draw into the administrative work the non-party people, as well, resp. to widen the narrow managing circle, consisting of communists. It would be best — he wrote — to draw in the high numbers of honest non-party workers through trade unions. And even, the party organizations should also perform such an organization by establishing non-party conferences which would ensure official connections with non-party elements. In these conferences, the official accounts of every office-holder should be organized in order to give possibility to criticize the administrative organs. This is also a means to terminate alienation, where communists are separated with a wall from out-party people. Lenin considered as necessary — in connection with struggling against bureau-

<sup>2</sup> Lenin: Op. cit.: vol. 37, pp. 344-6, 347, 375.

<sup>3</sup> Lenin: Op. cit.: vol. 38, (1974), p 416, vol. 40 (1974), pp. 201, 241, vol. 41, pp. 74, 348.

cratic excesses and protection — making also use of laws and the people's court if some cases occur that a worker has to go into office more than once and his affair is nevertheless not settled. He demanded just therefore that courts pay more attention to the judicial prosecution of the bureaucratic "red-tapism", in order to increase responsibility.<sup>4</sup>

In the course of passing over to the tax in kind, he emphasized that public administration should entirely be subordinated to policy. That is to say, the administrative employees, organization, activity should exist for the aims of policy, for rendering a service to it, for revising the relation between classes and correcting it, and not just the other way round. The elements of policy are, namely, the following: the relation of proletariat to the peasants and to the masses of proletariat, as well as the relation of proletariat resp. peasants to bourgeoisie. The political interests of peasantry should be taken into consideration in the course of solving the conflicting interests between the proletariat and peasantry. Lenin took a stand against the attempt of officials, too, with which they may try to form a "counter-public-opinion" against the new policy. He considered as a fundamental task of administrative institutions, to display a wide range of activities in order to embetter the peasant farms in every respect, to develop industry, co-ordinate the different works, with local initiatives and that the administrative employees should elucidate — with political explanations — the policy, expressing the passing over to the tax in kind.<sup>5</sup> He took also a stand against the "fireless rumours in the air" the "scanadal-mongers" resp. telling anecdotes, presenting within the administrative organs and claiming to call the individuals like these to account if these do not lay a complaint at an official institution. He emphasized that the personal petition to persons of influence, the "living connection" with them is useful because it shortens the transaction of affairs and the unavoidable protection connected with it.<sup>6</sup>

He deemed it important, too, to organize reporting in public administration and called the attention to the importance of propaganda (political informative work). But he advised a struggle against a practice wishing to solve any task with a word of command. He considered as important in the administrative work, as well, the scientific analysis of data, to come to right conclusion, and outlined his point of view that the backward, negligent resp. incompetent managers should be brought to trial.

Investigating into trade unions — in which the broad layers of non-party workmen should be united — he expounded their tasks in connection with public administration. These are: the protection of the class interests and of the interests of working masses; the struggle against the bureaucratic excesses, blunders frailties of the State and the protection of experts. as of a separate social layer, and not of a given institution; participation in constructing the (administrative) State organs by nominating candidates; participation with consultative right in the different instances of administrative organs; participation in choosing managers and teaching them to make managing work; participation in the work of planning organs; participation in elaborating the wage-system of workers and in ensuring workshop discipline. But trade union — he emphasized — can only perform its above tasks if the workers of the apparatus live among working masses and know

<sup>4</sup> Lenin: Op. cit.: vol. 44 (1975), pp. 168-9, 324.

<sup>5</sup> Lenin: Op. cit.: vol. 44, pp. 154-173.

<sup>6</sup> Lenin: Op. cit.: vol. 44, p. 265.

their life in detail; who can establish, in any moment and question, the needs of masses and the fact, under the effect of what kind of influences, petty bourgeois effects they are; who, with their human behaviour, could gain the unlimited confidence of masses. Trade union is, namely, a power transmission device between the Party and masses, ensuring that the Party does not dash forward with its policy. He pointed at, too, that the tasks of trade union are contradictory, owing to the joint application of convincing and force, the protection of the worker and the policy of the strong hand, as well as to the fact that although he should know to accomodate himself to masses but he cannot shut his eyes to their prejudices, backwardness. Just therefore, he considered the party as necessary, in order to solve disagreements.<sup>7</sup>

In 1922, Lenin called attention to the increased supervision of implementing the decisions. He established, namely, that it is not enough to write orders. The living work gets downed with in a sea of paper. Implementation should be prudential, its permanent, meritorious supervision is a control of what in the practice happens. Lenin disapproved of that the corporate administrative organs are overburdened with petty things of no importance and directed the attention to determining the individual responsibility. He also took a strong stand against refusing to accept responsibility. He again raised the role of legal courts in the struggle against bureaucratism and expressed that every official of the People's Commissariat of Justice should be appreciated from the point of view, how he struggled against the bureaucratic excesses "red-tapism". And he required to close every supervision with a detailed written decision.

He intervened against the continuous sitting, the exaggerated committee meetings, the proliferation of committees. He demanded to collect the important practical experiences and to analyse these, resp. to give preference to the public administrative employees who are skilled in implementation and supervision and can give advices to the organization of work. He considered as important to delimit administrative functions from those of the party in order that the "two wheels" should go round together.

He referred also to that the public administrative affairs should be touched in a civilized way, i.e. well-considered, after making preparations. And the experts working in public administration should be well-versed in avoiding petty conflicts.

He expends a meticulous care on the work of deputies, as well, mainly in the central organs of administration. He saw the main task of deputies in supervising the actual implementation of laws, orders, in decreasing the number of persons becoming members of a permanent staff (terminating the departments), in arranging and simplifying the transaction of affairs, as well as in the struggle against bureaucratism and "red-tapism". Then he specified their main tasks. They should take care of that the administrative questions in other institutions are investigated only with their knowledge and participation. The corporate organs should be released from the administration of petty questions and these are to be solved by the direct decision of deputies. Care should also be taken to that the task of the administrative functionaries be established exactly and individually. They should become acquainted with the administrative functionaries working on different

<sup>7</sup> Lenin: Op. cit.: vol. 44, pp. 332-340, 355.

hierarchical levels, they should follow with attention the payment and remuneration of these. They should organize model sections from the point of view of elaborating the norms concerning the staff and working methods. For this, American and German literature should be published. They should take care of the distribution of communists in the administration. They should take a stand against the dumping in reports and it is necessary that deputies should be released from the participation in various committees, in so far as it is possible, they should take measures against the pullulation of committees but they should urge the creation of a committee if it is necessary. Deputies should impose the administrative and disciplinary punishments in case of bureaucratic, "red-taping", slipshod work. If there are two deputies, these should inform each other about their dispositions and, if necessary, they should hold consultations but the differences between them will be decided by the superior. It is important, to divide the work rightly between them: who should do, where and what. Lenin attributed a great importance to working hours and the programme of work, particularly on the highest level of administration. At the same time, he required to take into consideration the advantageous sides of Taylor's system in the administrative work.<sup>8</sup>

He established, as well, that taking over a part of the old administrative apparatus led to the swelling of functionaries. Particularly on the lower level, there were many hundred thousands of old officials who worked consciously or unconsciously against the new order, sinking the living cases, drown in the paper sea of the mass of documents. They should fight against the "official cliquism", too, by decreasing the apparatus. 1/6 of the apparatus should be left — he wrote — as well as the half part of the old wage-fund, and the payment of officials should be raised to threefold.<sup>9</sup>

In connection with the double subordination, he calls the attention to that this takes place in administration because we have to take into consideration the different characteristics of the single areas. If there were namely not seen any local differences, then we would impede the local functionaries in taking them into consideration reasonably.

Lenin, in his last papers (1922-1923), deemed important, from the point of view of administrative work, the many-more expertness, needed for public administration, the acquirement of this, learning the connection of the of view of administrative work, the many more expertness, needed for learning activity with the official functioning. He took a stand on that the employees, working in the administration in a leading post, should pass an examination on administrative knowledge, the theory of public administration, the basic knowledge of management, the knowledge of the administrative bases of state structure. In connection with this, he proposed to have a hand-book written on the organization of public administrative work.

Moreover, he emphasized that the combination of the different characters, types and personal features (e.g. firmness, persistency in accomplishing the affairs, and even jocularly, inventive power etc.) in the administration and also in the state and party institutions, are needed in the interest of the good functioning of organizations.

The persons needed in the administrative organization — and particularly at the head of it — are, therefore, those who are theoretically eru-

<sup>8</sup> Lenin: Op. cit.: vol. 45, pp. 115, 123, 151-8, 327.

<sup>9</sup> Lenin: Op. cit.: vol. 45, pp. 181, 197, 252, 291.

dite and are capable of rallying people round themselves, resp. of supervising the work of others.

On the other hand, there are also some persons necessary in the public administrative organization, particularly as auxiliary employees, having particular administrative attitude.

The above two attributes are hardly joined in the same person and these will not even be needed — he wrote. And even earlier, he called the attention to that the strong sides of individuality should prevail so much that its weak sides weaken. He referred to, as well, that we should endeavour to unite the different properties, faculties. He did not consider as desirable to form the administrative organs from only people of state-official type. In his opinion, it is also necessary to give employment in these organs to people, as well, who know how to deal with people, that is to say, who are of agitpropist type.<sup>10</sup>

## II.

Lenin's ideas, mentioned above in relation to public administration, agree with the opinions of other thinkers, too, including newer thoughts, as well, and even with the actual relations today.

(1) Lenin recognized the necessity of the existence of the administrative organization, with the present-day terminology a formalized bureaucratic organization, as one of the kinds of social groups in the socialist society, as well, anything better of which could so far not be created. And he revealed, as well, the main characteristics of that, as outlined above. These are: that it is built up hierarchically; that fixed competences are to be found in it; that its organization and activity is regulated, mainly by rules of law; that professional training is necessary to perform the public administrative activity;<sup>11</sup> that the experts, working in public administration, are generally appointed; that the expert, working in public administration, gets a payment for his activity. This knowledge is partly connected with the knowledge of

<sup>10</sup> Lenin: Op. cit.: vol. 45, pp. 343-352. Lajos Lőrincz: Op. cit. pp.86-7.

<sup>11</sup> Martin Krygier takes in his paper "Weber, Lenin and the reality of socialism" a great care over Lenin's idea, formed after the revolution, in connection with the importance of the role of experts. He reveals the effect of Saint-Simon's technocratic opinion on the conception of Lenin and establishes that it fulfilled the theory of the practical building up of State that Lenin then took sides on forming such a policy which comes into being with the aid of technical competency and economic reorganization... "Lenin tried, with other words, ... to form an impersonal and efficient bureaucracy"... In this connection — according to M. Krygier — Moshe Lewin rightly establishes that "Lenin, who has always been regarded as an orthodox Marxist, used beyond all question the Marxist method in approaching the essence of society and sees the internal situation in the concept of class, raising the problems of government mainly from the point of view of the highest governing of the élite in broadest sense" (Moshe Lewin: Lenin's last struggle. London, 1973. p. 120, in: Bureaucracy. The Career of a concept. Ed. by Kamenka and Martin Krygier. Ed. Arnold. London, 1979, pp. 80, 86-7). In our opinion, the role of expertness, of experts has become necessary because the organization of production and consumption. This became fundamentally important in the course of the socialist construction in the public administrative organs of the socialist State, as well (Cf.: György Antalffy and Ignác Papp: A politikai és jogi tanok története (A history of the political and legal theories). Budapest, 1974. p. 343.

Marx's critical thoughts concerning the bureaucratic organization of classical capitalism, partly with the knowledge of the historical reality of the given period, particularly that of the public administration of socialism.

Lenini did also see that in the public administrative organization non-formalized structures take place, as well (thus e.g. gossip, as a not formalized structure), having an influence on the functioning of administrative organs.

The features of the administrative organization, as a bureaucratic one, were summarized by Max Weber in the following: the official affairs are conducted continuously; the administration of affairs takes place on the basis of elaborated norms and principles, determining the obligations of each of the officials, connected with his position, the scope of his activities, as well as the coercive measures at his disposal; the power of each of the officials is only a part of the whole official hierarchy and, compared with that, it is only of percentile character; the official has not his power owing to his individual qualities but as a consequence of his position in the hierarchy; the means of exercising the power are in the property of the organization and not in the private ownership of the single officials; therefore, the official is obliged to render an account of the way of using the means of which he disposes in the interest of the power exercised by him; the position and office do not belong to the private ownership of those serving as officials; it is, therefore not possible to sell, present, bequeath these; the whole process of functioning of the bureaucratic organization is built up on the traffic of documents. And the characteristic traits of the officials functioning in the bureaucratic organization, are as follows: they are free in their person and are appointed into given position; they exercise the power on the basis of impersonal rules, their loyalty applies to performing their official duties conscientiously; they are appointed into their position on the basis of their qualifications; the given position is fulfilled as a full-time and not a part-time employment; they obtain a constant payment, the prospects of their official career are guaranteed by impersonal laws.<sup>12</sup>

The role, importance of the non-formalized structure of the bureaucratic organization was only later demonstrated in the non-Marxist literature.

It is, at any rate, to be taken into consideration that in the bureaucratic public administrative organization, built up according to the above characteristics, the administrative activity is realized by the conduct of the official persons. This, however, means that the official persons follow, apart from the official aims, their own purposes, as well (although, their behaviour is influenced by the organizational aim, too, in the interest of which the organization was created). Anyway, the officials endeavour to form the ad-

<sup>12</sup> J.J. Wiatr: *A politikai viszonyok szociológiája* (Sociology of political relations). Budapest, 1980. pp. 89-90. (Cf.: Lajos Lőrincz Op. cit., pp. 139-149) expounds that Weber considered the predictable-regulation (administration according to calculable rules) as the essence of the organization, with educated functionaries and without regard to the person. Weber, in addition to the peculiarities of the public bureaucracy, standing near to him, wanted to give an answer to the question, too, what kind of factors had promoted the development of the organization (e.g. money, economy, the quantitative growth of tasks, the concentration of the means of management and, decisively, the technical superiority (e.g. speed, continuity, unambiguousness etc.) concerning every other form. And in the question: which social changes are the result of the increase in bureaucracy (it becomes, e.g., a hardly breakable formation, publicity is excluded and counterbalanced by democratization only seemingly, etc.).

ministrative organizational activity, as well. These conditions and the standing change on the level of professional knowledge, the element of power, the different faculties of experts, working there, the quality of those holding a leading post, and the difficulty of accommodation of the changing social environment: restrict the rational functioning of the public administrative — bureaucratic — organization. The administrative organization does, therefore, not function with machine-like precision, as well as — in contradiction with Weber — the functioning of a bureaucratic organization is not precise, either. The fundamental principles (characteristics) break, the internal communication is defective, becoming stiff against the environment of public administration. It cannot correct its failures alone. A correction is only to be imagined from above, and even the foresight of the consequence of the decision is often erroneous.

The Hungarian socialist administrative organization is also a formalized bureaucratic organization; the above outlined features are characteristic of that, as well. This administrative bureaucratic organization was built up in the first period of its development strongly centralized, in exaggerated and in a complicated way; it became stiff and conflicted with the innovating endeavours. In connection with it, the standpoint prevailed that it automatically represents the social interests and, therefore, the various part-interests could not even rise to the surface through the canals of democracy, The operative intervention of this public administration was, in several cases, superfluous and the supervision above the society was less effective.<sup>13</sup> The strong centralization of the Hungarian public administration has lessened from 1953 and, from 1960, it has become gradually decentralized. The aim was to create more centre of decision and grow the interestedness in regional and settlement structures. This public administration has, however, increased in staff, in technicality, and in efficiency. But its confusion has increased, as well. It was shown out, too, that public administration is not always suitable to achieve the published aims.

(2) Lenin recognized, as well, that from the characteristics of the method organizing public administration, as a formalized bureaucratic organization, or from the missing of only formal existence of such a feature (e.g. from the lack of special knowledge), negative, i.e. — with his words — bureaucratic excesses originate. There belongs here, particularly, as he often mentioned, the ensurance of the individual responsibility for a decision (resp. the disappearance of this), which is also an important precondition of the selection of employees, apart from the faculty to ensure the political

<sup>13</sup> György Szoboszlai: *Közigazgatás és társadalmi környezet* (Public administration and social environment). *Politikatudományi tanulmányok* (Political monographs). Budapest, 1982, pp. 208-216. He emphasized, as well, that the development of the predominant administration was in rapport with that in this country, was realized in a less developed society and was necessitated by the socialization of the means of production (Op. cit., p. 215). Then he writes in the following way: the strongly centralized administrative organization covered with a network the whole sphere of society, it functioned politically under a close supervision. This latter made the administration unavoidably indifferent towards the real social needs. They thought that the mechanisms of harmonizing the interests are superfluous. They overemphasized the role of the rule of law, overestimated it, thinking that social behaviours can only be influenced with rules of law and have not taken into consideration the other means — not by the State — of regulation. They under-rated the social role of settlements, as well, and reduced the local self-governments, restricting their role only to supervising the realization of central decision.

line. There belong to here, also, the absurdities, distortions, protections, exaggerations, failures, frailties, as well as "red-tapism" resp. the circumstance that people should go more than once into the office in order to perform their affairs: drowning the living affairs in the paper sea, resp. sinking them into the mass of documents; the fact that the tasks are solved with imperative measures, resp. from the monopoly of power; as well as the attempts to impede the realization of tasks. We should emphasize Lenin's thesis that the co-operation of public administrative employees is particularly important in the political propaganda work.

The recent research — originating from the bureaucratic structure of organization, e.g. the method of organizing the public administration, — emphasizes the following negative phenomena: the stiff adherence to rules, i.e. conservatism that may get into contradiction with innovative endeavours; the preliminary insurance ("covering") of the elements of decision e.g. with expert's opinions; the endeavour to survive even if the bureaucratic organization is not able or willing to recognize the reaction of social changes and is not ready to adapt its own structure and activity to the social changes though these have a significant influence on its behaviour (this may be connected with love of comfort, resp. with inner organizational interests, etc.). An objective source of the negative traits of the public administrative organization, as a bureaucratic organization, is not only the organization, built up in a peculiar way, but the economic, political and cultural environment, as well. For instance, in respect of investments, the stepped-up economic situation, the economy of want, the organizational multiplication — the fact that the organs, too, having originally belonged to the Movement, build up their organizations of administrative character; but the fact, as well, that they differently appreciate public administration in their consciousness, concerning following its own norms; it is criticized that they not always follow these or that they try to undermine these norms — depending on their interests.<sup>14</sup>

Investigating into the Hungarian public administrative organizations, we can similarly demonstrate that, even on a socialist ground, they are fraught with further bureaucratic dangers, originating from objective sources, though this administration can satisfy the needs on a high level. These bureaucratic dangers are as follows: that seen from outside, it is difficult to find our way among its hardly transparent, hardly cognizable organizations, first of all because of their professional character; the administration, owing to its personnel and financial dependance on the upper organs, may cut itself from the social realities, it is inclined to rigidity, to the conservation of the customary forms — what is confirmed by the monopolistic position of the organization, as well as by its key-position in the division of the extra-

<sup>14</sup> Kálmán Kulcsár: A bürokratizmus társadalmi összefüggései (Social connections of bureaucratism) *Gazdaság, társadalom, jog* (Economy, society, law). Budapest, 1982, pp. 235-254. László Sziklai presents well — following György Lukács — the Stalin-conception of the subjective sources of bureaucracy. Cf.: *A történelem szelleme* (The spirit of history). Adalékok Lukács György politikai filozófiájához (Contribution to the political philosophy of György Lukács). In: *Világosság*, 1982, No. 10, p. 603 — Cf. also: R.K. Merton: *Társadalomelmélet és társadalmi struktúra* (A theory of society and social structure) Budapest, 1980. pp. 452-471, Ferenc Erdei: *Szakszerűség és demokrácia* (Technicality and democracy). Település-politika, közigazgatás, urbanizáció (Settling policy, public administration, urbanization). Budapest, 1977, pp. 491-499.

production (the public administration is, namely, not interested enough in improving its activity, making it more civilized and the individual is defenceless against it); it is too inclined to secrecy, because this is a means to exaggerate, overestimate the importance of the power of the organization, and the monopoly of information is a source of the exclusiveness of the organization; and publicity, as a value, is problematic in case of decisions concerning planning and distributing.<sup>15</sup>

(3) Lenin calls the attention — in connection with the public administrative organization, a bureaucratic organization — to the necessity of evolving democracy, as well. His opinion was that democracy — in connection with the public administrative organization, as a bureaucratic organization — is important in order to overcome the bureaucratic excesses presenting themselves in the public administrative activity. He required the participation of workers and peasants in supervision, particularly through trade unions and through the mentioned control groups and the creation of party conferences. He considered important, as well, to draw the members of the representative organs into the administrative work, gradually, into every branch of that. He raised the question that the dilatory officials should be brought before the tribunal of public opinion. He regarded trade unions as a particularly important organization in the struggle against the bureaucratic excesses, fault frailties of administration. He emphasized, therefore, that, in addition to the supervisory work, they should take part, e.g., at the different instances of public administrative organs, with consultative right. And also in elaborating the wage-system, ensuring workshop discipline and protecting the interest of those, working in public administration. Lenin emphasized that though the work of trade union is contradictory but it can ensure the expression of the demands of masses and an important task of deputies is to supervise democracy, to take steps against the bureaucratic excesses. Lenin's idea about drawing men of different types into public administration deserves the greatest attention.

The recent research works concerning democracy, socialist democracy emphasizes that socialist democracy demands the participation of nationals, is advertizing power, and also the democratic organizational forms, needed to this, giving possibility to make known the opinions and interests and make them impact. And the participation in power means the freedom of speech before decisions, proposal, participation in making the decisions, resp. the supervision of making decisions and implementing the decisions. It is a very essential element of socialist democracy, to ensure the social dependence of administrative organs in direct and indirect ways. The exercise of socialist

<sup>15</sup> György Szoboszlai: Op. cit.: pp. 218-9. Our own empirical research work, performed in district Szeged in the end of 1976, is opposed to the first bureaucratic danger, to a certain extent (N = 621 heads). We have, namely obtained to the question: "Do you know the mechanism of the function of the local (council) administrative organs? the following answer: exactly 37 p.c., by and large 47.7 p.c., not 15.1 p.c. It is worth while to add to this that 32 p.c. of the sample was already the member of the local leading organ and 77.1 p.c. already had something to settle in the public administration. Cf.: Ignác Papp: A községi tanácsai közigazgatás a közvélemény funkcióinak tükrében (The administration of the council of the community in the mirror of the functions of public opinion: a manuscript), 1978, p. 9; M. Crozier: A bürokrácia jelensége (Phenomenon of bureaucracy). Budapest, 1981, pp. 297ff.

democracy connects, however, with socialist conviction, with the acceptance and support of the socialist system, political information and the existence of political opinion based on political experiences but being connected with the formation of a motivation system which animates people to take part therein.

It is important in our country, as well, to continue developing socialist democracy. There arose earlier the idea, to bring the tasks of public administration before social organs but this was not justified.<sup>16</sup> It is more important to supervise the administration through political and elected central, regional, settlement, state representative as well as social organs, through these bringing to the surface the different interests, and canalizing these into the processes of administrative decisions, taking into consideration the levels of administration. It is important, in this way, to confirm socialist democracy, the activity in public life, participation, the right of consultation,<sup>17</sup> generally the surpassing of the political culture of "subjects"<sup>18</sup>. The evolution of socialist democracy was broadened in our country in the past years by the admission of the difference in interests and the development and conciliation of these in the political system. This was in connection with the processes of rationalization and modernization, as well, though these do, not go unconditionally together. That is to say, democracy does not always function most rationally and rationalization can be realized in the framework of centralized directive effectively. Just therefore, the further development of socialist democracy should be ensured with a total and unambiguous reform policy, directed centrally by the party.<sup>19</sup> It is moreover important to take also measures against formalism, the vacant runs of the organization, rendering more difficult the development of socialist democracy,<sup>20</sup> and the democratic political praxis, the political security of individuals and

<sup>16</sup> Péter Schmidt: has expounded that socialization is not solved by rearranging the ranges of functions. And the system of the new direction of economy in this country queried the unrestricted, exaggerated entitlements of state administration, carrying the entitlement of an owner (cf.: A szocialista demokrácia és a mai állam (Socialist democracy and the present-day State) in: Ügyészségi Értesítő, 1981, p. 14). Péter Schmidt in an earlier study: A proletárdiktatúra és a szocialista demokrácia (Dictatorship of the proletariat and socialist democracy), in: Tájékoztató, 1978, No. 4, pp. 56-7, called the attention to that the strong level restriction of administration brings with itself the revival, extension of the bureaucratic phenomena, as well as that from the state character of ownership does not follow the unrestricted right of state organs to give directives. But it was just this right that incited the administrative organs to withdraw, and this way the cause of that the restriction of their sphere of action came into prominence.

<sup>17</sup> György Szoboszlai: Op. cit., p. 216; idem: A szocialista állam, az érdekvépviselet és a társadalmi ellenőrzés (The socialist State, the corporate system, and the social control), in: Társadalomtudományi Közlemények, 1980. Nos 3-4, pp. 416-421. Schmidt, P.: Op.cit. p. 15, where he emphasizes the role of territorial interest in connection with the functions of representative organs.

<sup>18</sup> Péter Hanák: Társadalom és politikai kultúra Magyarországon (Society and the political culture in Hungary) (Történelem és közgondolkodás) (History and public thinking). Budapest, 1982. Ed.: Henrik Vass, p. 119.

<sup>19</sup> Mihály Bihari: A politikai mechanizmus és a demokrácia (The political mechanism and democracy). Válság és megújulás (Crisis and renewal). Budapest, 1982. Ed.: Henrik Vass, pp. 276-294.

<sup>20</sup> György Badacsonyi: Politikai kultúra és szocialista demokrácia (Political culture and socialist democracy). In: Társadalmi Szemle, 1979, pp. 97-104.

communities, their freedom, political equality, e.g. the guarantee of the rights of the majority and minority,<sup>21</sup> as well as the decentralization of decisions and the development of major discussions<sup>22</sup> should also be guaranteed.

\* \* \*

It is to be established, summarizing, that Lenin's fundamental ideas, connected with the socialist public administration are edifying at present, as well, and directing the socialist political praxis. This is a consequence of that Lenin's ideas were synchronous with the constructive opinions of those days concerning public administration and the recent conceptions made the thoughts, raised by him, even more unambiguous.

<sup>21</sup> Mihály Bihari: *Op. cit.*, p. 290.

<sup>22</sup> Wiatr J. J.: *Op. cit.*, pp. 280-282. Kálmán Kulcsár: *A politikai szociológia alapjai* (Bases of political sociology) Budapest, 1977, pp. 145-151, particularly concerning the factors exercising the activity of the members of council.